providing for validation of prior taxes as passed by the United States Senate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7037. Also, petition of Port of New York Authority, New York City, N. Y., urging that Congress appropriate money for rivers and harbors improvement as recommended by the Chief of Engineers for the port of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7038. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition signed by citizens of Manitowoc County, Wis., requesting legislation covering immediate aid to the people of German and Austrian Republics, now famine stricken; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7039. Also, petition signed by citizens of Oshkosh, Wis., requesting immediate legislation extending aid to the people of the German and Austrian Republics, now famine stricken; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7040. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Ed Frommel and 61 other citizens of New York, urging Congress to extend aid to the people of Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7041. Also, petition of members of Wurttemberger Schwaken Unterstutzungs Verein, Buffalo, N. Y., indorsing a joint resolution providing for the extension of aid to the people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7042. Also, petition of members of Young Siegfried Lodge, No. 598, German Order of Harugari's, urging that aid be extended to the indigent people of Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7043. By Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey: Petition of 162 residents of New Jersey, favoring the abolition of discriminatory tax on small arms, ammunition, and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7044. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of California Farm Bureau Federation, Berkeley, Calif., urging an appropriation of $168,000 for soil-survey work in the United States; also, Tulare County Pomona Grange, of Visalia, Calif., urging appropriation for the improvement of the General Grant National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7045. Also, petition of Michael Carroll, secretary American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of San Francisco, Calif., relative to foreign propaganda in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7046. Also, petition of Immigration Restriction League (Inc.), by A. R. Webster, secretary, of New York City, opposing the legislation admitting Armenians into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7047. Also, petition of J. B. Levison, president Insurance Federation of California, protesting against the monopolistic feature of the Fitzgerald bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7048. Also, petition of the Pennsylvania State Grange, Williamsport, Pa., relative to the development of the Muscle Shoals project; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7049. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of the German Beneficial Union of the A. V. District 24, New Kensington, Pa., favoring a joint resolution purporting to extend immediate aid to the people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 26, 1923.*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 23, 1923.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary, George A. Sanderson, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1923.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WESLEY L. JONES, a Senator from the State of Washington, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. JONES of Washington thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT DOCUMENTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the number of documents received and distributed by the Treasury Department during the year ended December 31, 1922, together with the number remaining on hand January 1, 1923, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

DEPARTMENTAL USE OF AUTOMOBILES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, in partial response to Senate Resolution 399, agreed to January 6, 1923, relative to the ownership and upkeep of passenger automobiles in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Freedmen's Hospital, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the academy for the year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

USE OF AUTOMOBILES BY DISTRICT GOVERNMENT.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in 8-point type, the report which came in to-day from the District Commissioners relative to automobiles. I desire to note in the RECORD the fact that the report was sent to the Senate after the District appropriation bill was passed, just as I predicted yesterday and the day before would be done.

I want to add that the total annual cost of upkeep and maintenance for automobiles in the city, according to a hasty calculation I have made from the figures, is the enormous sum of $216,879.50. I also find that there are 17 private policemen listed, each drawing a stipend of $40 a month additional for upkeep of private automobiles in which to ride. I want to suggest that perhaps that is the reason we have so many accidents.

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

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, January 24, 1923.

Hon. CALVIN COOLIDGE,
President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have received copy of Senate Resolution 399, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, calling upon them to furnish to the Senate certain data regarding automobiles in use in the government of the District of Columbia, and in response thereto inclose herewith the following:

1. Statement showing allowances made from appropriations to officers and employees of the District of Columbia furnishing their own automobiles for use for official business.
2. Statement showing the number, location, and cost of garages, etc., and the number of passenger automobiles kept in said garages.
3. Statement of passenger automobiles the property of the District of Columbia.
4. Statement with reference to automobiles in use outside of the city of Washington.

Very respectfully,

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
By CUNO H. RUDOLPH, *President.*

1.—*Statement showing allowances for privately owned automobiles made to officers and employees of the District government, together with the amount of such allowances, the names, and the positions of those to whom allowances are made.*

Amount of allowance per month.	Name.	Position.
$26	J. W. Ireland	Electrical inspector.
26	F. D. Wallace	Do.
26	J. J. Murray	Do.
26	W. M. Barton	Inspector, surface division.
26	G. B. M. Ricker	Bridge overseer.
26	W. J. Downing	Assistant inspector, building inspection division.
26	S. G. Huntt	Do.
26	H. Van Den Boogert	Do.
26	Ralph Gedney	Do.
25	M. C. Hargrove	Purchasing officer.
26	W. E. G. Penny	Inspector, city refuse division.
26	W. J. Clements	Do.
26	W. C. Smith	Do.
26	E. H. Colvin	Foreman, city refuse division.
26	W. S. Wilson	Do.
26	W. R. Wood	Superintendent, city refuse division.
26	D. E. Davis	Foreman, city refuse division.
26	Charles Johnson	Do.
26	Wm. C. Fowler	Health officer.
26	Geo. M. Boteler	Assistant health officer.
26	J. T. Sprague	Chief, bureau preventable disease and director of bacteriological laboratory.
26	R. R. Ashworth	Chief food inspector.
26	R. L. Martin	Food inspector, dairy farms.
26	H. V. Neale	Do.
26	J. G. Conroy	Do.
26	T. W. Sproesser	Do.
26	J. B. McClellan	Do.
40	W. H. Harrison	Inspector, police department.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

1.—*Statement showing allowances for privately owned automobiles made to officers and employees of the District government, etc.*—Continued.

Amount of allowance per month.	Name.	Position.
$40	J. E. Boyle	Sergeant, police department.
40	J. W. McCormack	Do.
40	S. J. Marks	Do.
40	W. H. Bailey	Private, police department.
40	B. C. Black	Do.
40	W. H. Brauning	Do.
40	A. E. Brown	Do.
40	B. E. Gallimore	Do.
40	H. R. Levi	Do.
40	W. C. Lewis	Do.
40	G. M. Little	Do.
40	R. H. Mansfield	Do.
40	Jeremiah Mills	Do.
40	W. M. Rout	Do.
40	Avon Shocky	Do.
40	J. J. Tolson	Do.
40	O. J. Trenis	Do.

1.—*Statement showing allowances for privately owned automobiles made to officers and employees of the District government, etc.*—Continued.

Amount of allowance per month.	Name.	Position.
$40	F. L. Tyser	Private, police department.
40	W. D. Vaughn	Do.
40	M. W. Warren	Do.
26	George S. Wilson	Secretary board of charities.
26	Dr. F. W. Ballou	Superintendent of schools.
26	H. F. McQueeney	Superintendent of janitors.
26	S. E. Kramer	Assistant superintendent of schools.
26	G. C. Wilkinson	Do.
26	Miss R. L. Hardy	Director of primary instruction.
26	G. W. Bryant	Cabinetmaker.
26	W. B. Patterson	Supervising principal.
26	Dr. J. A. Murphy	Chief medical and sanitary inspector.
26	Dr. W. S. Montgomery	Supervising principal, colored schools.

In addition to the above we have nine authorizations for allowances on privately owned automobiles which are not taken advantage of at the present time.

2. *Statement showing the number, location, and cost of any garage or garages maintained; where such garages are located; cost of same; rentals on same; the number of passenger automobiles kept in said garages; the names of such officers or employees keeping such automobiles in such garages.*

Number of garages.	Location.	Maintenance cost.	Cost of garage.	Rental.	Passenger autos.	Trucks.	Employees.	Employees' autos.
(1) Refuse division	Thirteenth and Fourteenth, G and E Streets SE.	$31,126.64	$2,708.47	None.	1	30	4	None.
(1) Surface division	First and Canal Streets SW	6,360.16	[1] 10,000.00	None.	8	9	5	None.
(1) Municipal garage	1316 D Street NW	23,684.42	34,082.82	None.	29	9	8	None.
(1) Water department	Second and Bryant Streets NW	5,048.85	[1] 10,000.00	None.	1	37	4	None.

[1] Approximate.

Cars not kept in garages listed are kept in barns, stables, police precincts, fire houses, etc., and in these cases there are no garage charges.

3.—*List of passenger automobiles pertaining to the District of Columbia.*

CITY REFUSE DIVISION.

Manufacturer's name.	Cost (if no cost state how car was obtained).	Maintenance cost 1 year.	Pay of chauffeur.	Assigned to—
Ford	[1] $150.00	$546.55		Shop use.
Reo	[1] 150.00	707.04		T. L. Costigan.
Ford	499.52	[2] 96.55		D. M. Koontz.
Buick [3]				Morris Hacker.
Ford [3]				H. F. Krams.
Do.[3]				N. Duvall.

POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Ford	$500.00	$421.00		Not assigned.
Do	741.00	500.00		Investigation squad.
Cadillac	1,200.00	800.00		Detective bureau.
Haynes	1,425.00	500.00		Do.
Auto sales	3,475.00	636.00		Courts.
Dodge [4]		[5] 200.00		Inspector of traffic.
Marmon [4]		[5] 225.00		Detective bureau.
Packard [4]		[5] 300.00		Do.
Do.[4]		[5] 775.00		Do.
Hudson [4]		[6] 213.00		Women's bureau.
Do.[4]		[5] 390.00		Major and superintendent.
Dodge [4]		[5] 150.00		Assistant superintendent.
Do.[4]		[5] 195.00		Do.
Oldsmobile [4]				Not assigned.
Dodge [4]				Do.
White [4]				Do.
Studebaker [4]		[5] 483.00	[7]	House of detention.

PUBLIC LIBRARY.

Dodge	$1,450.00	$104.99		Librarian and members of staff.

TREES AND PARKINGS.

Dodge roadster [8]				Emergency car.

[1] Obtained from Washington Reduction Co.
[2] 4 months.
[3] Reported by municipal garage.
[4] Surplus war equipment.
[5] 6 months.
[6] 3 months.
[7] 2 at $780 each, 24-hour service.
[8] Loaned by Post Office Department; not in use.

3.—*List of passenger automobiles, etc.*—Continued.

SEWER DEPARTMENT.

Manufacturer's name.	Cost (if no cost state how car was obtained).	Maintenance cost 1 year.	Pay of chauffeur.	Assigned to—
Ford	$518.22	[1] $600.00	$1,126.80	Engineering field party.
Cadillac	1,750.00	249.65	None.	Out of regular service.
Do	1,869.35	611.05	1,151.84	Supervision of day labor construction.
Do	1,869.35	959.91	None.	Sanitary engineer.
Reo Speed	1,700.00	643.19	None.	Pumping station service.
Ford	783.61	561.17	1,126.80	Engineering field party.
Do	783.61	622.48	1,126.80	Inspection public service corporations.
Do	140.00	[1] 600.00	1,126.80	Engineering field party.
Do	436.36	[1] 600.00	None.	Inspection of complaints.
Do	518.22	[1] 600.00	1,126.80	Engineering field party.

SCHOOL REPAIR SHOP.

Ford touring	[2]	[3] $689.78		General delivery work.

SURFACE DIVISION, ENGINEER DEPARTMENT.

Ford	$876.00	$162.68	$808.34	Survey party.
Do	744.19	177.95	808.40	Do.
Do	876.00	284.38	808.40	Do.
Do	876.00	233.08	808.40	Do.
Hupmobile	1,650.00	333.79	808.40	Do.
Do	1,650.00	301.40	808.40	Do.
Ford	604.12	37.38	808.40	Do.
Do	400.96	139.91	808.40	C. B. Hunt.
Do	719.74	609.81	None.	Andrew White.
Do	719.74	550.01	None.	E. Lynch.
Do	536.08	319.23	808.40	Mr. Moss.
Do	536.08	143.93	808.40	Mr. Cleaver.
Do	582.94	226.26	None.	Disbursing office.
Do	536.08	193.23	808.40	Mr. Dare.
Do	536.08	149.13	808.40	Mr. Bell.
Do	538.01	503.13	None.	A. Mullen.
Do	538.01	526.99	None.	F. F. Withers.
Do	719.74	273.29	None.	Emergency.
Do	783.61	180.17	808.40	Do.
Do	783.61	244.34	808.40	Mr. Fennell.
Do	812.00	22.87	199.52	Engineer of bridges.
Do	594.74	233.08	None.	F. B. Couch.

WATER DEPARTMENT.

Chandler [4]	$1,950.00	$869.30	[5] $200.00	Superintendent water department.

[1] Machines in service less than a year; cost estimated on present performance.
[2] U. S. Government.
[3] $179.58, pro rata share of mechanics' time.
[4] Exchanged for Cadillac from police department.
[5] For cleaning.

3.—*List of passenger automobiles, etc.*—Continued.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Manufacturer's name.	Cost (if no cost state how car was obtained).	Maintenance cost 1 year.	Pay of chauffeur.	Assigned to—
Ford Sedan	$970.00	$584.21	[1] $780.00	Community centers.

FIRE DEPARTMENT.

Cadillac touring	[2] $500.00	[3] $1,359.81	(4)	Chief engineer.
Do	[2] 300.00	[3] 894.91	(4)	Deputy chief.
Dodge roadster	(2)	359.29	(4)	First battalion chief.
Do	(2)	424.76	(4)	Second battalion chief.
Warren roadster	1,750.00	567.17	(4)	Third battalion chief.
Stutz touring	2,350.00	989.87	(4)	Fourth battalion chief.
Dodge roadster	(2)	223.80	(4)	Fifth battalion chief.
Buick roadster	1,625.00	431.54	(4)	Fire marshall.
Jeffery roadster	940.50	190.05	(4)	Superintendent of machinery.
Hudson sedan	(2)	736.61	(4)	Special service.
Hudson touring	2,100.00	[3] 1,021.91	(4)	Deputy chief.
Washington roadster.	1,575.00	191.28	(4)	Fire department repair shop.
Dodge touring	(2)	643.23	(4)	Do.
Empire roadster	(2)	98.67	(4)	Do.

MUNICIPAL GARAGE.

Cadillac touring	$3,940.00	$515.87	$1,663.66	Commissioner Oyster.
Franklin touring	2,450.00	845.27	1,653.62	Commissioner Keller.
Empire touring	1,280.00	819.76		Major Besson.
Dodge roadster	1,175.00	580.11		Major Wheeler.
Reo touring	1,495.00	741.87		Surveyors.
Ford touring	582.94	473.74		Do.
Do	400.96	432.72		Health department.
Ford roadster	559.81	438.98		Garage assessors.
Do	369.73	495.64		Suburban roads (Grabil).
Do	589.53	769.61		Suburban roads (Gass).
Ford touring	543.78	760.38		Board of Children's Guardians.
Ford roadster	482.50	434.55		Garage.
Ford touring	727.75	588.35		Do.
Do	727.75	415.65		Do.
Do	812.00	462.26		Do
Ford roadster	774.75	410.13		Do.
Do	543.78	380.33		Do.
Ford sedan	970.00	604.90		Community centers.
Ford roadster	569.81	538.83		Electrical department (Lyman).
Do	359.51	500.00		Electrical department (Simpson).
Ford touring	812.00	663.56		Electrical department (Hadley).
Ford sedan	1,069.00	786.60		Playgrounds.
Ford coupe	999.00	540.27		Plumbing inspector.
Buick roadster	885.00	643.67		City refuse (Hacker).
Ford roadster	482.50	619.34		City refuse (Duvale).
Ford touring	250.00	450.77		City refuse (Krams).
Do	814.75	400.00		Building inspector (Healey).
Chandler touring	1,200.00	526.81		Assessors.
Ford touring	800.00	523.40		Corporation counsel (Dawson).

BOARD OF CHARITIES.

Overland	$650.00	New.		Gallinger Hospital.
Ford	700.00	New.		Do.
Overland	600.00	$547.57	(5)	Home for Aged and Infirm.
Ford	700.00	New.	(5)	Do.
Do	580.00	305.49		Jail.
Do	699.91	528.80		Industrial Home School (Colored).
Do	632.14	New.		National Training School (Girls).
Do	372.00	151.55	(5)	Reformatory.
Buick	1,265.00	258.36	(5)	Workhouse.

[1] Chauffeur, part time, plus bonus.
[2] United States Government.
[3] Rebuilt and repainted.
[4] No chauffeurs employed. Driven by officer or fireman detailed as aid to officer.
[5] Vehicles used by departments located outside the city of Washington.

4. Statement giving the information listed in the preceding enumerated paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, and pertaining to all passenger vehicles in use in the said departments, independent bureaus, and commissions outside the city of Washington:

1. No allowances made for privately owned automobiles of officers and employees connected with the following institutions which are located outside the city of Washington:

Home for Aged and infirm.
Reformatory.
Workhouse.

2. Statement showing the number, location, and cost of any garage or garages maintained; where such garages are located; cost of same; rentals on same; the number of passenger automobiles kept in said garages; the names of such officers or employees keeping such automobiles in such garages.

Home for Aged and Infirm: No garage.
Reformatory: No garage.
Workhouse: No garage.

3. Statement containing information relative to passenger automobiles.

See Board of Charities under list of passenger automobiles pertaining to the District of Columbia.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and to lie on the table a communication received from the American Chamber of Commerce for Brazil.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR BRAZIL,
Rio de Janeiro, December 22, 1922.

Hon. HARRY S. NEW,
United States Senator for Indiana.

SIR: The ship subsidy bill now before the Senate is of vital importance to all Americans living abroad and engaged in the development of our foreign trade.

The American Chamber of Commerce for Brazil, a body whose membership includes all American firms and individuals interested in the commerce between the United States and Brazil, earnestly solicits your vote for, and support of, the ship subsidy bill. The enactment of this bill into law, without changing its basic principles or hampering the American merchant marine by rules prejudicing its efficiency in competition with foreign lines, means the permanent establishment and continuance of our merchant marine, while, on the other hand, the defeat of this measure or amending it to an extent that would change its fundamental object, or imposing impossible restrictions, would stop the further development of our merchant marine, seriously affect our prestige abroad, hurt and retard the development of our foreign trade.

We Americans abroad, representatives of American manufacturers and commercial enterprises, are away from our native land for the serious purpose of furthering our foreign trade and marketing our home products. We believe that the future greatness of our country depends upon the development of a trade which will supply foreigners with American products, gives employment to many of our fellow countrymen, and enriches the national patrimony. Experience has shown us that the development of our foreign trade is dependent upon three fundamental principles, which are American ships, American cables, and American banking institutions; of these American shipping holds the leading position. We have always to face strong competition by commercial rivals strongly intrenched in the field, and, if we must pay toll to them in the way of ocean freight, suffer delays of and damage to our goods, we are simply defeating our object and nullifying our efforts.

The assurance of the continuation of our merchant marine is of primary importance to us; we believe that the measure under discussion will assure this result. The measure is constructive, financially sound, and based upon business principles: A measure which will stimulate private capital to buy and operate the present Government-owned ships, thereby strengthening the present existing lines, and perhaps bringing new lines into operation; reduce the burden borne by the American people; and salvage a considerable portion of our $3,000,000,000 investment in ships, is one we hope every Senator will support and, if necessary, temporarily set aside party lines for the general welfare of his fellow citizens.

The American Chamber of Commerce for Brazil has observed the expansion of opportunities for American business and increased prestige since the establishment of the American steamship lines to the east coast of South America. Many of our ships compare more than favorably with those of our competitive European countries. Our business has been benefited by better schedules of arrivals and sailings to the United States, which has opened up a field for trade in perishable goods which previously was impossible.

We believe in governmental aid being freely given to American steamship lines to all parts of the world where American products are marketed until these lines are firmly established.

We oppose governmental ownership and operation of public carriers—that is, steamship and railroad lines—as all our important public utilities have been successfully developed only through private initiative and energy. We also oppose the present method of joint operation by Government and private companies, as it is inefficient and expensive; responsibility can not be successfully divided.

Our competitors have built up large fleets through government support; our own Government has helped develop our great industries by protective tariffs; aid to our shipping interests should not be withheld, especially as they are of such vital importance to our foreign trade and the American people have such a large investment in the ships; aid through the tariff can not be given, but it can be given in some other form.

An analysis and a comparison of present conditions and the relief the ship subsidy bill offers should convince any reasoning man of the benefits to be gained by passing such legislation and win his support for the bill. At present the American people are paying an annual subsidy of over $50,000,000 to maintain the shipping interests of the Government; this does not provide for new construction or replacement, hence does not guarantee our merchant marine beyond the period that the ships will be serviceable; in addition to this outlay of funds the American people are suffering an annual loss, probably much greater, in the way of deterioration and wearing out of the ships, and it will only be a question of years until this huge investment becomes a total loss.

A continuation of present methods is not only obstructive but is destructive, while by enacting the measure under discussion into law the future of our merchant marine will be assured, a considerable salvage of the $3,000,000,000 investment will occur, and the annual subsidy will be reduced by one-half.

Your fellow citizens residing here—and many are from your State—strongly urge you to support the ship subsidy bill.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, composed of over 1,300 commercial bodies, with a membership aggregating 300,000, by referendum vote is overwhelmingly in favor of this bill. The House of Representatives has passed the measure, and the President is its strong advocate. The American Chamber of Commerce for Brazil feels so strongly in this matter that it intends to give its views the widest publicity and use the full force of its influence toward the support of this measure.

Should this measure fail to pass the Senate our chamber here will feel that those responsible for its failure will have shown a lack of patriotism, foresight, and astounding ignorance of the urgent needs of American foreign trade.

Respectfully yours,

AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR BRAZIL,
WM. J. STEVENS, *President.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution of the Woman's Club of Rock Springs, Wyo., favoring an amendment to the Constitution regulating child labor, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENDRICK presented resolutions of the Gate City National Farm Loan Association, of Pine Bluffs, and the Laramie County Farmers' Union, both in the State of Wyoming, opposing amendment of the Federal farm loan act in any manner which would affect the cooperative functions of the national farm loan associations, and urging that the Federal land banks be turned over to the farmers to be managed by farmer borrower-directors, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a communication in the nature of a memorial from the Texarkana Freight Bureau, of Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., remonstrating against the adoption of the Ripley plan for consolidation of the railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented 30 petitions, numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of legislation extending immediate aid to the famine-stricken peoples of the German and Austrian Republics, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LADD presented a petition of 53 citizens of Oakes, Crete, Stirum, and Hampler, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the passage of legislation extending immediate aid to the famine-stricken peoples of the German and Austrian Republics, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the accompanying letter, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

EIGHTEENTH LEGISLATIVE SESSION,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, January 23, 1923.

Senator E. F. LADD,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am authorized by the Senate of the State of North Dakota to forward you a copy of the Kretschmar concurrent resolution concerning the Great Lakes waterway project, which has been adopted by both houses of the North Dakota Legislature.

You will find a copy inclosed.

Very truly yours,
W. E. PARSONS,
Secretary of Senate.

Senate concurrent resolution introduced by Mr. Kretschmar.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROJECT.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas the great and natural resources of the State of North Dakota are as yet undeveloped and said State is dependent upon agriculture for its prosperity, and agriculture being the fundamental basis for prosperity in all Northwest States; and

Whereas in a large measure, if not entirely, the price of agricultural products is dependent upon foreign markets; and

Whereas the present rates for transportation of such products are too high to be in just proportion to the price received therefor at terminal markets, and thus has a tendency to curtail the production of the staple articles of agriculture needed by all people in all lands; and

Whereas the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project, if completed and perfected, will furnish to the people of the State of North Dakota a cheaper method of transportation of their products to foreign markets, thus assuring them a higher revenue for the same: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Eighteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States, and respectfully urge that Congress take immediate action toward the passage of such laws or law which will make possible the early completion and perfection of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Senate send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and of the Montana and Minnesota Legislatures, respectively, also to our Members in Congress.

Approved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota and the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 (by Senator Kyle).

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission in its various decisions has construed the transportation act as enlarging its jurisdiction over questions involving intrastate rates, fares, and charges, and has recognized as the controlling element in such decisions the revenue needs of the carriers in a particular group without particularization or definiteness as to the extent of discrimination between persons, companies, firms, corporations, or localities, which was the extent of its jurisdiction prior to the transportation act as evidenced by court decisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the house concurring therein, That we urge our Senators and Members of Congress to use their influence and best endeavor to have the transportation act amended restricting the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over matters involving intrastate rates, fares, and charges to that exercised under the interstate commerce act and prior to the passage of the transportation act.

Resolved further, That we urge our Senators and Members of Congress and all other Members of the Congress of the United States to support Senate bill 1150, introduced by Senator CAPPER, and House bill 7947, introduced by Representative HOCH, which bills provide for the amendment of the transportation act and limit the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission over matters involving intrastate rates, fares, and charges to that formerly exercised by that body prior to the passage of the transportation act.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the senate and passed that body January 16, 1923.

BEN S. PAULEN,
President of the Senate.
ARTHUR S. MCNAY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house January 17, 1923.

CHAS. E. MANN,
Speaker of the House.
LISLE MCELHINNEY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Approved, January 22, 1923.

JONATHAN M. DAVIS,
Governor.

Mr. STERLING. I send to the desk concurrent resolutions passed by the legislature of the State of South Dakota in regard, first, to Federal farm loans; second, Federal standards for grading grain; third, freight rates for grain and live stock; and, fourth, completion of a steel bridge at Chamberlain, S. Dak. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD and properly referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the resolutions will be referred as indicated.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to give immediate and careful consideration to Senate bill 4130.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

Whereas a bill raising the limit on Federal farm loans from $10,000 to $25,000 has been introduced in Congress, and which is now in the Committee on Banking and Currency;

Therefore we urge our delegation in Congress to do their utmost to secure speedy and favorable action by the committee and, thereafter, its prompt passage by Congress, so that it may become the law before March 1, 1923, at which time there are many Federal farm loans to be closed exceeding $10,000 in amount.

That the passage of this bill will not in any manner impair the operation nor the credit of the Federal land bank, but will result in extending its scope of usefulness so that a larger number of borrowers can be reached.

That all loans are made on the basis of the security offered, and borrowers of large amounts often offer the best security, owing to their executive ability and industry in the management of farm operation.

That the Federal land bank is seriously hampered in its operation owing to the $10,000 limit; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this resolution be prepared by the secretary of state, signed by the presiding officers of the senate and house of representatives, and forward one copy each to Senators NORBECK and STERLING and Congressmen CHRISTOPHERSON, JOHNSON, and WILLIAMSON, to the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to his Excellency, the President of the United States, Warren G. Harding.

CARL GUNDERSON,
President of the Senate.
A. B. BLAKE,
Secretary of the Senate.
E. D. FRESCOLN,
Speaker of the House.
WRIGHT TARBELL,
Chief Clerk of the House.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

A concurrent resolution requesting and demanding modification and revision of the present Federal standards for grading grain.

Be it enacted by the senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Bureau of Markets of the United States Department of Agriculture, in the spring of 1917, promulgated certain standards for grading wheat, which revolutionized the system of grain inspection to such an extent that the markets were seriously disturbed and confused, and the Federal rules were found unsatisfactory in commercial transactions; and as subsequent attempts by the said Bureau of Markets to amend the original standards and inspection rules have not removed the features objectionable to the wheat producers of South Dakota and the rural shippers of grain, with the result that the present standards are regarded by the farmers of the Northwest as unfair and unreasonable; and

Whereas the grades so established do not meet with the approval of the grain growers and shippers of this State and are believed to confer an undue advantage to the buyers, with a consequent discrimination against the farmers, thereby causing heavy losses every year; and

Whereas the States of Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Washington, at a meeting held in Helena, Mont., March 16, 1918, by formal resolution proposed standards for grading spring wheat, which were declared to be fair to all interests directly concerned; and

Whereas the South Dakota Farm Bureau Federation, the South Dakota Farmers Grain Dealers' Association, and other farm and grain organizations repeatedly have declared in favor of substantial modification of the Federal standards so that grain may be tested and graded in accordance with its milling value, and representatives of the States of the Northwest having appeared before the Federal Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Agriculture of both Houses of Congress advocating and urging action favorable to the requests and needs of the farmers of South Dakota; and

Whereas the legislators of Minnesota and North Dakota directed the promulgation of State grades for use in the inspection of grain produced and marketed within those States, the purposes of such legislation being to give the wheat producers of those States all the benefits possible from the application of State rules and regulations, but this plan was found not feasible because of conflict with the Federal rules and laws; and

Whereas the Millers' National Federation has opposed the efforts of the farmers of the State to obtain a modification and revisions of the Federal grain standards; and

Whereas HALVOR STEENERSON, Congressman from the ninth district of Minnesota, has introduced a bill in Congress to establish standards for grading spring wheat, which, if adopted, will virtually recognize the milling value of wheat and place the producers and the buyers on an equal footing in the grain markets of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, That it hereby, in behalf of the people of South Dakota, requests and demands that the Federal authorities, either in Congress or in the Department of Agriculture, do so modify, revise, or amend the present Federal standards for grading spring wheat as to comply with the requests of the farmers of South Dakota and the Northwest, and thereby remove the present discriminations and penalties, in order to promote the prosperity and welfare of the agricultural interests of South Dakota and the Northwest; be it further

Resolved, That we approve the aforesaid Steenerson grain grading bill and urge its immediate passage by Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, to both Houses of Congress, and to the individual members of the South Dakota delegation in Congress.

CARL GUNDERSON,
President of the Senate.
A. B. BLAKE,
Secretary of the Senate.
E. O. FRESCOLN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
WRIGHT TARBELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

To the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

A concurrent resolution requesting and demanding modification and reduction of the present freight rates for grain and live stock.

Whereas the present freight rates for shipment of grain and live stock by the railroads are excessive and of such a nature as to render the prices received by producers of such commodities less than the cost of production; and

Whereas several efforts have been made by the railroad commissioners of the State of South Dakota to secure reductions that are necessary for the preservation of the great industry of agriculture in the State of South Dakota; and

Whereas the rates now in force are approximately 20 per cent higher than the rates in force prior to 1918; and

Whereas the prices of farm products to the producer in this State are approximately 20 per cent lower than the average prices received by such producers for such commodities during the 10-year period just preceding the year 1918: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That it hereby in behalf of the people of the State of South Dakota requests and demands that the Congress of the United States, by appropriate legislation or otherwise, and the Interstate Commerce Commission and all other bodies of the Federal Government having in their power or discretion to modify, reduce, revise, or amend the present freight rates, perform such duties as to comply with the requests of the farmers of the State of South Dakota and the Northwest, and thereby remove this menace to the prosperity and welfare of the agricultural interests of South Dakota and the Northwest; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be prepared by the secretary of state and forwarded to our Representatives and Senators in Congress, to the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to his excellency the President of the United States, Warren G. Harding.

CARL GUNDERSON,
President of the Senate.
A. B. BLAKE,
Secretary of the Senate.
E. O. FRESCOLN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
WRIGHT TARBELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

To the Committee on Commerce:

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and our Senators and Representatives in Congress to amend section 2 of House Resolution 8744, approved December 21, 1921, and enact in lieu thereof an act to require the completion of a steel bridge at Chamberlain, S. Dak., as required by act of Congress approved April 28, 1916, said bridge to be completed during the year 1923.

Whereas by an act of Congress dated April 28, 1916, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. was authorized to construct a steel bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain, S. Dak., and permission granted to continue the use of a pontoon bridge for the transportation of freight and passengers across said river until the completion of said steel bridge; and

Whereas the right to construct said bridge was extended by act of Congress approved February 25, 1919, and by a further act of Congress approved December 21, 1921, which last-named act extends the time for the completion of said bridge to April 28, 1925; and

Whereas said Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. began the construction of and completed a portion of said bridge in the year 1918, but has wholly failed to do anything toward the completion thereof since the early part of 1919; and

Whereas the use of said pontoon bridge is believed to endanger the lives of the employees of said railroad operating trains thereon and the lives of the traveling public; and

Whereas serious and costly accidents and delays in transportation have already occurred, to wit:

First. That on or about June 21, 1922, while a gravel train was crossing said bridge the pontoon used as a draw upset and caused the engine and several cars to be thrown into the Missouri River, together with the engineer, who was seriously injured.

Second. That during the spring of the year when the ice is going out and during the June rise and in the fall of the year, and when the ice is forming or floating in said river, it is impossble to operate the draw in said bridge, and by reason of that fact all passenger, mail, freight, and express traffic to points west of the Missouri River is greatly delayed, especially when said bridge is out or draw open, and the development of the country deterred, and the business interests of the people located between Chamberlain and Rapid City, S. Dak., jeopardized: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States and our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, urged to use all honorable means at their command to secure an amendment to section 2 of House Resolution 8744, which shall require the completion of said bridge not later than during the year 1928; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this preamble and resolution be prepared by the secretary of the senate, signed by the presiding officers of the senate and house of representatives and forwarded to the Congress of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the Secretary of War.

CARL GUNDERSON,
President of the Senate.
A. B. BLAKE,
Secretary.
E. O. FRESCOLN,
Speaker of the House.
WRIGHT TARBELL,
Chief Clerk.

THE MUSCLE SHOALS PLANT.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a resolution of the Oklahoma Legislature with reference to Muscle Shoals.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Engrossed House Resolution 8 asking Congress to accept Henry Ford's offer for Muscle Shoals.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives in the Oklahoma Legislature of 1923 as follows:

Whereas the United States Government, for the purpose of rendering useful the immense power running to waste at Muscle Shoals, has spent large sums of the people's money in the construction of dams, etc., and is still expending large sums in the completion of the work begun; and

Whereas in the summer of 1921 the War Department forwarded letters to certain prominent men, firms, and corporations asking if they would consider taking the job of completing the work and operating the plant, one of which letters was sent to Henry Ford, of Detroit, Mich.; and

Whereas Henry Ford was the only person, firm, or corporation who responded favorably to said invitation; and

Whereas Henry Ford did respond by offering to lease said plant from the Government for a period of 100 years, he to complete the plant at actual cost, or the Government to complete it, and when completed Mr. Ford to pay an annual rental to the Government of an amount equal to 4 per cent of the total cost of construction, and at the end of the lease return the property to the Government; and

Whereas the farmers of the South and Southwest believe that Henry Ford by his operation of said plant can save them at least $75,000,000 each year in the production of cotton alone with his cheap fertilizer; and

Whereas besides the nitrates to be obtained from the air there are rich deposits of phosphates near Muscle Shoals by the use of which on the Corn Belt soils it is possible to double the yield; and

Whereas Henry Ford's offer includes the production of great electric power to take the place of coal rendered expensive by long hauls; and

Whereas we believe Henry Ford's offer for said plant is fair to the Government, and that his operation of said plant will greatly inure to the benefit of the farmers throughout the entire United States; and

Whereas Henry Ford declared that if his offer is accepted he will give employment to 1,000,000 people; and

Whereas his offer is now pending before Congress and has been for a period of time sufficient to be fully understood by its Members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That for the sake of prosperity we believe it will bring to the farmers of the United States in the production of cheaper power and cheaper fertilizer, and for the sake of humanity in the giving of employment to the laboring class we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to consider and accept the offer of Henry Ford for Muscle Shoals without further delay; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of these resolutions be sent to Senators OWEN and HARRELD, of Oklahoma, and to Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, at Washington, D. C.

Adopted by the house of representatives this the — day of January, 1923.

MURRAY F. GIBBONS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. POINDEXTER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7864) providing for sundry matters affecting the Naval Establishment, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1061) thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on January 25, 1923, they presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 247) authorizing the appropriation of funds for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property during the convention of the Imperial Council of the Mystic Shrine in the District of Columbia June 5, 6, and 7, 1923, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4419) providing for the acceptance of a gift of property to be used as a residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4420) to amend section 2 of the act approved February 15, 1893, entitled "An act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine Hospital Service"; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4421) granting a pension to Mrs. William Campbell Gunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4422) extending the provisions of the Federal highway act approved November 9, 1921, to the Territory of Hawaii (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 4423) granting a pension to Frederick Muller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 4424) to provide credits to secure the successful production and profitable and orderly marketing of agricultural products and live stock in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIAL:

A bill (S. 4425) to authorize appropriations for the relief of certain officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

RURAL-CREDIT FACILITIES.

Mr. OWEN and Mr. McKELLAR each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (S. 4287) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States, to amend the Federal farm loan act, to amend the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CLAIMS OF PERSONS NOT INDIANS WITHIN PUEBLO LANDS.

Mr. BURSUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3855) to ascertain and settle land claims of persons not Indians within Pueblo Indian land, land grants, and reservations in the State of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 8, after the word "Zuni," strike out all down to subsection (b) and insert: "to which the title of the said Pueblos, respectively, or any individual Pueblo Indian holding separate title, has not been extinguished, and so long as such Indian title shall continue."

In lines 12 to 20, inclusive, page 2, strike out subsection (b).

In section 2, page 3, in line 15, insert a comma after the word "issued" and after the word "America"; and in line 18, strike out the second "o" in the word "Pojooaque"; and in line 23, after the word "Zuni," strike out all to the end of subsection (a) and insert the following: "to which the title of the said Pueblos, respectively, or any individual Pueblo Indian holding separate title, has not been extinguished, and so long as such Indian title shall continue."

Strike out all of subsection (b) on page 4.

In line 15, page 4, strike out "(c)" and in lieu thereof insert "(b)."

In line 3, page 5, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)."

And in line 7, strike out the words "of the" and strike out the letter "s" at the end of the word "inhabitants," and after the word "thereof" insert "or any person."

In line 8, insert the letter "a" between the word "as" and the word "Pueblo."

In line 9, at the end of the syllable "dians," strike out the letter "s" and strike out the words "ex contractu and ex delictu."

Strike out all of subsection (e) from line 13 to line 17, both inclusive.

Strike out all of section 3.

Strike out all of section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. All suits brought under this act shall be entitled in the name of the United States of America, as guardian of the particular Pueblo or Pueblo Indian, naming them, respectively."

In lines 13 to 23 inclusive, page 6, strike out all of section 5.

In line 24, page 6, strike out "6" and insert "4."

On pages 7 and 8 strike out all of section 7.

On pages 8 and 9 strike out section 8 entirely and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. The United States of America, in its sovereign character as guardian of the Pueblo Indians, and of each individual Indian, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, shall, by the Attorney General, without unnecessary delay, file its bill or bills of complaint, in the nature of an action or actions to quiet title to real estate, with prayer for the discovery of the nature of any adverse claim or claims alleged therein, against any and all such claimants of lands within the limits of any Pueblo Indian grant or so-called 'purchase' lands or any lands otherwise claimed or possessed by such Indians or any of them."

Insert the following new section:

"SEC. 6. In all such bills the plaintiff shall disclaim for its said wards, in favor of the occupants of such lands or any part thereof, all right, title, claim, interest, and demand of, in, and to any and all parcels, lots, and tracts of land, which shall be well described in such disclaimer, situated within the exterior boundaries of any such Indian lands, where it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior, and upon his recommendation to the Attorney General, that the occupants and claimants of such interior parcels, lots, and tracts of land have had adverse possession thereof, within the terms of the limitations or either of them, hereinafter prescribed, and such disclaimer may be made subsequent to the filing of the bill or bills of complaint, if for any good reason it has not been made therein."

Insert the following new section:

"SEC. 7. Such disclaimer, if accepted by a writing filed in the said cause by the beneficiary or beneficiaries thereof, either before or after the service of process, but before adjudication, shall be warrant for the said United States district court to enter in such action its decree in favor of such beneficiary or beneficiaries for the premises so disclaimed and so described as aforesaid, quieting and setting at rest in them, respectively, the title thereto, which shall have the effect of a quit-claim deed, and such disclaimer may be amended at any time before final decree entered."

Insert the following new section:

"SEC. 8. If such disclaimer is not accepted in manner aforesaid within 30 days after notice thereof in writing given by the Attorney General or his assistant and served and returned by the marshal, as mesne process is served, the suit shall proceed as if no disclaimer had been made, and as if such beneficiary or beneficiaries had been impleaded as wrongfully claiming title to the lands so disclaimed, or the bill may be amended to meet the condition thus created."

Insert the following new section:

"SEC. 9. All non-Indian persons claiming the title and ownership of lands within Indian grants or purchases aforesaid may in such suit or suits, in addition to other legal or equitable defenses which they may have to the claim presented by the Government, plead limitation of action, as follows, to wit:

"(a) That in themselves, their ancestors, grantors, privies, or predecessors in interest or claim of interest, they have had open, notorious, actual, exclusive, continuous, adverse possession of the premises claimed for more than 20 years next preceding the passage of this act, under color of title:

"(b) That in themselves, their ancestors, grantors, privies, or predecessors in interest or claim of interest, they have had open, notorious, actual, exclusive, continuous, adverse possession of the premises claimed for more than 30 years next preceding the passage of this act, without color of title.

"(c) That section 3364 of the New Mexico Codification of 1915, and section 2938 of the New Mexico Compiled Laws of 1897, as modified by the next preceding subsections (a) and (b), shall be rules of practice and decision in such cases."

Insert the following new section:

"SEC. 10. The plea of such limitations, successfully maintained, shall entitle the claimants so pleading to a decree in their favor, quieting and setting at rest in them, their heirs, executors, successors, and assigns, the title to the premises so claimed by them or so much thereof as may be thus established, and judgment and decree in favor of the claimants upon any other ground shall likewise carry with it and express therein the quieting and setting at rest of title in them as aforesaid."

Insert the following new section:

"SEC. 11. The Government may likewise plead in favor of the Pueblo or individual Pueblo Indian, as the case may be, and with like effect, the said limitations hereinbefore defined. Strike out all of section 9, pages 9 and 10."

Insert the following new section:

"SEC. 12 All lands, the title of which is determined in favor of the non-Indian or any individual Indian claimant, shall, where necessary, be surveyed out and mapped under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior at the expense of the United States."

Strike out section 10 entirely.

Insert the following new section:

"SEC. 13. All proceedings under this act, as well original as appellate, shall be without costs to any party, and any party to the action aggrieved by any final judgment or decree, whether civil or criminal, shall have the right to a review thereof by appeal or writ of error, or other process, as in other such cases."

Strike out section 11, page 11.

Strike out section 12, page 11.

Strike out section 13, page 11.

Strike out section 14, pages 11 and 12.

Strike out section 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 14. The so-called Joy surveys may be used by either party in the trial of any such suit as prima facie evidence of the extent of claim or disclaimer, but shall not be conclusive except in the event of disclaimer based thereon and accepted as aforesaid."

Strike out section 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 15. Where premises within such Indian grants or purchases, or any part or parcel thereof, on the trial of any such action, are shown not to be the property of the non-Indian claimant under the provisions of this act, but if the claimant acquired the same in good faith and improved such premises by the expenditure of labor or money, believing that he was the lawful owner thereof, in view of equitable considerations he may make application to the Secretary of the Interior to purchase the same, who may allow the application, at such price and upon such terms as he may fix, excluding the value of the improvements, and the money thus derived shall constitute a trust fund to be laid out in the purchase of other lands for the particular pueblo, either within or without the grant or purchase area, and if no suitable lands are purchasable then such fund, at such time as the said Secretary may deem advisable, may be surrendered to the pueblo.

"SEC. 16. In the sense in which used in this act the word "purchase" shall be taken to mean lands acquired by the Indians other than by grant or donation from a sovereign.

"SEC. 17. Any person not impleaded in any such action may demand to be made a party defendant thereto, with benefit of disclaimer in a proper case, or may intervene in such action, setting up his claim in usual form, and the Government may disclaim in answer to such intervention in like manner as it might have disclaimed in the original bill.

"SEC. 18. Where, as a result of this act, the Indians shall have lost any lands under the plea of limitations, without color of title, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be selected and set off to the Indian pueblo from any part of the public domain a tract or tracts of land of value equal to the unimproved value of the land thus lost;

and if the Indians desire the land thus selected and set off to be sold, at the request of the Indian council the Secretary of the Interior shall cause the same to be sold under such plan as he may define, and the proceeds to be applied as he may deem best for the benefit of the Indians or in the purchase of lands held in alien ownership within the pueblo grant or 'purchase.'"

COLORADO RIVER AND ITS UTILIZATION.

Mr. ASHURST submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed 3,000 copies of Water Supply Paper No. 395, entitled "Colorado River and Its Utilization," by E. C. LaRue, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Department of the Interior.

WITHDRAWING POWER FROM FEDERAL COURTS TO DECLARE ACTS OF CONGRESS VOID.

Mr. OWEN. I ask unanimous consent that 500 copies of Senate Document No. 737, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, entitled "Withdrawing Power from Federal Courts to Declare Acts of Congress Void," be printed for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 4287, to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States, and so forth, may be laid before the Senate and proceeded with.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Ransdell
Ball	George	McCormick	Reed, Pa.
Bayard	Hale	McCumber	Robinson
Borah	Harreld	McKellar	Sheppard
Bursum	Harris	McKinley	Shields
Calder	Harrison	McLean	Smith
Cameron	Heflin	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Nelson	Spencer
Caraway	Johnson	New	Sterling
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Trammell
Couzens	Kellogg	Norris	Underwood
Culberson	Kendrick	Oddie	Wadsworth
Curtis	Keyes	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	King	Pepper	Warren
Dillingham	Ladd	Phipps	Williams
Fletcher	Lenroot	Poindexter	Willis

Mr. SMITH. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is detained at a committee hearing.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], is detained from the Senate by reason of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNARY in the chair). Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RURAL-CREDIT FACILITIES.

Mr. LENROOT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of Senate bill 4287.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4287) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to amend the Federal reserve act; and for other purposes.

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE ROLAND W. BOYDEN.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD in 8-point type a letter from the Secretary of State transmitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday, together with two previous letters, which are very brief, but which are necessary to an understanding of the situation in regard to the Reparation Commission, with which the letter of the Secretary of State deals.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the document the Senator from Massachusetts had printed in the RECORD?

Mr. LODGE. A letter of the Secretary of State which came to the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday, which was given to the press and which I think ought to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it a very long letter, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. LODGE. It was printed in the press, but I think not completely.

Mr. HARRISON. I read what was in the press, but I do not think the letter was printed in full.

Mr. LODGE. No; that is one reason why I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HARRISON. If it is not too long, it might be well to have it read, because it is a matter in which we are all interested.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that is necessary; it would only cause delay.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well.

The matter ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 18, 1919.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There are some things in connection with the execution of the treaty of peace which can hardly await the action of the several Governments which must act with regard to the ratification of the treaty, and the chief of these is the functioning of the Reparation Commission. It is of so much importance to the business interests of the United States, as well as to the nations with which we are associated, that the United States should be represented on that commission, and represented now while the work of the commission is taking shape, that I am taking the liberty of writing to ask if you will not be kind enough to consult the Committee on Foreign Relations with regard to this particular appointment, and say to them that I would very much appreciate their approval of my appointing provisionally a representative of the United States to act upon the Reparation Commission.

Very sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

—

JULY 22, 1919.

To the PRESIDENT.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with my note to you of Sunday last, I laid your letter of July 18 before the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday morning. In that letter you suggested that you would be glad to receive the approval of the committee for the provisional appointment of a member of the Reparation Commission which is to be established when the treaty with Germany goes into effect.

The committee instructs me to say that it is the judgment of the committee that until the proposed treaty is ratified in accordance with its terms no power exists to execute any of its provisions, either provisionally or otherwise.

I have the honor to be, respectfully yours,

H. C. LODGE, *Chairman.*

—

[For the press.]

JANUARY 25, 1923.

The following correspondence between the Secretary of State and Senator LODGE, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, was made public to-day:

On January 16, 1923, the Secretary of State wrote a letter to Senator LODGE outlining, in accordance with his request, the origin and nature of the association of the American observer with the work of the Reparation Commission.

On January 20 Senator LODGE, on behalf of the committee, requested certain additional information with respect to specified points. The Secretary of State, in compliance with this request, wrote a further letter on January 25, 1923.

The two letters are as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1923.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Referring to our conversation regarding Mr. Boyden's duties in Paris at the present time as American observer with the Reparation Commission, I take pleasure in outlining briefly the origin and nature of his association with the work of that body.

Following the signature of the treaty of Versailles on June 28, 1919, and pending its ratification (the treaty came into effect on January 10, 1920) the committee on organization of

the Reparation Commission was created for the purpose of inaugurating informally the work of the permanent commission contemplated by the treaty, and members of the American peace delegation participated in the work of this committee during the summer and fall of 1919.

Upon the departure of the American peace commissioners in December, 1919, Mr. Albert Rathbone, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, remained in Paris and attended the meetings of the organization committee of the Reparation Commission. Mr. Rathbone was instructed to keep in close touch with reparation matters, both in order that this Government might be fully informed of developments and also to safeguard the interests of the United States.

At a meeting of the organization committee of the Reparation Commission on January 9, 1920, the United States Government was invited, through Mr. Rathbone, to attend unofficially the meetings of the commission. It was understood, of course, that the United States would not vote or take formal part in the work of the commission. Mr. Rathbone was authorized to accept the invitation thus extended, and on January 24, 1920, he and Col. James A. Logan, jr., attended unofficially the first meeting of the commission.

Since Mr. Rathbone was unable to remain in Paris, Mr. Roland W. Boyden succeeded him in the spring of 1920 as special representative of the United States Treasury at Paris, and attended the meetings of the Reparation Commission in his place. The salaries and expenses of Mr. Boyden and of his alternate, Colonel Logan, have been and are paid by the Government of the United States. The plan of organization adopted by the Reparation Commission made provision, in the case of each national delegation, for office accommodations, as well as for the necessary funds for subordinate staff, and similar provision was made by the commission for the offices and staff needed by Mr. Boyden. This Government saw no reason for objecting to this arrangement.

On February 11, 1921, the previous administration instructed Mr. Boyden to announce to the Reparation Commission his retirement, which he did on February 19, 1921. However, on May 7, 1921, pursuant to an invitation from the allied governments that the United States resume its previous relations with the commission, Mr. Boyden was instructed to attend its meetings as an observer. He has continued to act as an observer since that time. He does not vote or take part as an official representative on the commission, but he is advised as to its transactions and is in a position informally to express his opinion as occasion may make it appropriate for him to do so.

It is deemed to be of great importance to this Government that it should be informed in detail of the proceedings of the Reparation Commission. The work of the commission has such an intimate relation to political and economic conditions that we should be advised of whatever takes place. It is manifest that in view of the extent and character of the commission's work and the intricacy of the many problems with which it deals, this information could not be secured through the ordinary diplomatic channels. In addition to the general information which we ought to have so that we may be prepared to act intelligently in any exigency, there are questions arising from time to time in which this Government and its citizens have an immediate interest. These purposes have been served by the contact with the commission which we have been able to maintain through the present arrangements.

I am, my dear Senator LODGE,

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

—

JANUARY 25, 1923.

The Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: In my letter of January 16, 1923, I outlined, in accordance with your request, the origin and nature of the association of the American observer with the work of the Reparation Commission. I also pointed out the great importance to this Government of having detailed information of the proceedings of the Reparation Commission and of being able to protect the interests of the United States in the various matters with which that commission is concerned. I may repeat that the present arrangements are intended to serve this purpose.

On Saturday last you advised me that the Committee on Foreign Relations desired additional information with respect to certain specified points, and it gives me pleasure to comply with their request.

First, you ask for—

"Report of the committee on guaranties to the Reparation Commission, made after their last visit to Berlin (in October?); also Reparation Commission Document 1462, 'Economic Survey of Germany, September, 1922.'"

I send you herewith the following papers:

"Report of the committee of guaranties:

"Annex No. 1532, a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, Part I, and

"Annex No. 1532, i, bis. Part II;

"Annex No. 1532, j, Part II, first section;

"Annex No. 1532, k, l, Part II, section 2;

"Annex No. 1532, m, Part II, section 3;

"Annex No. 1532, n, Part II, section 4;

"Note by the French representative on the committee of guaranties, Annex 1595; and

"Memorandum by British representative on committee of guaranties, Annex No. 1595, b."

You will observe that each of these documents is marked "confidential," being the confidential print of the Reparation Commission. As the restriction of confidence has not been removed by the commission with respect to these documents, I am sending them to you with the understanding that they will remain in the confidence of the Committee on Foreign Relations and will not be made public.

I also inclose the following papers:

"Annex No. 1462, a, b, and Annex No. 1462, c, d, being 'Reply from the German Government to the letters of the Reparation Commission dated March 21, 1922 (Annex 1353) and April 13, 1922 (Annex No. 1390), concerning the measures to be taken by the German Government regarding the maintenance of the provisional postponement.'"

This is the only "Reparation Commission Document 1462" with which I am acquainted, and I believe that it is the document to which your request refers. While Annex No. 1462, a, b, and Annex No. 1462, c, d, bear the mark "confidential," I understand that the restriction has been released and that these documents are subject to public use.

Second. You ask for—

"Report of bankers, including financial correspondence in June or July, 1922."

I inclose "Report of the loan committee to the Reparation Commission," being annex No. 1478, which is the report of the committee of bankers. This has already been made public.

I do not understand what is meant by "financial correspondence in June or July, 1922," and I must ask that this request be made more specific.

Third. You request further—

"Copy of the so-called Boyden plan."

I handed you some days ago the public statement that I made on January 16, 1923, with reference to the false reports that had been published to the effect that an "American reparation plan" had been submitted to the Reparation Commission. I then said that neither I nor anyone in behalf of the Department of State had approved any plan for submission to the Reparation Commission or had authorized any such submission.

It appeared from the press dispatches from Paris that the misleading reports had reference to a memorandum which had been prepared by Mr. Boyden in November last, and a copy of which had been sent to the Department of State and had been received about December 1. This memorandum, however, was not in any sense a plan for the settlement of reparations nor was it authorized by the department. As so much had appeared in the public press which was likely to give rise to misapprehension, I made public in the statement above mentioned the circumstances in which this memorandum had been prepared.

It is understood that on November 13, 1922, Mr. Boyden had been requested by one or more members of the Reparation Commission to draft, as a purely personal suggestion, a proposed letter to be sent by the Reparation Commission to the German Government on lines he had informally indicated. This Mr. Boyden did in the memorandum in question, which he gave as a draft to one of the members of the Reparation Commission. This memorandum contained no plan for the settlement of reparations; no suggestion as to amounts, time, or manner of payments. It dealt with general considerations as to the necessity of establishing confidence, and especially as to the importance of the attitude of the German Government in expressing Germany's national will for peace. The memorandum was prepared and submitted by Mr. Boyden as a personal matter and without consultation with the Department of State. When its text was subsequently received by the department it was not regarded as a plan for the settlement of reparations or as requiring any action whatever on the part of the department. It was deemed to be a personal memorandum which Mr. Boyden had already submitted to one of the members of the commission, of a general nature, and which merely emphasized some of the fundamental considerations which were

deemed to be pertinent to the situation in a large way. At the time that the memorandum was forwarded to the department it was also advised that the situation had changed since Mr. Boyden had prepared his draft, by the receipt of the German proposals.

The department heard nothing further about the memorandum or its submission until January 13, 1923, when it received a cable message, sent the day before, that this suggestion of Mr. Boyden was to be placed on the commission's agenda, and that the memorandum had been revised slightly in language but not in substance. Thereupon, on January 14, 1923, I telegraphed Mr. Boyden that when the question of replying to Germany should come up in the commission, he should refrain from expressing any opinion and from urging the consideration of his suggestions in the absence of instructions from the department.

As further misleading reports continued to come from Paris, I telegraphed again the next day—January 15—repeating my request that no opinion should be expressed and no plan submitted without express directions from the department; also that the memorandum had in no sense received the approval of the department. I had cabled for the revised text of the memorandum and this was received on January 16. I understand that no further action has been taken with respect to the memorandum.

As I must assume, in the absence of anything else, that the memorandum in question is what is described as the "so-called Boyden plan" in your request, I inclose a copy of the memorandum of Mr. Boyden as originally prepared and also a copy of its revised text. I am advised that this memorandum is still held in confidence by the Reparation Commission, and I am therefore sending it to you with the understanding that it will be held in confidence by your committee.

Fourth. Again, you ask for—

"Copy of any instructions given to Mr. Boyden at the time of his appointment by the present and the previous administrations; also copy of any other instructions issued to him from time to time."

Without in any manner derogating from the constitutional authority of the President in the conduct of foreign affairs, it is my desire to inform your committee as to the steps that have been taken, in the matter in question, in order to protect the interests of this Government. In anticipation of the formal organization of the Reparation Commission, the Department of State on December 19, 1919, telegraphed Mr. Rathbone, who was then an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and had remained in Paris after the departure of the American peace commissioners, the following instructions:

"You will realize, in view of the nonratification of the United States, that you can not officially take part in the deliberations of the Reparation Commission, which derives its authority from the provisions of the German treaty; but in order to safeguard the vital interests of the United States in matters which may come before the commission you are authorized on the formal organization of the Reparation Commission unofficially to attend its meetings and in accordance with instructions received from time to time give expression to the views of the Government in regard to the above matters when deemed necessary in performance of your duty.

"You may extend similar authorization to your assistants to attend meetings of subcommittees of the Reparation Commission."

Again, on December 27, 1919, Mr. Rathbone was instructed as follows:

"It is intended that you shall, of course, continue acting as heretofore on organization committee, and that upon the organization of the permanent Reparation Commission and until the United States takes definite action in respect to the treaty, or until further notice, you shall, with the approval of the other Governments concerned, attend the meetings of the commission unofficially. As the prime object of your attending those meetings will be to protect the interests of the United States, it will naturally be necessary for you, in order to do so, to participate unofficially in the discussions of any questions arising which concern the United States. The internal organization of the commission and its methods of dealing with the various problems would have considerable bearing on a constructive handling of the various problems; and, as any actions of the commission which might be unsound from a financial and economic standpoint would seriously affect the United States, you should use your best endeavors in advocating the adoption of sound constructive policies."

Then at a meeting of the organization committee of the Reparation Commission on January 9, 1920, an invitation was extended to the American delegation, through Mr. Rathbone, to attend unofficially the meetings of the commission, it being expressly recognized that attending in this manner they would not have the privilege of voting.

The first meeting of the Reparation Commission was held on January 24, 1920, and according to the minutes Mr. Rathbone and Colonel Logan "attended unofficially during part of the meeting." Col. James A. Logan, United States Army, had been Mr. Rathbone's principal assistant in connection with these matters.

Mr. Rathbone being unable to remain in Paris, Mr. Roland W. Boyden succeeded him. Mr. Boyden is a lawyer of distinction, residing at Boston, and had been connected with the Food Administration under Mr. Hoover. Mr. Boyden attended the meetings of the Reparation Commission in Mr. Rathbone's place, and Colonel Logan acted as his assistant. This course was followed until shortly before the end of the previous administration; that is to say, until February 19, 1921, when the unofficial observers were withdrawn.

When the present administration came into power it was felt that this Government should not forego the opportunity to be made fully cognizant of all the proceedings of the Reparation Commission, and that it was advisable, in order that our information should be complete and our interests should be properly safeguarded, that we should again have the advantages derived from the position of our observers.

Accordingly on May 6, 1921, in response to an invitation extended to this Government, it was publicly announced that Mr. Boyden's attendance in an unofficial capacity in connection with the Reparation Commission would be resumed, and on May 7, 1921, the Department of State sent the following instruction to Mr. Boyden:

"You should immediately inform the chairman of the Reparation Commission that you have been instructed by your Government, in response to the request made by the supreme council, to resume your unofficial position on the commission. You should, as formerly, keep the department informed by cable of the discussions and decisions of the commission with your comments thereon."

I have thus stated, as requested, the instructions given to our observers by the present and the previous administrations. It is impracticable, however, for me to attempt to set forth the other instructions which have been issued from time to time on account of their large number and the varied subjects to which they relate. The work of the Reparation Commission covers an enormous field and its transactions are very extensive. The Department of State has been for about three years in almost constant receipt of information and has sent numerous instructions both with respect to the importance of being advised upon various points and with reference to the protection of particular interests of the United States. For this reason I could not attempt to set forth all the instructions, and I am quite sure that this would serve no useful purpose. If your committee desires information upon any particular point I shall be glad to furnish it to the best of my ability.

I should say, however, that it has not been the policy of this administration to participate in the fixing of the amounts to be paid by Germany upon reparation claims; and particularly with respect to the discussions that have been going on during the past few months before the Reparation Commission in relation to the amounts and terms of Germany's reparation payments, the department has cautioned its observer not to take any position that would involve this Government in these discussions.

As showing some of the subjects which have engaged the attention of the American observers, and as to which instructions and requests for information have been sent from time to time, I may mention:

(1) Costs of the American army of occupation.

(2) Interest of the United States in safeguarding the rights, reserved by the joint resolution of Congress of July 2, 1921, under the treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, and Trianon, the benefits of which are secured to the United States by the treaties with Germany, Austria, and Hungary.

(3) American interests in Austrian and Hungarian pre-war bonds and in the currency notes of the Austro-Hungarian Bank, now in liquidation.

(4) Lien of the United States on reparation receipts by certain countries.

(5) Austrian relief, involving the question of the release of Austrian assets pledged to the United States.

(6) Relief and food purchases by European Governments other than Austria.

(7) American interests in German oil tankers.

(8) Various shipping questions.

(9) Effect of reparation payments on the foreign exchanges.

(10) Instructions as to the position of this Government regarding alien property in the United States.

(11) Information with respect to the Brussels conference of 1920 and other conferences.

In addition there are the general subjects of inquiry and report by reason of the importance of the Reparation Commission as a source of information dealing with economic and political questions in Europe. There has thus been received currently a mass of valuable material.

In conclusion I may say with respect to the work of the American observers that it has been distinctly understood that no opinions were to be expressed on behalf of this Government, except under specific instructions from the Department of State.

Fifth. Your next request is for—

"Information as to the staff of Mr. Boyden, where maintained, cost of maintenance, etc."

Mr. Boyden is the American observer and Colonel Logan is the assistant observer.

Mr. Boyden receives a salary at the rate of $5,000 a year and in addition has an allowance for expenses not to exceed $1,000 a month, thus limiting the total amount of his compensation and allowance for expenses to $17,000 a year. This amount was fixed in July, 1920, and has been continued since that time.

Mr. Boyden has received and receives no compensation or allowance from the Reparation Commission.

Colonel Logan received no salary other than his Army pay until he resigned from the Army in the summer of 1922, and since his resignation he has been paid a salary at the rate of $4,000 a year. He receives in addition an allowance for expenses not to exceed $6,000 per annum, making the limit of his salary and allowance for expenses $10,000 a year.

Colonel Logan has received and receives no compensation or allowance from the Reparation Commission.

I should add that the assistant observer acts as alternate to Mr. Boyden and is on the same basis as to unofficial status, and has been in attendance at meetings of the committee of guaranties and of other committees which have been constituted of the assistant delegates to the Reparation Commission from other countries. This work has been of large importance and has involved a great deal of detail.

The secretarial and clerical staff consists of 21 persons, being a secretary and assistants, a registrar, file clerks, stenographers, and messengers. This staff is maintained at 15 rue de Tilsitt, Paris, the quarters being furnished and the expenses in connection therewith defrayed by the Reparation Commission. Aside from the expense of these premises, the total cost of this staff, with the exception of four messengers, is $4,887.09 per month. The cost of the four messengers is 2,200 francs a month.

The cost of this staff, as well as the expense of its quarters, is paid by the Reparation Commission. This matter was taken up in May, 1920, under the previous administration, and the arrangement which was definitely approved in July, 1920, has since been continued. There seemed to be no reason why the expense of these facilities should not be defrayed by the Reparation Commission, as the commission was willing to defray it, there being no inherent objection to this, any more than to the agreement to pay the cost of the American Army of occupation.

There are two other persons who have been associated with the American observers but who have rendered technical and expert services to the Reparation Commission and have been paid for these services by it. These are Hugh A. Bayne and Ralph H. Hess.

Mr. Bayne is an American lawyer of high ability, who before the war practiced in New York City for many years. He served with the American Expeditionary Forces in France and has remained there, being now a member of the legal firm of Coudert Bros. He is connected with the legal service of the Reparation Commission and renders services to the commission as a lawyer, and is paid by the commission precisely as any lawyer would be paid for similar services. When the American unofficial observers were withdrawn in February, 1921, Mr. Bayne continued to render legal services to the commission. Mr. Bayne receives no compensation from the Government of the United States. He is paid by the commission, as his total compensation and allowance for expenses, at the rate of $961.48 a month.

These services of Mr. Bayne do not affect in any way the unofficial status of the American observers. This was distinctly understood, and the Department of State was advised under date of July 1, 1920, upon this point as follows:

"Understanding perfectly clear and so expressed by members commission when decision taken that all payments based solely on theory that commission merely paying compensation for outside assistance rendered to commission in its work. Delegation retains absolute unofficial character unchanged."

The same may be said of Mr. Hess, who is paid by the commission for technical or expert services in connection with the finance service, and receives a total compensation and allowance for expenses at the rate of $768.54 a month.

I am also advised that Colonel Winship has rendered expert services to the Reparation Commission in connection with the service of restitution and reparation in kind, and that Captain Madison has rendered services in a similar way in relation to maritime matters and questions of valuation. Neither Colonel Winship nor Captain Madison has received a salary from the commission, but they have had allowances other than salary at the rate of $704.23 in the case of Colonel Winship and $714.63 in the case of Captain Madison.

The only expense to the Government of the United States in this whole matter (aside from the Army and Navy pay of Colonel Winship and Captain Madison) is the amount of compensation and expense allowances paid Mr. Boyden and Colonel Logan, and this amount, as already stated, does not exceed $27,000 a year.

Sixth. Finally, you ask:

"Exact fund from which Messrs. Boyden and Logan receive compensation."

Mr. Boyden and Colonel Logan are paid out of the emergency fund of the State Department.

I remain, my dear Senator LODGE,

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

The Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,

United States Senate.

(Inclosures.)

Report of the committee on guaranties:

Annex No. 1532, a, b, c, d, e f g, h, i, Part I, and

Annex No. 1532 i, bis, Part II;

Annex No. 1532 j, Part II, first section;

Annex No. 1532 k, l, Part II, section 2;

Annex No. 1532 m, Part II, section 3;

Annex No. 1532 n, Part II, section 4;

Note by the French representative on the committee of guaranties, Annex 1595; and

Memorandum by British representative on committee of guaranties, Annex No. 1595 b.

Annex No. 1462 a, b, and Annex No. 1462 c, d, being—

"Reply from the German Government to the letters of the Reparation Commission dated March 21, 1922 (Annex 1353), and April 13, 1922 (Annex No. 1390), concerning the measures to be taken by the German Government regarding the maintenance of the provisional postponement."

"Report of the loan committee to the Reparation Commission," being Annex No. 1478.

Memorandum prepared by Mr. Boyden (original draft).

Memorandum prepared by Mr. Boyden (revised draft).

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is a matter of urgency requiring the passage of the bill (S. 4390) to amend the last paragraph of section 10 of the Federal reserve act as amended by the act of June 3, 1922. I ask at this time unanimous consent that the measure be taken up for immediate consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah requests unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 4390.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill by title.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to join in the request of the Senator from Utah that permission be granted to consider this bill. I am certain it will only require a few moments to dispose of it. It relates to the authorization for the construction of branch bank buildings by the Federal reserve banks. It will be recalled by the Senate that some time ago the law touching the subject was modified so as to prohibit the reserve banks from constructing buildings the total cost of which would be in excess of $250,000. It has been found that in a number of cases plans for the erection of branch bank buildings had already been adopted when the law was modified restricting the right of the reserve banks to construct the buildings. If the law be amended by the passage of the bill for which consideration is now asked, the reserve banks will be enabled to construct those buildings.

The bill proposes to authorize the construction of buildings where the cost of the building proper does not exceed $250,000; that is, excluding the cost of vaults, equipment, and fixtures. If passed, it will enable the reserve banks to construct a number

of buildings, including the branch bank buildings at Salt Lake City, Utah, and Little Rock, Ark.

It will also be recalled that the Senate some time ago passed a joint resolution known as the Spencer resolution, which authorized the construction of a bank building at St. Louis, Mo., and branch bank buildings at Salt Lake City, Utah, and Little Rock, Ark. That measure passed the other House with amendments, and, although a conference report on the measure was submitted, that conference report has been pending for quite a length of time. It appears that some difficulty has been found in securing consideration of the report. In any event, the matter has not been disposed of.

This bill was originally introduced in the House of Representatives by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of that body. It has been favorably reported, as I understand unanimously, by the House committee. The object in passing the pending bill here now is to facilitate the legislation so as to make certain that the measure may be enacted prior to the adjournment of Congress on the 4th of March next.

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

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, this subject has been one which has been prolific of debate. I should have no objection to the consideration of the bill if it could be disposed of within a few minutes. If the Senator from Utah will withdraw the bill, if debate on it shall run over 15 minutes, I shall not object to its consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly shall do so, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin. I believe, however, the consideration of the bill will take but a few moments.

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, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last paragraph of section 10 of the Federal reserve act as amended by the act of June 3, 1922, is amended to read as follows:

"No Federal reserve bank shall have authority hereafter to enter into any contract or contracts for the erection of any branch bank building of any kind or character, or to authorize the erection of any such building, if the cost of the building proper, exclusive of the cost of the vaults, permanent equipment, furnishings, and fixtures, is in excess of $250,000: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall apply to any building now under construction."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say merely a word or two. The only amendment to the existing law which is proposed by the pending bill is the insertion, after the word "building," of the words "proper, exclusive of the cost of the vaults, permanent equipment, furnishings, and fixtures." Those words are proposed to be added to the existing law.

The joint resolution referred to by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] was passed by the Senate on June 30 of last year. Subsequently it passed the House of Representatives and went to conference. There is objection to the form in which the joint resolution passed the House, for the reason that it is proposed to authorize the erection of branch bank buildings based upon a certain percentage of their assets. That would give some branch banks of the Federal system three or four times the amount which would be available to some other branch banks in some other districts. For instance, in the Arkansas district they would not have enough money to erect a bank building of the proper size, while in the Salt Lake City district there would be an authorization to expend too much money for the purpose under the provision as the House passed the measure. So the only change in the law provided in this bill, which, I understand, is acceptable to both the Senate and House conferees on the joint resolution referred to, is the insertion of the words to which I have referred. The existing law reads:

No Federal reserve bank shall have authority hereafter to enter into any contract or contracts for the erection of any branch bank building of any kind or character, or to authorize the erection of any such building, if the cost of the building is in excess of $250,000.

Under the proposed amendment of the law it will read:

If the cost of the building proper, exclusive of the cost of the vaults, permanent equipment, furnishings, and fixtures, is in excess of $250,000.

That is the change proposed of the existing law.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is intended that this proposed legislation shall take the place of a number of resolutions that have been presented and that it shall provide a permanent law to cover all cases?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the object of the bill. The bill has been reported by the Senate committee just as it passed the other House; so that if it shall pass the Senate that will be the end of the matter.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. HARRELD. I wish to make an inquiry. Somewhere along the line the branch banks at Salt Lake City and Little Rock have been included. Was that done in the House, in the Senate, or in conference?

Mr. SMOOT. That was done in the Senate as to Salt Lake City, and that city was added simply because of the fact that in that case the land had been purchased and the plans had been virtually drawn. Therefore Salt Lake City was put into the bill when it was under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. HARRELD. I have no objection to the provision for those two cities; I am merely asking about the procedure. I wish to know if either of those two cities were added in conference without first having been passed upon by the House of Representatives?

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator from Utah will permit me, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma they were not. The Spencer joint resolution as originally presented proposed to authorize the St. Louis bank proper to construct a building for its main offices and a building for the branch bank at Little Rock. The Senate amended the joint resolution so as to include the branch bank at Salt Lake City. The bill, however, went to the House of Representatives and was amended so as to strike out provision for the branch banks and to leave the measure so that the main building at St. Louis could be constructed. It passed the House of Representatives with those amendments, and the measure then went to conference. A conference report was submitted, in which it was proposed that the House recede from its amendments to the joint resolution. The conference report, however, was never agreed to. There were a number of cases where it appeared desirable to construct branch bank buildings, and the House seemingly took the position that a measure of a general character should be enacted. That is the measure of which the Senator from Utah has procured consideration.

Mr. HARRELD. The point I want to make is this——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator further, so that he will have the whole matter before him, that the provision as it passed the House and the Senate read as follows:

That the total investment in such building shall not exceed an amount equal to 25 per cent of its paid-in capital stock and surplus.

I have referred to the fact that in some cases that would give altogether too much money to erect a branch bank building in some places, while in other cases it would not provide enough. Therefore, the bill which I am asking the Senate now to pass was agreed upon to take the place of that measure.

Mr. HARRELD. That does not give me the information I want. I have heard it stated that the conference committee added things to the joint resolution in relation to two of the branch banks that were not in the bill as it passed the House and were not in the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is not correct.

Mr. HARRELD. I am inquiring to know whether that is true?

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the fact.

Mr. HARRELD. I have no objection, of course, to Little Rock being included, but I am opposed to methods of procedure such as I have indicated, and that is the reason for my inquiry.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have stated that the original measure embraced a bank building at St. Louis and a branch bank at Little Rock, and the Senate incorporated an amendment relating to Salt Lake City.

Mr. HARRELD. I presume, then, I was merely misinformed about it, and in view of the Senator's statement, which I accept, that will end it, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ROBINSON. The language was somewhat changed, but provision for buildings at all those places was made in the joint resolution as it passed the Senate.

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

NANTICOKE RIVER BRIDGE, DEL.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4346) granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware State Highway Department to construct a bridge across the Nanticoke River, and I submit a report (No. 1062) thereon. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] is very anxious to have the bill passed to-day. It is in the usual form of such measures, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Delaware State Highway Department and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Nanticoke River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Seaford, in the county of Sussex, in the State of Delaware, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

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

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, at this time I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its business to-day it shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, with the understanding that we will conclude the session reasonably early to-morrow afternoon and adjourn then until Monday, so that we may have a morning hour on Monday.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am not disposed to object, but I think it is asking a good deal to request Senators to be here at 11 o'clock to-morrow. The Senator promises, however, that he will not keep the Senate very late to-morrow and that an adjournment will be taken to-morrow afternoon to Monday. In view of that, I shall not interpose an objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator that I will be willing to conclude the session to-morrow at not later than 4.30 o'clock.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I invite the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that eulogies are to be pronounced in the Chamber on Sunday? I do not know whether he will have to modify his request in view of that fact.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then we can adjourn to-morrow until Sunday, and we will adjourn, of course, on Sunday until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13926) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS.

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. 13926) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives, agree to the conference asked for by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. HARRIS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROBLEMS RELATING TO REFORESTATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 398, agreed to January 22, 1923, to investigate problems relating to reforestation, the Chair appoints the following Senators: Mr. MOSES, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. COUZENS, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. FLETCHER.

RURAL-CREDIT FACILITIES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4287) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to amend the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in reference to this general subject I think there is a pronounced and well-justified demand all over the country for some system of supplying short-term credit to meet the needs of those engaged in agriculture.

The subject is not without difficulty. There has been one view of it to this effect: On account of the different laws in the different States, the different rates of interest prevailing in different States, the different kind of credit securities, the various and varying requirements as to chattel mortgages, and the distinct provisions as to liens on crops and on personal property generally the view has obtained very largely that these credit associations or agencies for supplying short-term personal credit ought, if possible, to be constituted of local organizations, and that such organizations ought to be created under States laws, if possible. In other words, there has been some doubt whether Congress ought to attempt by national legislation to enter that field and undertake to cover it in the face of the varying conditions and varying laws and requirements in the several States and localities.

If it were possible to have those engaged in agriculture organized in such sort that local credit unions would be formed, and in such a way as to bring about real cooperation among the farmers, it seems to me that would be a more desirable method of effecting what we are trying to do here. I regret to say that it appears, from what has developed in the country and what has been testified to before various committees, that the cooperative spirit among farmers in this country has not yet been sufficiently developed to bring about that condition which would form the soundest and best basis for short-term personal credit. In some States these credit unions have been organized. In some States cooperative societies and associations have been established, and wherever they have been established and are being conducted upon the true cooperative basis they are accomplishing very great beneficial results.

Some years ago this subject was under consideration by what was known as the American commission, with which the United States commission was created to cooperate in studying various systems of agricultural finance which had been established in the older countries of Europe, and which had been found to be eminently successful there. Those commissions visited the European countries. They sailed from New York and landed first in Genoa. They were received at the building built by the King of Italy in Rome as the home of the International Institute of Agriculture, and from there they visited the European countries, including Austria, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Belgium, Holland, France, England, and Ireland; and they brought with them a mass of literature on the subject which has been of immense value to the people of this country, and especially to Congress, because it formed the basis and furnished the information upon which was constructed the farm loan act.

Those commissions reported at the same time that they submitted their report, on the main question of a plan for financial accommodations for farmers, embodied in Senate Document No. 214, something like 1,000 pages, and, as I say, embracing information and data which it would be impossible to obtain now, and never will be possible to obtain again, some views on the subject of short-term personal credit. The Europe they saw is dead, and the great agricultural development which had taken place there could scarcely be appreciated upon a visit to those countries to-day. However, those who have been in Europe comparatively recently tell me that the farms in Germany, especially, have been kept up, and show evidences of that splendid system known as the landschaft system, which had been in operation some 100 years in that country before the war. I am told, too, that the farms in Germany are virtually all free from mortgages. The mortgages were paid off in spite of the depreciated value of the mark. In spite of world conditions, in spite of what Germany has gone through, her farms to-day are practically free from mortgages and are in a high state of cultivation. Certainly the landschaft bonds, corresponding to the farm-loan bonds in this country, have been as readily salable as the Government bonds, and in fact never lost their standing as the highest securities offered in Germany.

We passed the farm-loan act. It has been in operation since 1916, except that it required from six to eight months to get the system organized. Under the law 12 district land banks had to be established in 12 different districts of the United States. Those banks had to be officered. The temporary organization required that the Farm Loan Board should name five directors for each of these banks until the stock in each of them to the amount of $100,000 was acquired by the national farm loan associations, and then they were to be permanently organized. Under that provision for permanent organization six directors in these banks were to be selected by the national farm loan associations, holding stock to the

extent of $100,000 in each bank, and three of the directors were to be named by the Farm Loan Board. That was the plan of permanent organization. It never has been put into effect. The temporary organization continued, notwithstanding the national farm associations own more than $100,000 of the stock in every bank of the system, and in four of them practically all.

The system began to function, and was proceeding nicely until finally suit was instituted in the State of Missouri, in the United States court, attacking the constitutionality of the act, and especially assailing that feature of the act which exempted farm-loan bonds from all taxation. That suit was undoubtedly instituted by farm-mortgage associations doing private business which they had been engaged in for years, and in which they had been making enormous profits by charging farmers rates of interest which were oppressive in effect, and which those associations desired to continue without interruption and without opposition or competition; and they realized that once this farm-loan system was thoroughly established there would be very serious competition with them in the matter of making loans upon farms.

They brought the suit. The suit was won in the lower court by the Farm Loan Board and was carried to the Supreme Court. Finally, in February, 1921, the Supreme Court sustained the constitutionality of the act in every respect; so that, that question being settled, the system for the first time had the chance to show what could be done under it. Since then over $700,000,000 have been found for farmers in the United States at 5 to 5½ per cent interest, payable on practically their own terms, the principal being paid at the rate of 1 per cent per annum, with the right to pay off any portion of the principal at any interest period.

Homes have been saved to farmers in this country. They have been able to develop their estates. They have been able to get their capital requirements, so far the demand has thus far been met, and to-day they are supplied with ample funds to respond to the demands to meet their needs in accordance with the purposes of the act. That has been accomplished by the issuing of farm-loan bonds against collective mortgages by the Federal land banks, as the law provides, and those bonds are readily salable on the market at above par. The last issue bears a rate of interest of 4½ per cent. Seventy-five million dollars of bonds were offered recently, and they were taken within two hours; so that those bonds are upon a splendid footing, and loans are being granted at the rate of $200,000,000 a year. They are designated as instrumentalities of the Government. They are backed by the personal obligation of the borrower and by a mortgage upon his farm at a valuation of 50 per cent of its value and 20 per cent of the insured value of improvements; they are backed also by the indorsement of the National Farm Loan Association of which the borrower is a member by a pledge of 5 per cent of the stock—5 per cent of the loan must be taken in stock in the Federal land bank—and by the Federal land bank itself, all issued under the supervision and control of a bureau of the Government—the Farm Loan Board. There is no sounder security in the country. There is no agency of the Government which has ever accomplished as much for the farmers of this country. There is no system which has ever been established to meet the needs of agriculture that compares with the farm loan system. They should be able to supply—and no doubt will reach that figure—a million dollars a day to the farmers of the country.

I dislike very much to see any modification or change in the farm loan act. I dislike to have any proposed amendment of that act presented at any time. Of course, I may say that, like all acts of Congress, it could scarcely be said that it was absolutely perfect when it was passed, and as time goes on we may see the need of amendments from time to time as in any general legislation; but I venture to say that there never has been passed by Congress an act which has needed or received as few changes or amendments as has the farm loan act. The Federal reserve act was a splendid, magnificent piece of legislation, and we had supposed that after years and years of study we had passed an almost perfect piece of legislation; but consider the amendments which have been made to the Federal reserve act since it was put upon the statute books, as compared with those which have been offered to the farm loan act. It will be observed that the ratio is 10 or more to 1.

I have not taken the trouble to count them, but I am simply saying that when the farm loan act was passed it was as perfect a piece of legislation, in my judgment, as was ever put upon the statute books; it has accomplished more for agriculture in this country than anything else Congress has ever done, and naturally I feel disposed to question any attempt to amend that act in any respect.

The bill before us proposes certain amendments, and it may be that it is the wisest thing for us to do now, in order to associate with the long-term credit system provided by the farm loan act this short-term credit system, keeping them separate, however, in administration in the Federal land banks and under the Farm Loan Board.

While hesitating to launch upon this new venture and to enter upon these amendments to the farm loan act, I am inclined to favor this legislation as the best that has been offered, it seems to me, to meet what appears to be a real need on the part of the farmers of the country. They ought to have their own financial system, because agriculture is an industry which is not only the basis of all our prosperity and all our well-being, but it is peculiar in that the business is altogether different from that of a merchant or a manufacturer, where they are turning over their goods from day to day, or in 60 or 90 days, inasmuch as the farmer must wait upon the seasons, take all the chances of drought and flood and enemies of plant life, take all the risks, and can not expect to realize from his labor, his work, his toil, until the crop matures and is finally put upon the market.

The farmer needs a different system from that of the merchant or the manufacturer or the business man. He needs altogether a different plan from the commercial plan. He needs a system peculiarly adapted to meet the needs of that particular industry, which is fundamental, and which must be taken care of, because all our prosperity at last must depend upon a sound and healthy agriculture.

I think, therefore, it is advisable to link this plan up with the Farm Loan Board and the farm loan act, rather than with the Federal reserve act and the Federal Reserve Board, which is, after all, a part of our commercial system. I am therefore going to support this bill, although I hesitate even now to favor changes in or amendments to the farm loan act.

Referring to the work of those commissions which I have just mentioned, I had the honor of being the chairman of both of the commissions; and I must say, although I perhaps should not, inasmuch as no one else, I believe, has mentioned it, that, although Congress appropriated some $20,000 to cover the entire expenses of the United States Commission in connection with that work, involving three months of travel and investigation and study in Europe, we actually paid back into the Treasury something like $3,000 of that fund and did not ask Congress for an additional appropriation, which is quite the uniform practice in the Senate, I find. We actually covered the entire expenses for clerks, translators, and everything connected with the commission in that tremendous study and work, and returned to the Treasury a part of the appropriation which had been made to meet our expenses.

On March 13, 1914, that commission submitted to the Sixty-third Congress, second session, Document No. 380, a report in three parts. One of the parts refers to personal or short-time credits, and I beg leave to call attention to some of the things which we stated in that report. I read:

> The purpose of credit unions is not to make commercial profits but to give credit to members on favorable terms.

That is based upon a study of credit unions established in European countries and was submitted for consideration because the commissions finally decided that they had better confine themselves to this long-time credit plan as being the primary need of the farmers of the country and not make any recommendation at that time with reference to short-time personal-credit systems. We said:

> As generally found throughout Europe this system does not even admit of any distribution of dividends. Where this rule is in complete force all net earnings or profits are carried to the reserve fund or used in the creation of institutions of public utility or are devoted to the common good.

That is at page 28 of the report I am reading. I continue:

> A few of the credit unions, however, and particularly those which have a material share capital, provide for the distribution of dividends, but even in these cases rules are very strict, and the dividends never exceed the maximum rate of interest charged the borrower. In Austria the profits are never paid in the form of interest on shares, except in the very rarest cases, being placed in the reserve almost always, although in some cases small amounts are devoted to the common good. The same general rule applies in the case of Italy and other European countries.
>
> The fact that no dividends are paid or that dividends when paid are insignificant does not mean that these credit unions are not prosperous. Taking Germany again as an illustration because of the fact that Germany has literally thousands of these societies, we find that the great majority close their business each year with a respectable fund designated "net earnings." Out of the 12,797 credit unions referred to in the small table presented above 11,795, or more than 92 out of each 100, closed the last fiscal year for which reports are available with net earnings, while only 911, or 7 out of each 100,

declared a loss. Ninety institutions closed their business for the year with a balanced sheet, showing neither profit nor loss.

If we take the total result of all these credit unions under consideration the net earnings after subtracting losses amount to not far from $2,000,000 for one year, or almost 30 per cent of the share capital of these institutions; but, as noted above, this is not declared in the form of dividends on the share capital, and, as a matter of fact, when the total working capital is considered, these profits represent only about 0.4 per cent, showing what a narrow margin the institutions consider safe.

We rather thought that there ought to be encouraged in the United States this idea of creating these local credit unions in the various States, and in that way the plan would be worked out for supplying the personal credits, or the credits based on the personal obligations of the borrower in connection with the mortgage or lien upon his personal property, whatever that might be, somewhat after the plan proposed in this bill.

Then, in the summary, at page 29, we said:

A careful examination of the descriptions of these European banks or credit unions suggests the questions: Are these institutions necessary in this country; and if so, should they be provided for by law, or is any legislation necessary?

The members of your commission feel that such institutions are necessary in many, if not all, country communities in the United States. We will not take space or time here to establish this position, believing that it represents the unanimous opinion of farmers and of unbiased or unprejudiced observers acquainted with the problem.

The members of your commission are of the opinion that credit unions could be organized in almost every State in the Union, if not in every State, without specific legislation, as they were organized in many European countries and as they have already been launched in several American States. At the same time it is believed that legislation clearly defining credit unions, their scope, their functions, their methods of operation and limitations, as well as a system of inspection or supervision of these institutions, is eminently desirable.

The members of your commission are agreed that it is clearly within the power of the different States to pass the necessary legislation, and we desire to call the attention of Congress to the specific laws of Massachusetts, New York, Wisconsin, and Texas providing for credit unions within those States.

Then follow certain conclusions and recommendations; for instance:

The minimum capital for banks organized under Federal charter is fixed at $25,000 in the national bank act. The Federal reserve act reenacted this provision in fixing the capitalization for member banks in the new system. It follows, therefore, that the rediscount privilege created by the new law is extended only to banks having a capital equal to that of national banks under the old law.

There are more than 8,000 State and private banks in the United States with a smaller capital than that required by law of member banks in the new system. These banks are located mainly in small country villages and do business either directly or indirectly with farmers. No reorganization of our national banking system can be complete and just to the agricultural interests which deprives or withholds from these small banks participation in the benefits of the Government rate of discount.

In order to be sure of its ground, your commission addressed letters of inquiry to several hundred of these small State and private banks, asking if it was their purpose to increase their capital so as to join the new system; and if not, whether they would join were the capitalization to be reduced to $10,000. The replies were practically unanimous. These banks will not increase their capital, because in most instances a capital of $25,000 is not warranted by the volume of business transacted by them; this minimum is excessive for banks located in thinly settled farming districts. For this reason, then, and not from any spirit of hostility to it, these banks will not enter the new system. The very large majority of those replying stated that with a minimum capital of $10,000 they would reorganize and become member banks of the regional system.

The decision of these country banks renders it certain that without amendment to the national-bank act relatively few farmers can become patrons of member banks in the reserve system. Thus the advantage of direct Government rediscount—which is the rational basis of all approved systems of short-time rural credit—will be largely withheld from farmers because of their residence in thinly settled parts of our country. Our rural population is justly entitled to receive credit direct from reserve banks in the same degree that urban population enjoys this advantage; and the method of bank organization should be such that residents of country districts can successfully overcome the disadvantages of their environment.

Your commission is of the opinion that a very few changes in the present banking systems would better adapt large numbers of existing small banks to the needs of great numbers of farmers and farm laborers, and at the same time leave these institutions unimpaired to perform the commercial functions for which they were primarily established.

Considering that was written in March, 1914, it seems to be rather prophetic. I am glad of some effort to induce the smaller State banks to become members of the Federal reserve system. The situation now was cited in the preamble of a resolution offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] yesterday that—

It appears from the last annual report of the Federal Reserve Board that 9,640 State banks and trust companies, constituting over 85 per cent of the eligible State banks and trust companies in the United States, have failed to become members of the Federal reserve system.

The bill offers some inducement in that direction and it may be that more of the banks will join. But I conceive the trouble to be not so much the need of additional member banks in the system as increased activity on the part of those who are members of the system. A great many of the member banks at present do not transact any rediscount business at all. They apparently are not serving the communities in which they now exist. Even the members of the present system seem not inclined to make rediscounts and seem to pride themselves on the fact that they are not discounting any of their paper.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Florida has referred to the fact that there are a large number of State banks and trust companies which as yet have not affiliated with the Federal reserve system, as I understood him. He took the position that he believed it would be advantageous for more of the institutions to which I have referred to become associated with the Federal reserve system. May I ask the Senator what reasons he has for assuming that great advantages would flow from the State banks and State institutions affiliating with the Federal reserve system?

I ask the question particularly in view of the fact that last summer when I was west I encountered a good many bankers in my own and in other States who had not joined the Federal reserve system, who deprecated what they seemed to think was the tendency of the Federal reserve system, namely, to impose so many impediments, restrictions, and obstacles as to separate the people from the banks. That is to say, under the old system they contended that the banker was brought into contact with the people, knew their needs and their wants, could understand the element of the personal equation in making loans, and could make safer and better loans, and could better satisfy the people than could be and has been done by the Federal reserve system. Their contention was that the Federal reserve system made a sort of procrustean bed that tried to establish some system of uniformity, and that the personal equation and the legitimate needs of the people could not be taken into account. Therefore, they insisted that they did not intend to become members of the Federal reserve system.

I would like to have the views of the Senator from Florida upon that criticism.

Mr. FLETCHER. I know there is a sentiment of that sort. They do not care to come under the control of the Federal Reserve Board and have certain restrictions and limitations placed upon them, certain examinations made, requirements as to the kind of paper and securities they may take, and so forth. But the Senator will note that in order that paper may be rediscounted by the Federal reserve banks and circulating notes issued on that paper, it must bear the indorsement of a member bank of the system. Consequently the banks outside of the system have not the facilities that the member banks have for obtaining circulating notes on paper. Hence it is thought to be important that as many banks as possible should acquire the status of members in order that they may have the full rediscount privileges and be entitled to have circulating notes issued on the paper rediscounted for them. That, of course, is a great facility and it must have many advantages. It is upon that theory it is desirable, if possible, to increase the membership of the Federal reserve system.

Mr. KING. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there are members of the Federal reserve system who have not availed themselves of the privileges of rediscount?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely, but I think that is a great mistake.

Mr. KING. They are sufficiently strong that they feel they do not need to resort to rediscounting their paper with the Federal reserve banks.

Mr. FLETCHER. I observed just a moment ago that I thought that there was a real difficulty and weakness in the system, that the member banks themselves were not taking advantage of the facilities in sufficient degree. To my mind, instead of using as a sort of advertisement the fact that they do not need to rediscount their paper and thus bolstering up confidence in them, I think it shows they are neglecting the requirements of their communities.

Mr. KING. The Senator must not forget, however, that the banks of our country to-day have assets of the aggregate value of perhaps $40,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000. In view of the fact that many of the banks have large deposits and large resources, sufficiently large to meet the legitimate demands of their customers, they feel that there is no necessity of applying, even though they are members of the Federal reserve system, to the central organization for the privileges of rediscount. It seems to me they are wise in adopting that course. They have all of the interest, because they are not paying any part of it to the central organization. They are deriving all of the benefits, all of the profits and advantages that result from the lending of money, and are not compelled to share with the central organization.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, they are not subject to criticism if, as a matter of fact, they are meeting all the needs of their several communities without rediscounting. They ought not to be criticized for not availing themselves of that opportunity under the system. On the contrary, they are to be commended for it. However, I am very much afraid that some of them have the impression that if they can let it be known that they are not rediscounting paper in the Federal reserve bank they are thereby on such a solid foundation and entitled to so much confidence that it can be and is used as a sort of advertisement, which I do not think is the right spirit if their communities really need all the facilities which those banks can afford. If we could increase the membership and spread it out in the Federal reserve system, I think we would make a wider field for the use of the rediscount privileges under the Federal reserve act, and thereby be helpful to agriculture as well as business generally.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator, if he will pardon me further——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield further to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The criticism has been made by many economists and many students of our fiscal affairs, agriculturists as well as bankers, that the facilities for credit in the United States perhaps have been too great, the result of which has been that we have become a Nation of debtors as well as a Nation of creditors, with property of the value of perhaps $250,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. I am speaking now of the aggregate value of all the property of the United States and all of its nationals. We have an indebtedness—National, State, municipal, and individual—of from $100,000,000,000 to $150,000,000,000. I have attempted to ascertain approximately what was the indebtedness of the character last referred to. The figures differ, but I have not any hesitancy in saying the obligations of the United States, the States, municipalities, and private individuals reach the stupendous figure of more than $100,000,000,000.

Now, with a mortgage of more than one-third of the value of all the property of the United States upon that property it does seem to me we can not complain about not having sufficient credit. I grant in some sections the fountains of credit have been perhaps dried up or have not flowed sufficiently copiously, but, generally speaking, it seems to me we have gone mad upon the question of credit. Instead of seeking economies we have sought to develop new fountains of credit.

I was wondering if the Senator believes that the need of the country now is additional credit, unrestricted credit, or rather the development of markets for the commodities which are produced so abundantly, particularly by the farmer and also by the manufacturer of the United States. We need markets, it seems to me, more than we need anything else, and opportunities for the farmers and the producers of commodities to obtain sufficient credit to enable them in an orderly way to place in the hands of the consumer those commodities which the consumers must have.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, referring to the question of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], I will say that, of course, primarily we do need, and probably our greatest need is, the development of markets and marketing facilities and a proper solution of the problem of distribution. There is no question that we must devise some plan for the economical distribution of products. That would be most helpful. At the same time, whereas it may be that we have abundant credit facilities—that is, possibilities of extending credit and therefore possibilities of going into debt—still the matter of interest is very important in that connection.

Our people from time to time have been borrowing a great deal of money, but they have been paying enormous rates of interest. For instance, agriculture for nearly a century past has paid rates of interest which would have meant the destruction of any other industry; no other industry in the world could have survived under the burdens of interest and charges and terms which agriculture has had to bear. The main thing to be gained now is to afford to agriculture that accommodation which it needs to-day upon terms and at a rate of interest which the industry can stand. That is the object we are trying to attain in the passage of the pending legislation.

Referring to the report from which I previously read, at page 32, I will continue to the conclusion of it:

> Students of this subject will recognize in these suggestions the elements of the French system of rural banks, which is the latest system to be devised and which has been tested sufficiently by actual experience to prove its efficacy. Happily, these principles adapt themselves very easily to our reserve system, and in our opinion would prove of large benefit to our rural population. We are aware that France supplements the rediscount advantage by the deposit of considerable sums of public moneys in these banks to be loaned exclusively to farmers. The Government of France is also very friendly to the agricultural interests of the nation, and encourages a liberal policy by the Bank of France in extending rediscount privileges to the farm paper held by these small banks. The commission feels justified in assuming that the Federal reserve act will be administered in a similar spirit toward our agricultural interests, and, while making no recommendations to that effect, the commission records its conviction that in some sections of the United States either aid of similar character by our Government will be necessary or founders' shares will have to be purchased by men who are inspired by altruistic motives if personal loans are to be speedily extended to farmers in all sections of the Republic at fair rates of interest.
>
> Banking laws have been unfair to rural industry because farmers have been widely scattered and not in a position to use them, and because no special type of institution has been provided in the past to care for their special needs. As a result these laws have militated against the growth of industrial democracy, and unless supplemented will destroy the fruition of the new freedom to a large part of our industrial population.
>
> Your commission believes that it is also within the power of Congress to pass laws providing for credit unions or cooperative credit associations and making them fiscal agents of the National Government, but the conditions of agriculture differ so widely, the needs of farmers vary so greatly, and the status of the different classes of people in rural communities are so unlike that it is our opinion that such laws where called for can best be enacted by the various State legislatures.
>
> DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, *Chairman.*
> THOMAS P. GORE.
> RALPH W. MOSS, *Vice Chairman.*
> HARVIE JORDAN.
> JOHN LEE COULTER, *Secretary.*
> KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD.
> CLARENCE J. OWENS.

That was the view we held in March, 1914. As I said at the outset, I have all along been impressed with the feeling that if those who are engaged in agriculture would cooperate among themselves—and I have always hoped that the national farm-loan associations would be the nucleus for that sort of cooperation—and then would establish such institutions as they might need, such as the credit unions, under the laws of the different States in the different communities, that would be probably the best way to work out a system of short-time personal credit. However, the cooperative spirit has not seemed to spread very greatly, although its soundness and advantages are being realized especially amongst our people who have to do with marketing agricultural products. Such cooperation is essential in the handling of their products, and cooperative marketing associations have been established and have accomplished a great deal of good; but cooperation in the nature of credit unions it seems has not developed sufficiently to meet the needs. Hence we come now to Congress to provide some sort of plan, and the plan worked out in the bill which is now before us seems to be the best we can offer.

I wish to say just another word with respect to the question of tax exemption of securities. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] yesterday expressed his view that there ought to be an end of the exemption of securities from taxation of any kind of securities; I take it he means whether issued by the States, the Federal Government, or any other agency. The Senator seems to be somewhat inclined to apologize for the provision in the pending bill which proposes to exempt from taxation the debentures which will be issued by the Federal land banks under the proposed act. I make no sort of apology for that. On the contrary, I should not support the measure unless it did carry the provision that such debentures were to be exempt from taxation. I differ from the Senator with regard to the whole subject, as to the proper policy to be pursued by the Government and as to the great loss which it is claimed the Government is suffering in the failure of taxes because, as alleged, the rich are investing their money in tax-exempt securities.

It seems to me the whole basis for that sort of a claim is absolutely wrong. In the first place, the Federal Government is not losing anything, because it never had any right to tax State securities or the securities issued by any subdivision of a State. The Federal Government never undertook to tax its own bonds in all the history of the Government until within a recent time—I think it was in 1916 or 1917—when we began under certain conditions to require the income from certain Government bonds to be taxed. In my judgment it is an unwise proceeding for the Government to issue its bonds and then require that a tax upon those bonds or the income derived therefrom shall be paid to the Government.

Certainly the right of the States to tax their own securities or not to tax them should not in anywise be interfered with by the Federal Government; and I am opposed to any sort of constitutional amendment which would undertake to deprive the States of the right to tax their own securities or exempt their own securities or the securities of any subdivisions of such States. It is a monstrous proposition. We are gradually cutting away all the rights which the States have left.

Some people do not seem to realize the nature of this Government. The Federal Government has only the power that the States have granted to it and such as are necessarily implied therefrom. The States have all the powers reserved to them which have not been granted to the Federal Government and not prohibited by the Constitution to the States. The power to tax is the power to destroy, as Chief Justice Marshall said in McCulloch against Maryland, and now the proposition is embodied in a joint resolution, which recently passed the House and is now before the Finance Committee of the Senate—I do not know what action they will take upon it—to amend the Constitution so that the Federal Government may tax securities issued by the State.

I call attention to the provision of the Constitution:

AMENDMENT X.

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Some people keep talking about what the Federal Government is losing because a large amount of money is being invested in securities that are exempt from taxation. The Federal Government is losing what it never had and what it had no right to have. It is a very queer kind of a situation when multimillionaires come forward—such as Kuhn, Loeb & Co., J. P. Morgan & Co., the Farm Mortgage Bankers' Association of Chicago, and the Wall Street Journal—and advocate this kind of a constitutional amendment. These altruistic, beneficent friends of the poor, downtrodden taxpayers of the country are insisting that they are being robbed under the present plan and that it ought to be changed in order that the rich may contribute their proper share of taxes of the country. Millionaires and multimillionaires demanding that they, the rich, shall be taxed more than they are now taxed; that they shall not be permitted to escape taxation by investing their money in tax-free securities! Whoever heard of those gentlemen insisting that they ought to be taxed more than they are now taxed? Who is preventing them from bearing their share of the taxes? Whoever heard of those friends of the downtrodden proletariat, who are now demanding that the common, every-day taxpayer shall be relieved by their additional contribution to the taxes of the country? That insistence from that source is a suspicious circumstance, it seems to me, that should be considered in connection with the movement to amend the Constitution in order that State securities may be taxed by the Federal Government.

I venture the assertion right here, Mr. President, that this movement, this whole agitation with reference to amending the Constitution and this whole cry against tax-free securities, found its very beginning and inception in the Land Mortgage Bankers' Association—a multimillionaire organization that has grown rich out of the charges it has imposed upon the farmers of the West—because they started out with a proposition to deprive farm-loan bonds of that feature. They knew perfectly well that if the tax-exemption feature was taken out of the act under which farm-loan bonds were issued the rates of interest which the borrower would have to pay for the money obtained from the proceeds of those bonds would be very greatly increased. It is estimated that it would be necessary to fix as to these bonds, or every kind of security that must pay a tax, a rate from 1 to 2 per cent more than the rate they bear if they are tax free; and, consequently, the Land Mortgage Bank Association wanted to increase the rate of interest to the farmers of this country, and thereby somewhere nearly reach the amount of interest which they would charge upon loans obtained through them. They started this whole movement to destroy the tax-exempt feature of farm-loan bonds; and, inasmuch as they could not make headway in that direction as to those bonds, they then spread out and changed their plans and brought to themselves other multimillionaires, and said, "We want to eliminate all this exemption feature as to all securities by States, cities, counties, or other subdivisions, and by the Federal Government."

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. Has the Senator ever considered how much profit might come to these people who already hold tax-exempt bonds if all other issues should be stricken down?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think beyond any question they would profit to the amount of something like a billion dollars. It is estimated that the securities outstanding to-day that are now tax exempt run from ten to eighteen billion dollars. The minute you impose taxes on all future issues, of course, the value of these tax-free securities will at once increase, and I dare say those gentlemen holding them will profit to the amount of nearly $1,000,000,000; but it is perhaps not so much that that is in their mind as that some of them undoubtedly are influenced by the idea that if tax-exempt securities can be taken off the market it will broaden the market for their industrial securities, their railroad bonds, their industrial bonds of every kind and character. The public will absorb just so much; and if you impose taxes upon these securities which are now exempt you will bring them up to the level of the industrial securities, and the industrial securities will undoubtedly enjoy a broader market than they have to-day.

So, in the first place, I am utterly and teetotally opposed to any further inroads being made upon the reserved rights of the States of this country. I have not been as careful about that heretofore, I am afraid, as I am getting to be the longer I am here and the more I see the States being gradually deprived of almost the last vestige of rights and of sovereignty. I am very much indebted to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who sits before me, for some sound doctrine on that subject from time to time declared here, and I have been impressed by his observations, and I feel more than ever the danger point being reached in that regard. The whole foundations of the Government are about to be undermined by repeated efforts being made on every hand and on the slightest pretext with the purpose to disregard and even usurp the rights and the sovereignties of the States and to vest in the central power here full authority over the people and their affairs.

That is the first proposition, and that prompts me in the outset to oppose this movement. In the next place, I do not agree that any increase of revenue of any consequence would come to the Federal Government even if this sort of change is made. It is estimated by experts on the subject, as I have just said, that these tax-free securities sell at par at a rate of interest 1 per cent less than they would sell for if they were not tax free. Very well. Here are people with money. They invest in these tax-free securities. They practically discount their income tax by making that investment to begin with. They say: "I am willing to take 1 per cent less interest on my money where I know it is safe and I have no income tax to pay than I would take if I had to pay an income tax on my investment." Therefore, as I say, they practically pay their income tax when they invest their money in the first instance in tax-free securities.

In the second place, without this tax-exempt feature there are many municipalities, many counties and districts in the United States which would be unable to go on with great public improvements that mean the progress and development of those communities. I had some occasion to say this on that subject on January 12, 1922, and the more I think about it, the more the soundness of it is fastened upon my convictions:

But the arguments offered are challenged for the following reasons:

1. There is no proof that exempt securities, outside of United States bonds, are held in large amounts by men of large incomes. And who can say with certainty that investment by this class of investors in United States bonds is inspired more by a desire to escape taxation than by patriotic motives and safety.

2. Such amendment can not affect outstanding tax-exempt securities, and therefore no increase of Federal revenue can come from outstanding issues.

3. The amendment would deprive States and municipalities from procuring future funds at a low rate of interest, and thus prevent development and progress in the way of essential public improvements.

4. The class of funds which go into tax-exempt securities comes largely from estate and trust funds, for the benefit of widows and orphans, by reason of the fact that the element of speculation—consequent from high interest rates—must be eliminated from such securities, the safety of the principal being the first requisite.

Again, capitalists will not, simply to escape a reasonable income tax, invest in securities paying from 4½ to 6 per cent when they are able to make many times this per cent by investing in some business or enterprise.

I stand by that now.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CARAWAY. I was just going to ask the Senator to discuss this phase of the question: It is contended that if tax-exempt securities be stricken down, the people will profit. If the securities are taxed, who has to pay the tax?

Mr. FLETCHER. Unquestionably the people who issue the securities.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Government has not a dollar of its own. In other words, the man taxes himself for the privilege of saying that the security is taxed. Is not that it?

Mr. FLETCHER. It comes to that eventually.

Mr. CARAWAY. And it always costs quite a good deal to collect a tax, does it not?

Mr. FLETCHER. It does.

Mr. CARAWAY. The people never get back what they paid.

Mr. FLETCHER. The percentage of cost of collection is growing all the time. The cost of collection, I think, is very much higher to-day than it ever has been before.

Mr. CARAWAY. And that would be a clear loss, would it not, to the people who had to finance their activities?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely. In other words, the taxpayers would pay the increased rate of interest and then pay a bureau to go out and get a part of it back. We will take, for instance, as an illustration of that point, these figures: The average of all returns for income taxes in 1920 was $3,270. The amount of capital invested in bonds at 4½ per cent that would yield that income would be $72,666.57. The taxpayer whose income is $3,270 presumably in the first instance would be entitled to the exemption of a head of a family, which would be $2,000. Therefore, he would only pay, say, 4 per cent on $1,270. You see what that would be. Four per cent on $1,270 would be a little over $50. That is the amount of the tax which he would pay, leaving off the cost of collection entirely, assuming that he just comes up and pays it over to the Government, and there is no cost at all, and the Government gets $50 income tax. What do the people pay who issued those bonds? Seven hundred and twenty-six dollars and sixty-six cents—1 per cent more—is the estimate of all the experts. That seems to be quite agreed upon as the difference between what would be paid on tax-exempt securities and what would be paid on those that bear the tax. One per cent on $72,666.67 is $726. In other words, the county or the State which issued those bonds would pay $726, and the Federal Government would get $50. That is the way the thing works out.

Suppose there were no exemption. The income yield to the Government would be $130.80 on this investment of $72,666 in taxable securities, and the taxpayers who issued those bonds would be obliged to pay $726 a year in order that the Government might get $130.80 income. You see how it works out.

In the Daily News of January 16, 1923, this statement is made:

> Well, friends, admitting there are two sides to this question, we desire to offer the following facts in extenuation of the principle of tax-exempt municipal and State securities—a principle which seems to lack press agents just now.
>
> If there had been no tax-exempt securities San Francisco would still be in the throes of a corrupt, inefficient, and nerve-wrecking street car monopoly; Los Angeles would be buying water and hydraulic power from a private monopoly, as many less-favored cities are doing; Detroit would have no municipal street railroad; there would be mighty few State or county paved highways, and the electric power of the future would be securely held "in trust" by the first friends of Messrs.—

I need not call any names here, but meaning these multimillionaires.

> The rich lovers of the common folk may be perfectly pure in their protestations, but somehow we are suspicious of the whole Greek gift-bearing outfit.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, right in that connection, in any other respect did you ever hear a rich man howling for the opportunity to pay taxes?

Mr. FLETCHER. As I said awhile ago, that is a most unusual performance, and it is one to excite some suspicion when you consider the influences back of this whole agitation. To bring the matter very close home, and make a definite application of it, I know, for instance, that one of the most progressive and highly developed counties in Florida is Polk County. Beginning in 1916, they issued $1,500,000 of bonds for the purpose of building county-wide asphalt roads. There was another issue by districts in 1917, 1919, 1920, and 1921, a total of $2,540,000 of bonds issued in that county by the whole county and by different districts. Those bonds were all exempt from taxation. The county-wide bonds sold for one-eighth above par. The balance sold for something less than that. All of the proceeds from the sales went to the county, and were expended for the building of hard-surfaced roads in Polk County. The effect of the expenditure of that money on good roads has greatly increased the value of all kinds of property in the county.

The assessed valuation in 1914 was $9,755,090. In 1922 the assessed valuation was $20,516,873, and the increase attributable to the improvements financed by the bond issues is 90 per cent, according to the tax assessor. Unquestionably they could have sold those bonds without the tax-exempt feature, but they would have paid an average of 1 per cent more interest than they pay now, and by the use of those bonds they have increased the assessed value of property in that county in three years from $9,000,000 and something to over $20,000,000. Anyone riding through the county to-day will observe the splendid development taking place in every direction wherever those roads reach, and whereas a few years ago you would ride mile after mile between one home and another home, now when you ride along those beautiful roads it is almost as if you were on the paved streets of a city. Settlement is taking place on both sides of every road everywhere; there are orange groves, vegetable farms, beautiful homes lining these great highways, and the development and progress of the county are almost beyond comprehension. That has been brought about by the issue of bonds and the making of these great public improvements, and I have no doubt it is typical of other counties. I am quite sure it is. I could name other counties in my own State where the same thing is true, and I have no doubt every Senator here can cite cases of that kind.

The proposition is to make the people who have issued these securities for the purpose of these public improvements, and in order to promote the progress and development of their communities, pay an additional 1 per cent interest on those bonds annually until their maturity in order that the Federal Government may lay its hand on the income and derive some little revenue, nowhere approaching the amount of the additional tax that would rest upon the shoulders of the people who issue the securities. So I say that I am utterly against this whole proposition of amending the Constitution in order to accomplish what these gentlemen claim is in their minds, and I am heartily in accord with that feature of this bill which exempts the debentures the Federal land banks are to issue in the same way that farm-loan bonds are exempted. I do not believe the constitutional amendment has any chance of receiving a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and I do not believe it has the ghost of a chance of receiving the ratification of the requisite number of States, but just as sure as that amendment is adopted it will be found that every farm-loan bond hereafter issued will be taxed by the Government, and these debentures will be taxed, and the farmers of this country will be called upon to pay an additional rate of interest over that which now prevails.

Mr. CARAWAY. I ask the Senator if he observed with what horror the proponents of the amendment viewed the amendment to strike out the word "hereafter," so as to make all bonds taxable? Did the Senator read the proceedings in the House? They looked upon that as absolutely unconscionable. In other words, they do not want the amendment to reach the people who have all the billions of wealth, and therefore they would not consent to striking out the word "hereafter," so that the tax woud rest upon all bonds. They want it merely on bonds issued hereafter.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not kept up carefully with the debate in the House, though I have been interested in reading some of it and found it very admirable; but I can well understand what the Senator suggests about it. It means this—and there is no escape from it—that under this constitutional amendment the Federal Government could not tax State securities, unless it taxed farm-loan bonds, and therefore the ultimate result of this thing would be that the farm-loan bonds would be taxed.

Mr. CARAWAY. That was the primary object.

Mr. FLETCHER. That was the primary object, and they are reaching it in a roundabout way instead of directly.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I suggest to the Senator, too, that they undertake to make it appear that the State gets an advantage in having the right to tax Federal securities; but who pays the tax? I would like to ask again, whether the tax is levied on a Federal security or a State security, who pays it?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course the taxes must come out of the people.

Mr. CARAWAY. The same people?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; the same people.

Mr. CARAWAY. It does not create one dollar of wealth, does it?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not at all.

Mr. CARAWAY. Therefore it is no extension of a privilege to the citizens.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is undoubtedly right about that. In connection with that subject, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Mr. Stuyvesant Fish, taken from the New York Times of Sunday, January 21, 1923. It is a very clear, fair, and forceful statement.

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

[The New York Times, Sunday, January 21, 1923.]

ARGUMENT FOR TAX-FREE BONDS ANSWER TO PROFESSOR SELIGMAN—RIGHT OF RAISING REVENUE RESERVED WHEN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WAS ESTABLISHED—ASSERTS CONTENTION OF ECONOMIST IS BASED ON FALSE PREMISES.

(By Stuyvesant Fish.)

May I be permitted a few words on Prof. Edwin R. A. Seligman's article which appeared on Sunday, December 31, 1922, on the first and seventh pages of the New York Times? Under the heading "Menacing,

flood of tax-free bonds," he makes a studied plea for the proposal now pending in Congress to further amend the Constitution so as to deprive the several States and their municipalities of their inherent rights to borrow money free of Federal taxation.

Had the Constitution been framed for the purpose of enabling the Federal Government to tax the several States and the people thereof without limit, there might be some cogency in the arguments brought forward by the administration at Washington and elaborated by Professor Seligman. The Constitution was and is a delegation by the several States to the Federal Government of certain powers for certain purposes, as is so clearly set forth in the preamble thereto.

Upon its ratification by the States 10 amendments—our "Bill of Rights"—were adopted defining and limiting the powers of the Federal Government. They end thus:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

From the beginning to this day that which Mr. Jefferson somewhere refers to as "our agency at Washington" has been so continuously and of late so aggressively usurping to itself the powers reserved by the States to themselves or to the people that we now find even so well read a man as Professor Seligman led into the error of speaking of the "exemption" of State and municipal bonds from Federal taxation. He even goes so far as to speak of Congress as "conferring a special privilege and advantage on the States," and "according a special privilege to the State and local government bonds." Neither he nor any member of the administration can fail to know that the Federal Government lacks all authority to confer or accord privileges or advantages to the States or any of them.

The States and their minor divisions enjoy no exemption whatever, the fact being that they have not given Congress power to tax their bonds or the interest thereon.

The proposition now before Congress is simply an effort by those at Washington to deprive the States, their municipalities, and their people of yet another of their reserved rights, and must be resisted by all who do not want to see a "Frankenstein" created at Washington, which its creators, the States, may later have, for self-preservation, to destroy.

It would require a letter as long as Doctor Seligman's—say, five or six columns in the Times—to review and answer all the sophistries therein set forth. But let us look into some of them.

I.

Under his heading "III" Doctor Seligman figures the Federal, State, and local bonds which he speaks of as "exempt" as amounting to about $15,000,000,000, and the interest thereon at 4½ per cent as $675,000,000, and then says:

"The Federal Government alone will have lost up to 1926 not only the 8 per cent normal tax, but also the surtax, in so far as these securities are held by the richer individuals."

Like others, the Federal Government has not lost and can not lose that which it never had, namely, the right to tax its own bonds which were issued tax free, and the bonds of States and municipalities which Congress has never had the power to tax in any way. Those seeking for fresh fields for Federal spoliation could readily and might just as logically figure out a vastly larger total in the value of lands and buildings in the United States which Congress can not and does not tax. The real estate in the city of New York alone was last year assessed for $10,249,991,835, and so on through the whole country.

Doctor Seligman then says:

"If we assume that these bonds are so held that they are subject to an average tax of 40 per cent, we have a loss to the Federal Government of $270,000,000 a year. * * * This makes no allowance for the 12½ per cent tax on the bonds held by corporations, which will bring the figure to at least $300,000,000."

From which he argues that this nonexistent and imaginary loss transcends any possible gain that might accrue to the Federal Government from lower rates of interest on tax-exempt bonds. But where does he get his figure of 40 per cent? The present law requires an income of at least $68,000 for the exaction of a 40 per cent income tax. How misleading his estimate is will be further shown in a moment.

II.

Lower down, under the same heading "III," Doctor Seligman produces figures from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, made public a few days ago. Taking his figures we find that the number of returns for income-tax purposes, the amount of revenue collected therefrom, and the average income return to have been as follows:

	Total number of returns.	Total net income.	Average income per return.
1916	437,036	$6,298,577,620	$14,412
1917	3,472,890	13,652,383,207	3,643
1918	4,425,114	15,924,639,355	3,599
1919	5,332,760	19,859,491,448	3,724
1920	7,259,944	23,735,629,183	3,270

The average income throughout the United States having in 1920 been $3,270 and obviously tending downward, what becomes of Doctor Seligman's assumption that the income from the bonds which he speaks of as exempt "are so held that they are subject to an average tax of 40 per cent"?

In another part of his article, under his head "IV," Doctor Seligman makes a comparison between 4 per cent tax-free bonds and 5 per cent bonds subject to 1 per cent tax, ignoring the fact that under the present law it would require at least a taxable income of $38,000 to yield 25 per cent income tax.

III.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his report for 1922 (p. 13), gives as "among the means frequently used to reduce the amounts of income subject to taxation" these four:

"1. Deductions of losses on sales of capital assets, with the failure to realize on capital gains;

"2. Exchanges of property and securities so as to avoid taxable gains;

"3. Tax-exempt securities; and

"4. Other avenues of escape, such as the division of property, the creation of trusts, and the like."

But not so Doctor Seligman.

Under his subheading "How the plan works," he says:

"It is beyond peradventure of doubt that the prodigious falling off implies an immense investment in the tax-exempt securities."

Doctor Seligman must know that with the introduction of a highly complicated, graduated income tax law there sprang up all over the country a class of lawyers who give their undivided attention to advising those capable of paying their fees on making out their tax returns. Apart from this, any very rich man, having been mulcted out of 73 per cent of his income in one year, would naturally look around during the next 12 months to see how he could better his condition; and I incline to think from what those learned in that business have told me that some of the very rich have subdivided their securities among various corporations or trustees. Secretary Mellon's report for 1922 (p. 13) shows that in 1916—

Of incomes of over $300,000 there were returned for taxes	$992,972,986
And in 1920	246,354,585
Decrease	746,618,401

Assuming that the securities which yielded this difference carried 4½ per cent interest, the principal involved would have been $16,591,520,022. Does Doctor Seligman want us to believe that those having incomes of over $300,000 have bought up all, indeed more than all, of the $15,000,000,000 of untaxed bonds?

IV.

Toward the end of his paragraph III Doctor Seligman says that—

"With the growing and imperious needs of the Federal Government we may be compelled to depend again in large measure on the largesses of the States."

Wouldn't it be better to limit the "imperious needs of the Federal Government" and make that concern "cut its coat according to its cloth"? The plain people who do not directly pay taxes are beginning to understand that a great part of the awful burden which they do carry in the excessively high cost of living comes from taxation and maladministration of Government, Federal, State, and municipal.

Throughout Doctor Seligman speaks of the exemption from taxation as "accruing to the rich." Bless his honest soul! Does not every man, rich and poor, try to so manage his affairs as to escape some of the terrible burden which is oppressing us? He must know, as I know, many holders of exempt bonds, so-called, whose return for income tax does not bring them above the normal.

V.

Doctor Seligman's statement under his heading "V," "What is the solution?" gets down to this: He proposes that the Nation shall have the right to subject State and local bonds to the same tax it assesses on its own bonds; the State and local governments shall have the right to subject Federal bonds to the same burdens as they impose on their own bonds, all of which reminds me of the equally "naif" proposition made in his historically informing book on "The Income Tax" (Macmillan Co., 1911), published while the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution was under consideration. His solution of various difficulties then in view (see page 655) was that "the National Government assess the (income) tax, and let the State and local governments share in the proceeds." Out of all the billions which the Federal Government has taken from the people by way of income tax in the last 10 years, has one cent been restored to any of the States or the citizens thereof?

VI.

Professor Seligman's whole argument is based on the false premise that holders of what he calls exempt bonds escape burdens, which they pass on to others. On the contrary, those who lend to the United States, the States, and their minor divisions, against their tax-free securities, by accepting 4 per cent per annum interest, while they might get 5 on taxable securities (Doctor Seligman's estimate), really pay more than their share, and at the outset agree to pay it for the full life of such securities. To that extent they benefit all other taxpayers.

Should the Constitution be so amended as to prevent the further issue by the States and their municipalities of tax-free securities, the difference between the interest on taxable and nontaxable securities, which Doctor Seligman, I think rightly, figures at 1 per cent per annum, will have to be added to the taxation of every State and municipality throughout this broad land for all time. To us here in New York, where the city has already borrowed so nearly up to if not beyond the legal limit of such borrowing, the change will have relatively small effect on the taxpayer. But our friends in the rural parts of this State and throughout the West and the South, whose growing needs call and will continue to call for fresh borrowings of untold billions, must in their own interest see that this amendment be defeated alike in Congress and in the State legislatures. The maxim that "the power to tax is the power to destroy," must not be forgotten.

As to the contention that by way of income tax there can be collected anything approaching to the difference in interest between a 4 per cent and a 5 per cent bond, let me point to the fact that the Government has never given out any figures showing what is collected as income tax on interest on taxable Government bonds. In letters to the Treasury Department, to Members of Congress, and to the Federal Reserve Board at Washington, and in various other ways, I have been vainly trying to get some light on that subject, ever since the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, first departed from the settled, honest and wise American policy of issuing all obligations of the United States as tax free. The power of Congress to tax is ever unlimited as to amount. That to-day those who hold taxable securities of the United States are not mulcted out of 100 per cent of the interest covenanted in them to be paid is due to the forbearance of Congress and not to its want of power to thus repudiate the whole debt.

The average of all returns for income taxes is yearly decreasing and was, in 1920, $3,270. Taking Doctor Seligman's rate of yield for State and municipal bonds, 4½ per cent, this represents a capital of $72,666.67. Returns of $3,270 of income yield the Government $130.80 per annum. But as he figures that subjecting such securities to taxation will raise the rate of interest to be borne by them by 1 per cent per annum this collection is less than one-fifth of the $726.67 required to pay the increased interest, not to speak of the cost of collecting. In the collection of internal revenue the per cent of cost of collection has in recent years risen from 0.95 per cent in 1917 to 1.30 per cent in 1922.

I am fully aware that in dealing with the average figures of returns, I am subjecting myself to the retort that under our graduated income tax vastly higher percentages are exacted from the very rich. But Mr. Mellon's reports are eloquent and convincing on the unwisdom of the very "high brackets," as a means of collecting revenue. It is sad to say so, but none the less true, that those who can afford the price of "the advice of counsel" always have and ever will protect their own interests within the law, be it what it may, as against the great mass of the plain people who can't afford the necessary fees.

Mr. FLETCHER. Some time ago, on Sunday, December 31, 1922, there appeared an article in the New York Times by Professor Seligman, and this is a reply to what Professor Seligman had to say. I would not mind putting his article in the RECORD, but it is a very long one, and this perhaps refers to the portions of it which are particularly material and in point. I submit that these propositions laid down by Mr. Fish are absolutely sound, and his argument, it seems to me, in unanswerable. It is in accordance with what I submitted on the subject in January, 1922, and confirms absolutely my conviction that the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution ought to be opposed by every possible means that can be exerted against it.

I close by saying that I am in hearty accord with the provision of the bill which exempts these debentures from all taxation, and I feel that the measure as now submitted is perhaps the best that can be proposed at this time. I believe it can, if properly executed, accomplish a great deal of good and be of immense value to the farmers of the country.

It will depend, after all, on the administration. If the administration is what it ought to be, this plan can be made most effective and valuable. If the administration chooses to hold it back or to neglect it or to delay and indirectly, if not directly, in a way refuse to have it function properly, then it will not accomplish any good, but it will be a failure. But that, of course, we will have to learn from experience. If it is administered as I hope it will be—and I do not mean to imply that I question that it will be well administered under the Farm Loan Board—I think the measure will be of great value.

The Farm Loan Board prefers not to take the responsibility upon itself of administering this system, and there is a little complication about it, it being linked up with the farm loan system, which is altogether based upon mortgages to meet capital needs, and for long time. It is distinct in many ways from that system. There has been an attempt in this bill to keep the operations separate in the Federal land banks, and I hope that can be done. I can see how the Farm Loan Board hesitated a little, even as I hesitated, to amend the farm loan act and take on this additional work and responsibility, but if Congress puts it on the Farm Loan Board, I think they will conscientiously and energetically endeavor to administer it to carry out the purposes and objects of the legislation. I hope that will be the case in any event.

HELENE M. LAYTON.

During Mr. FLETCHER's speech,

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4113) for the relief of Helene M. Layton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 4113. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, while technically under the rule the Senator from Delaware could not properly interrupt the Senator from Florida for that purpose, if the bill will excite no discussion, I shall make no objection to its consideration.

Mr. BAYARD. I will state the purposes of the bill, if the Senator desires me to do so.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the bill takes no time for consideration, I shall make no objection.

Mr. BAYARD. It is a very short bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. If I shall not lose the floor by doing so, I am perfectly willing to yield.

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

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Secretary will read the bill.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill (S. 4113) for the relief of Helene M. Layton, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Helene M. Layton, administratrix, cum testamento annexo, of the estate of Lewis W. Mustard, deceased, the sum of $2,852.43 by reason of an overcharge in connection with the estate tax on the above estate arising out of the requirement of the United States Court in China, at Shanghai, China, that the tax be paid by Edward H. Dunning, the executor in China, before the account of said executor could be closed.

Mr. BAYARD. May I state to the Senator from Washington——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill if it may be passed at once.

Mr. KING. I hope the bill may be immediately considered and passed.

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.

After the conclusion of Mr. FLETCHER's speech,

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11939) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCFADDEN, Mr. DALE, and Mr. WINGO were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11939) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MCLEAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCLEAN, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. FLETCHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, in another body the curtain was rung down yesterday on a great farce. The headlines in the Washington Post of this morning read:

Daugherty cleared by House, 204 to 77.

Permit me again to say that there is a very great difference between the word "cleared" and the word "whitewashed." The words "cleared" and "whitewashed" seem to be used interchangeably. I am not criticizing the House; but it could not "clear" Mr. Daugherty. There are things that even the House of Representatives can not do. It can "whitewash" Mr. Daugherty, and it did it. It was no surprise. Everybody knew it was to be done.

I should not say a word about the matter at all if it were not for the heat with which the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House pursued the witnesses who had the temerity to appear against the Attorney General. He said in effect that if it were not for his kindness of heart he would have another Member of that body [Mr. KELLER] in jail until he talked as he—the chairman—wanted him to talk.

I should like to call attention to the fact, Mr. President, that Mr. KELLER and the chairman of the committee are from the same State. They are members of the same political organization, both being members of that nearly defunct political party called the Republican Party. They both submitted their claims to the people of Minnesota in November, both standing on their records. The chief effect, I understand, that each made in the election was to call attention to what had been his attitude touching the charges against the Attorney General. Mr. KELLER had insisted that charges should be investigated. Mr. VOLSTEAD, as chairman of the committee, had prevented the investigation. When the election was over Mr. KELLER was found to have received the largest majority that he had ever received, and, I understand, the largest majority ever given for a Congressman in that district. Mr. VOLSTEAD received several thousand less than a majority, and will hereafter have that rare experience for him of trying to make a living without being on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. WOODRUFF was also one of the men who had asked for an investigation of the Attorney General and his resolution had gone to the Committee on Rules. The chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], after the committee had voted out the rule, put it in his pocket and refused to report it to the House, and intimated that the desire to investigate the Attorney General was purely political and cheap politics at that. Mr. WOODRUFF and Mr. CAMPBELL both belong to the same party. Both of them are members of whatever remains of the Republican Party. They each went to their people on the question of whether they had been wise or otherwise in dealing with the question.

Mr. WOODRUFF got every vote cast for Congressman in his district. Mr. CAMPBELL got all but a tremendous majority; he got a small minority. Mr. WOODRUFF will continue to represent his district in Congress; Mr. CAMPBELL will have to find something he can do outside of holding office.

Therefore I say that the committee can not clear the Attorney General. The committee can do what every colored man in my State does in the spring of the year—whitewash. It will not stay on quite as long as the "whitewash" we put on our cabins, but it is composed of the same material.

I am under no obligation to defend a Republican against a Republican. Ordinarily, I think about the only time we might with some confidence accept the statement of a Republican is when he is criticizing another Republican. But I would like to show who Mr. WOODRUFF is, whom the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary on yesterday so contemptuously refused permission even to make a statement. I read from the Congressional Directory:

ROY ORCHARD WOODRUFF, Republican, of Bay City, Mich.; born at Eaton Rapids, Mich., March 14, 1876; educated in the high school at Eaton Rapids and Detroit College of Medicine, Detroit; received the degree of doctor of dental surgery from the latter institution; practiced dentistry for 10 years in Bay City; was elected mayor of Bay City in April, 1911, and was elected to the Sixty-third Congress in November, 1912; served as an enlisted man through the Spanish War with the Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry; served two years in the World War as an infantry officer, acquiring the rank of major during service in France.

I want to say again that he received every vote in November that was cast for a Member of Congress in his district. The chairman of the Committee on Rules received a truly small minority. What is more remarkable is the fact that on yesterday every Republican who defended the action of the committee in the other body, except one, had been given a commission to stay at home next year.

But these men, whose faith in people has gone since the people have withdrawn their support from them, find themselves now anxious to bow to the powers that be, the powers that can appoint, as we saw yesterday illustrated in the Senate on the street-car fare question. I tried to cure that situation by a resolution which suggested that defeated Members of either House ought not to participate in framing fundamental legislation.

It was said in the paper—and I am talking about that, only incidentally mentioning this other "body" in passing, not in a spirit of criticism, because I have no intention of doing that—that the—

Exoneration of KELLER'S charges is complete.

It was said also in the article, following what has been quoted, that there was no evidence to sustain the charges and that witnesses, wherever they were suggested, could not be had. Of course they could not be had when the committee would not hear them.

I am not inclined to waste the time of the Senate in discussing these charges against the Attorney General. I shall merely ask permission to insert in the RECORD certain letters upon which I wish to comment briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

The letters are as follows:

MAY 5, 1922.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: Before bringing to your attention my memorandum to Col. Guy D. Goff, Acting Attorney General, dated March 18, 1922, and incorporated in your speech to Congress on April 11, I desired to be sure that Hon. H. M. Daugherty, the Attorney General, was personally acquainted with and fully informed as to all matters involved in the situation at the Department of Justice, in order that he might act in the premises if he desired to do so.

I was informed that Col. T. B. Felder was a very close personal friend of Mr. Daugherty, and I was brought in contact with Colonel Felder and explained the situation to him and requested him to call the attention of the Attorney General to the reports that I had filed and to inform him that unless he acted I would pursue the course indicated in the memorandum referred to. The next day I was called to the office of the Attorney General, and he stated to me that he had my reports before him, and I then ascertained that he had been personally acquainted with the situation.

The Attorney General stated to me that he would call me into conference on the following Tuesday, but I heard nothing further from him, and after waiting a sufficient time to give him every opportunity to act, I formally transmitted the matter to you, as is now well known. I might add that I had never known Colonel Felder before meeting him on this occasion and for the purpose stated, and subsequent thereto have only seen him casually until last night.

Yesterday I had a message from Colonel Felder to meet him in his room at the Shoreham Hotel, which I did last night, and in the presence of a witness I engaged with him in an extended discussion of conditions in the Department of Justice, of which I had complained. I stated to him that I had no animus against the Attorney General, but that I felt most bitter against the conditions which he was permitting in the Department of Justice. During the course of the conversation Colonel Felder stated that he had been retained as counsel for the Bosch Magneto Co. and that he desired to associate me with him in the case. He told me that he had been with the Attorney General during the afternoon and had gone into the matter with him fully and that the Attorney General wanted him to see me. He stated that the Attorney General had agreed to cooperate with us and that he had also talked with Col. Guy D. Goff for an hour and a half during the afternoon, and that everything had been arranged for us to proceed.

Before leaving his room in the Shoreham Hotel, Colonel Felder stated that he was going to spend the night with the Attorney General at the Wardman Park Hotel and that they would talk about the matter until 3 o'clock that night. Each time Colonel Felder broached the subject of my employment I shifted the subject, and when we parted he asked me to do nothing in my fight until he could see me next day. When we parted Colonel Felder took a taxi for the Wardman Park Hotel and asked me to join him that far out on my way home, but I declined. This morning I received a letter from Colonel Felder notifying me that I had been retained in the Bosch Magneto case, a copy of which is hereto attached.

While I think it is eminently proper that a suit should be brought to set aside the Bosch Magneto sale, and while under ordinary circumstances I would have had no hesitation in being employed in the case, when Colonel Felder disclosed the fact that he had come to me from the Attorney General and with the arrangements that had been suggested, the impropriety of the proposal I consider reprehensible, and I desire that you be acquainted with the facts.

In order that there may be no misconception of my true position and intentions in the matter in case I am further approached, I am reducing the foregoing statement to writing and will have this letter duly witnessed.

Very truly yours,

H. L. SCAIFE.

SHOREHAM HOTEL, *Washington.*

DEAR CAPTAIN SCAIFE: Am obliged to return to New York to-night. Sorry I did not see you before my departure. I expect to return on Monday or Tuesday next, when I will complete our tentative arrangements. You may consider yourself retained in the Bosch Magneto case. We will discuss the details on my return.

Very truly yours,

THOS. B. FELDER.

The above letter was undated, but bears postmark of May 5, 1922.

Mr. CARAWAY. Captain Scaife, a man as to whose high character Members on the floor of the Senate have borne testimony, had formerly been an investigator in the Department of Justice under the present Attorney General. Because the Attorney General would not move in some cases where men who had perpetrated great frauds upon the Government and would not prosecute them, Mr. Scaife resigned. He would not be a party to a farce that pretended to prosecute people who had violated the law when in fact there was to be no prosecution of them. So he quit the department.

Thomas B. Felder, whose name, I presume, everybody has forgotten, but who at one time was an attorney in the State of Georgia until Georgia had a house cleaning, when he sought more congenial associates and went to New York, had had some dealings with the Attorney General with reference to procuring a pardon for Charles W. Morse, who was confined in the penitentiary at Atlanta. By the way, he is the same Charles W. Morse for whom the Attorney General had the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] so vehemently deny that he, the Attorney General, when in private practice had had anything to do in procuring a pardon, or that he had ever received a cent in connection with his, the Morse case. Afterwards, when I read his contract with Morse into the RECORD, which showed not only that he was attorney for Morse but had been paid for his services, or at least paid in part, the Attorney General had the poor grace to turn on his friend and supporter and say that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] had misquoted him. Oh, he used stronger language than that, but I want to be decent about the matter.

But in fact he left the question of veracity between himself and the Senator from Indiana to determine each for himself. I think everybody who knows both of them, however, had no trouble in doing that. We all believed the Senator from Indiana, and necessarily disbelieved the Attorney General, because the Attorney General had given out so many contradictory statements about his connection with this case that his denial came too late to be accepted. However, I am wandering.

Felder came down here, as he had come on many occasions before. Whenever he had a case involving some violation of the Federal statutes, it seems that his practice was to see the Attorney General, and he had very good luck with his clients after that. He came here and, according to his own statement, entered into an agreement that he should become attorney for the stockholders of the old German Bosch Magneto Co. and bring suit against the Federal Government; that he and the Attorney General had agreed in advance upon what should be the result of the trial seems implied. He was required, so he said, to take Captain Scaife in with him. So a man working for the department went to see Captain Scaife and took him to the hotel where Felder was, and Felder there disclosed what he said had been an agreement. This is disclosed in the first letter set out above. He also said that he had been required to take care of Captain Scaife in this case and in some others in order that he might effect the settlement with the Attorney General. In the presence of at least one man representing the department—oh, but I will take that back; a man working for

Mr. Burns, who is at the head of the investigating department for the Attorney General—he suggested that Scaife should be paid $10,000, one-half down and one-half when the case was terminated.

Scaife declined it. He was then offered $12,000 to accept employment in this case. In confirmation of that statement, I desire to say that Mr. Felder was called away to New York that night, and he wrote Captain Scaife a letter. That letter has been in the RECORD for nearly a year. It has been commented on in both Houses and has never been either explained or denied. Mr. Felder wrote Captain Scaife a letter stating, "Go no further in your fight"—I am not quoting the letter exactly, but I will have the letter reinserted in the RECORD—"you may consider yourself employed in the Bosch Magneto matter." This is the second letter printed above. It was an attempt to retain him who had been the chief agent investigating the matter on the part of the Government to appear with Mr. Felder against the Government, representing the German stockholders of the German Bosch Magneto Co.

I repeat, that letter was never explained or denied. Having commented upon it, I then received a letter, among many others that Mr. Felder wrote me, in which he said if I would give him a chance he could satisfactorily show that his and the Attorney General's position were compatible, one representing the Government and the other representing the stockholders who were to sue the Government; that it was perfectly legitimate and compatible that they should get together and have him hire away from the Government—the Government's chief investigator—and then the controversy settled. He said also if I were inclined to be critical he would bring his clients—that is, the people who held the stock of the German Bosch Magneto Co.—here and show that the arrangement was perfectly proper. I put that letter in the RECORD months ago. I repeat, none of these letters has ever been explained and never been denied. All those matters were before the House investigating committee. They knew the witnesses, but not one of them was asked to testify.

If it be true, Mr. President, that the Attorney General of these United States may enter into a conspiracy with a lawyer representing hostile interests to settle a case at a cost to the people of millions of dollars, and that be entirely proper, of course the committee ought to have applied the whitewash brush very heavily. The people, I am sure, do not agree with that view, however. There is not a lawyer, I venture the assertion, before the bar in any State which is represented by a Senator now on this floor who would not have been disbarred had he been guilty of such conduct. The allegation goes unanswered and undenied, and yet the chairman of the committee put in all of his time denouncing those who made the accusations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas permit a question?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. KING. I wish to ask two questions, so as to save interrupting the Senator again.

First, was Captain Scaife, to whom the Senator has referred, actually in the employ of the Government with the knowledge of the Attorney General at the time Mr. Felder says he was directed by the Attorney General to confer with Mr. Scaife? That is the first question.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; he was not. Let me answer that question. If I left that impression I wish to correct it now. I thought I explained that Scaife had been connected with the Attorney General's office and had grown impatient and resigned. He could not even see the Attorney General, as is disclosed in his letter to WOODRUFF herein presented, until he got Mr. Felder to arrange for him to have an interview.

He could not speak with his own chief until Mr. Felder, who represented hostile interests, made an appointment with the Attorney General so that Captain Scaife might see him. He became disgusted with that situation and left the employ of the Government, and was trying to have Congress call the Attorney General to account for his failure to do his duty. Then Mr. Felder was sent to him, as I have shown, and said, in effect, "Come with me and you will receive $10,000 in this Bosch Magneto case, and will be employed in other cases." The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] knows Captain Scaife, who is a citizen of South Carolina, and the Senator knows whether he is a man of high character and ought to be believed.

Mr. KING. So far as the record shows, did the Attorney General know that Captain Scaife had been making the investigation for the Government and that as a result of his investigation the Government had instituted some suits or was preparing to defend the suit which was about to be instigated against the Government?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes. Captain Scaife left the service and wrote a letter to the Attorney General explaining why he was leaving the service.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas have any information as to the final result of the case? Were the $2,000,000 paid?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; they never proceeded further. After the whole affair became public the proceedings seemed to have stopped.

I do not care whether it is an impeachable act or not; but a member of the household of the Attorney General, in the presence of two other witnesses, speaking about the question of examining the mail of Representatives and Senators, said to me that he knew the Attorney General had the mail of Representative JOHNSON of South Dakota and Representative WOODRUFF, of Michigan, examined, and that among those who examined it was the negro chauffeur of the Attorney General, who seems to have been converted into a very great detective. He is almost the head of the Secret Service so far as examining into the mail of Congressmen is concerned.

For all these and many other acts the committee pardoned the Attorney General.

There is a court, Mr. President, before whose bar all of us have to go. The Attorney General, his chief, the members of the committee, the Members of the Senate—all of us must go before the bar of public opinion, before the constituencies whom we represent. I am sure that they will appraise accurately the relative merits of the people who are connected with this controversy. I should like to add that wherever they have had the opportunity to speak they have recorded their verdict in favor of the charges and against the whitewash; and that they will continue to mete out to each of us the deserts which we are entitled to receive I have no doubt. Therefore it makes no difference, and it is rather hypercritical to call attention to the fact that the Washington Post in its headlines declares "Daugherty cleared by the House." If the word "cleared" conveys the idea of what the writer of the article understands the word "whitewash" to mean, I have no objection at all.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I have no desire to criticize anyone in connection with the matter. It is not a closed incident, however, because I have lying right on my desk reports and copies of reports that touch very vitally the conduct of the office of the Attorney General. I have photostatic copies of letters which I have hesitated heretofore to publish; but as soon as I have time to arrange them in the order which I desire I may publish and let the public themselves judge as to whether the Attorney General has been "cleared" or "whitewashed."

RURAL CREDIT FACILITIES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4287) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States, to amend the Federal farm loan act, to amend the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I did not have the opportunity on yesterday of hearing the address of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] on the bill now before us. Doubtless he canvassed the points to which I am about to call his attention. May I inquire of the Senator whether there is a unanimous report upon the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. LENROOT. There is not. One member of the committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], dissented and submitted a statement of his views.

Mr. KING. I inquire of the Senator whether the Senator from South Dakota was the only member of the committee who dissented from the report of the committee?

Mr. LENROOT. There is no other signature to the views of the minority. I am not myself a member of the committee, and so I really can not answer the Senator's question.

Mr. KING. A page has just handed me the views of the minority, which I have had no opportunity to examine, but I observe on page 2 the heading:

Inadequacy of the Lenroot bill.

Apparently this criticism of the Senator from South Dakota is based upon the proposition as stated in the views of the minority as presented by him that—

No regard is given to the well-known fact (that has again been demonstrated by the War Finance Corporation) that shortage of credit is more acute in certain districts than others, where there is an abundance of local and banking capital, so that only on rare occasions is assistance needed.

May I ask the Senator whether in his opinion there is justification for that criticism; whether or not his bill is a sort of blanket bill that extends exactly the same privileges, no more, no less, to each section regardless of the needs—the greater needs, probably—of some sections as compared with other sections of the country?

Mr. LENROOT. I will say that the bill provides for the subscription to the capital stock of $5,000,000 for each one of the 12 existing land banks. The bill provides that one bank may use its funds for the business of another land bank, but it is optional and not compulsory. The bill also has a provision that if in any land-bank district the capital is not sufficient to meet the needs of agriculture, upon application of the Farm Loan Board, approved by the President of the United States, the capital of that bank may be increased another $5,000,000; so the bill is designed to take care of the very situation of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator believes that under the provisions of this bill, if an acute shortage of credits should exist in any of the 12 districts, sufficient elasticity is found in the bill to provide relief for that situation?

Mr. LENROOT. If in one land-bank district there is not a demand for credit, of course that bank naturally, if there is a demand from another land-bank district, will rediscount the paper of the other land bank. If there is a demand for the entire $60,000,000, for instance, or an acute demand in some section, there is a means provided for doubling the capitalization, but I do not know of any way whereby we can go above that unless we simply take further sums out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. KING. The Senator will appreciate the fact that but few Senators are members of the committee reporting this bill, and they did not have the opportunity of hearing the numerous witnesses who testified; and I am told that a number of witnesses did appear before the committee, some of whom are experts of recognized standing in the United States. I regret to say that no Senator, at least on this side of the Chamber, has explained the provisions of this bill; and its defects, if there be any, have not been pointed out. So some of us who have been waiting for light are somewhat in doubt as to the wisdom of this bill and as to whether or not it meets all of the evils which it has been declared have existed in the past and which exist now with reference to the agricultural interests of the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. I will say to the Senator that I occupied two hours of the Senate's time yesterday in explaining this bill. Of course, I understand that the Senator does not criticize anyone. It was his own misfortune if what I said was worth listening to at all and he was not here to listen to it.

Mr. KING. The Senator understands that committees are in session now and were yesterday.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand.

Mr. KING. And many Senators, including myself, were compelled to be absent from the Chamber during the time that the Senator delivered his address.

Mr. LENROOT. I shall be glad to answer any questions that the Senator may desire to put.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator thinks that the criticism of the Senator from South Dakota, as I have just directed attention to it, is not sound, and that there is sufficient flexibility to meet any emergency that may arise?

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator will find, when he goes through the minority report, that the chief criticism of the Senator from South Dakota is that this scheme does not provide money enough for this personal-credit system; and that means, of course, that we must choose between something of this kind and taking four or five hundred million dollars out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that in the discussion of rural credits bills there has been and doubtless is a diversity of opinion as to whether a Government agency should be set up to loan Government money and to furnish newer capital, or whether provision should be made for the creation of proper corporations with private capital under governmental supervision for utilization by the agriculturists of the United States, to obtain necessary credits. May I inquire whether the bill now before us attempts to meet the criticism that I have understood was urged at one time against a measure which the Anderson-Lenroot committee proposed, namely, that it puts the Government into the loaning business or into the banking business? Does it put the Government into the banking business, or does it rather encourage the furnishing of capital by private individuals, under governmental supervision, to meet the needs of agriculture?

Mr. LENROOT. It does put the Government into the banking business not directly but very similarly to our present Federal reserve bank—not member banks but the Federal reserve bank.

Mr. KING. The parent or central bank?

Mr. LENROOT. The central bank. No provision is made for direct loans to farmers or to any other individuals. There has been, as the Senator says, diversity of opinion as to whether the Government should enter this field; but I have not heard from anyone, from the many, many witnesses that were examined both by the Commission of Agricultural Inquiry and by the Banking and Currency Committee, that any plan can be devised whereby the Government does not furnish the initial capital, except possibly in the case of large live-stock interests, which the Capper bill covers, where it is hoped that under that plan the large live-stock interests, having large resources, doing business upon a very large scale, can organize their corporations under Federal supervision and secure the money necessary; but it has not been suggested to the committee by anybody, so far as I know, that that plan can be carried out so as to be utilized by the average small farmer of the United States.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether the committee considered the advisability and feasibility of so amending the Federal reserve banking system as to furnish the credits which the bill now before us seeks to supply to the agriculturists of the United States? The Senator will recall that some fiscal experts, some of our economists and students of banking matters, have believed that the Federal reserve system, devised primarily to care for the commercial interests of the United States, might be so expanded and modified as to furnish needed credits, credits which might be denominated commercial credits, in contradistinction to land credits, to the farmers and stock growers; that it could be expanded so that the paper of the farmers could be rediscounted and loans extended for a period of one year. Does the Senator know whether or not the committee or the commission with which he was associated in this investigation considered the feasibility of amending the Federal reserve law so that adequate credits of the character to which I have just referred might be furnished agriculturists?

Mr. LENROOT. I will answer the Senator by saying that this bill, as did the Capper bill, has a provision extending from six months to nine months the eligibility for rediscount of agricultural paper. With reference to that extension, I will say that the Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, which made its report more than a year ago, after a very exhaustive investigation, did not at that time make any recommendation that that paper be extended beyond six months. The commission took that action because of the fact that it was advised by the Federal Reserve Board and by bankers generally that the resources of the Federal reserve system were so largely loaned out, and there was such demand, that there was great necessity of keeping the resources as liquid as possible; and of course the Senator understands that this whole question of the term of paper is dependent upon the liquidity of it. We often hear it said that this class or that class furnish so much of the deposits, and therefore they are entitled to long-time loans. Of course, the first duty of any bank is to protect its depositors; and that is the reason, as the Senator well knows, why long-term paper generally is not feasible—because it can not be realized upon. Conditions have changed during the last year, however, so that now bankers generally and the Federal Reserve Board feel that that eligibility can be safely extended to nine months, but I do not think there is any opinion that it will be safe to extend it beyond nine months.

Mr. KING. Even a limited quantity of paper?

Mr. LENROOT. This bill and the Capper bill, too, limit it in this sense: Having in mind an emergency where it might be necessary to limit it, the power and the duty are given to fix the amount of such nine months' paper or over six months' paper upon a percentage of the assets of the Federal reserve bank.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I also call attention to the fact that the Lenroot bill proposes an amendment to the Federal reserve act which reduces somewhat the capital required by State banks and makes the system more inviting in that way to some of them. There are over 9,000 eligible State banks that have not come into the system. That amendment is, I think, in the Lenroot bill and the Capper bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Both of them; they are identical. I may say to the Senator from Utah, with reference to the amendments to the Federal reserve bank law found in this bill, that with one exception, which relates solely to land banks, they will be made the same as they were in the Capper bill, because

an agreement was reached in the committee as to what should be done; and so they were put in both bills with the idea that the first bill that goes through will contain these provisions amending the Federal reserve system, and they will be eliminated from the one that is behind.

Mr. KING. I observe on page 3 of the minority report submitted by the Senator from South Dakota, under the head "Establishment of separate agencies," what appears to be a criticism of this bill because a separate organization was not provided similar to the War Finance Corporation. May I ask the Senator whether that question was brought to the attention of the committee and whether emphasis was laid upon the proposition that there ought to be two agencies; that an organization devoted to dealing with land and the extension of credits upon land mortgages might not, by its training and its disposition toward the entire subject of credits, have the right slant, the right point of view, in dealing with paper of farmers, paper which might be denominated "commercial," in contradistinction to mortgages upon real estate?

Mr. LENROOT. That was very fully considered by both the Commission of Agricultural Inquiry and the Committee on Banking and Currency. One very prominent farm organization of this country favors entirely separate agencies if that could be brought about. There are two objections to a separate agency. I think it was Secretary Wallace who stated that a difference of 1 per cent in the interest rate paid by the farmer was equal to a 20 per cent reduction in his freight rates. If we establish entirely independent agencies, the cost, which, of course, is very large in gross, must either be paid by the farmers or come out of the Federal Treasury; and I do not think the Senator would maintain that, outside of the central organization, such as the Federal Reserve Board or the Farm Loan Board, the Federal Treasury should be charged with all the administration of a personal credit system. That ought to be carried by those who receive the benefit of it.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LENROOT. We thought, and we were firmly convinced, that we could get a lower rate of interest for the farmer by having this system a department in an existing agency, and thus save all the overhead of an extra organization; and, in addition to that, it would take a year, in all probability, to establish and organize a separate agency, while this could be put into effect and operation almost immediately.

Mr. KING. This bill, then, utilizes existing organizations——

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; it does.

Mr. KING. And empowers them to extend credits to farmers under the conditions named in the bill?

Mr. LENROOT. I would be very glad to state, in a word, just what it does in that respect.

Mr. KING. I should be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LENROOT. The bill sets up in each one of the 12 land banks a farm-credits department, with an initial capital of $5,000,000 for each, provided by the United States Government. The credits department is managed by the present board of directors so long as the temporary board of directors shall be in control, but if a permanent organization shall go into effect, wherever the permanent board of directors shall control the affairs of the organization, the credit side shall be managed by the district directors only, or, in other words, those appointed by the Federal Farm Loan Board. The assets and liabilities of the credits department are entirely separate and apart from the existing system, and it simply runs as a separate department, with the same general officers, but it is, of course, expected that a competent manager would be appointed for each department in each land bank.

Mr. KING. Would dividends, if any are declared, be segregated? Are there two kinds of stock in the bank?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; the stockholders of the farm loan bank, as it now exists, will have nothing to do with this part of the business.

Mr. KING. Then if losses should result in the administration of the provisions of this bill, the existing farm banks can not be affected?

Mr. LENROOT. They would not be affected in any way.

Mr. KING. Or the dividends affected?

Mr. LENROOT. No. That is expressly provided in the bill.

Mr. KING. Is there provision for two characters of stock and two kinds of stockholders?

Mr. LENROOT. No; the Government is the only stockholder.

Mr. KING. The Government is the only stockholder under this system?

Mr. LENROOT. That is correct.

Mr. KING. Is there any provision under which at any time the Government may cease to be a stockholder and the stock be acquired either by the agriculturists who borrow, or by any other agency, or any individual or corporation?

Mr. LENROOT. No; there is not, and I very frankly say to the Senator that at various times during the consideration of this measure the joint commission had that subject under consideration. After the fullest inquiry, this being not a profit-making institution—and if it is to serve the farmer, it must not be a profit-making institution—we could not find any feasible way to apply the present farm-loan system to this system, because there would not be subscriptions to the stock. This contemplates the principal benefit to the farmer through the medium of the banks, State and National, whether they are members of the Federal reserve system or not, but provision is made in the bill for the discount of paper of credit companies or corporations such as the Capper bill provides, so that if a bank is unwilling to serve its customers as it should there will be another means by which access can be had to this system. But banks are not going to subscribe to the stock of the Federal land banks for the privilege of doing that, and farm-loan associations are not feasible, as I think the Senator will see in a moment, because it would not be good business to allow 5 per cent subscriptions to the capital stock and then allow a farmer twenty times the amount of his subscription on his personal note, with no other security. Of course, so far as the land bank is concerned, we have the security of the real estate in every case, so there is a very clear distinction between the farm-loan association system as applied to real estate and any possible association as applied to a personal credit system.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, the United States is authorized to subscribe a primary capital of $5,000,000 for the farm credits department, and that then is permitted to build up a surplus, and from the time when it amounts to $2,000,000, thereby providing a new going capital, 25 per cent in additional surplus goes to liquidate the original capital advanced by the United States, and the capital itself is being built up by three-fourths of the added surplus from time to time as it may be earned. Is that correct?

Mr. LENROOT. That is correct, and, as the bill now reads, until the capital furnished by the Government is reduced to $1,000,000. I stated yesterday I would be willing to support an amendment that would still further reduce it, so that it would be only a nominal sum held by the Government.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if he does not think there is some incongruity in engrafting upon an organization now in existence, which was created for the purpose of making real estate loans to farmers, and which provides for the ultimate absorption by the farmers of the stock, and the elimination of the Government as a stockholder from the organization, an organization such as is created by this bill, which embarks upon an entirely different enterprise, different in the sense that this makes provision for short-time credits and the other long-time credits upon real estate, and which retains the Government perpetually as the only stockholder?

Mr. LENROOT. Let me correct the Senator in one particular. The present law does not contemplate the Government being eliminated entirely at any time from the present farm loan bank system. All the present law does is to provide that when the subscriptions by borrowers are equal to the subscriptions of the Government, the permanent organization provided by the law shall go into effect and the Government stock be retired; but at all times the Government will have one-third of the board of directors.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is speaking of a farm loan act, and not this bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Not this bill. The Senator from Utah asked if it was not incongruous. Under the proposed system the Government will have three directors all the time, and the bill provides that the three directors, who shall always be there representing the Government, shall manage the credit department.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will allow me——

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. It is provided that the Government maximum for the 12 banks may reach $160,000,000?

Mr. LENROOT. One hundred and twenty million dollars.

Mr. SMITH Yes; $120,000,000. There are 12 banks, and the provision is for $10,000,000 each. After it gets to be a going concern, a certain percentage is set aside from the profits for a sinking fund, until that shall reach $1,000,000. That means that the Government is still to be the only stockholder

in this credit department, but deriving its money from a different source than from the initial subscription?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. The first coming from the Treasury and the other coming from the profits which accrue?

Mr. LENROOT. The Government's management will be the same, however, whether its stock is retired or not.

Mr. SMITH. This bill proposes that as the volume of business increases, if the institution should be a success, no limit shall be placed upon the amount of bonds or obligations which may be issued in furtherance of the accommodations to be extended?

Mr. LENROOT. Ten times the amount of the capital.

Mr. SMITH. And the ultimate capital is fixed at $10,000,000 for each one of the Federal land banks?

Mr. LENROOT. It is fixed at $5,000,000 initially.

Mr. SMITH. But $10,000,000 ultimately?

Mr. LENROOT. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. That would then give something like $1,000,000,000, in round numbers.

Mr. LENROOT. One billion three hundred and twenty million dollars.

Mr. SMITH. That would be the entire amount available from all sources for carrying on the farm industries of the country. That source of credit it also supplemented by a slight liberalizing of the Federal reserve law as it now stands?

Mr. LENROOT. A very substantial liberalizing, as applied to this system.

Mr. SMITH. I shall not take occasion this afternoon, Mr. President, to go into this matter as fully as I intend to before the pending bill shall be disposed of. I have been considerably confused as to why there should be any hesitancy on the part of the Congress to extend to agriculture the same access to all the credits available under the Federal reserve act that it has extended to commerce. All of us know that the substitution of the Federal reserve act for the old banking and currency act was to furnish the people of this country with a flexible system of currency, safe in its basis of redemption, but also capable of meeting the expanding and contracting conditions which are incident to all business. Hence there was incorporated into this bill perhaps the one distinctive feature, namely, the power to issue upon the wealth of the country, put in the proper commercial form, a temporary form of currency, known as Federal reserve notes. They are clearing-house certificates. That is what they really are. We make our Federal reserve system the clearing house for the wealth of the country and, upon that wealth being put in proper form, there may be issued from time to time, upon these commodities as collateral, a certain form of credit known as Federal reserve notes.

Of course, the inertia of habit and the power of custom and the disasters which have overtaken us in the form of panics from time to time had made the banking world stand near the shore. Hence they insisted upon and demanded a short-time credit in the very best gilt-edge form. Ninety days was about the extent to which they felt safe to invest the available liquid currency of the country, even a per cent of it, for fear that something might occur and a panic would be precipitated, because the money supply might be tied up in 90-day paper, and before the 90 days should have expired disaster would have befallen them. We thought we had obviated the possibility of the recurrence of a panic by providing that the wealth of the country when in commercial form should be the basis of the issuance of this temporary form of credit.

I do not recall a time since the enactment of the law when the gold reserve was not amply sufficient to justify a further expansion of the circulating medium, the temporary medium, at any given time. The gold held in the country that was available for reserve certainly reached a most stupendous, colossal amount above the required reserve during the very time when the country was suffering most from lack of credit. I think I am correct when I say that I was informed by the Comptroller of the Currency that at one time in 1921 we had perhaps in excess of $1,500,000,000 of free gold, gold against which there was not a single obligation, gold against which there was not a single reserve note. That $1,500,000,000 of free gold in the country would have become something like three or four times the basis of credit on safe commodities plus the gold. It was not extended. I shall not take the time this evening to give my opinion as to why it was not extended.

What I want to say, with these few preliminary remarks, is that what the banking world has been afraid of under the old system was not a basis of fear under the new system. Under the old system the amount of currency that could be put into circulation was as rigid and as unchangeable as the value of gold. It was absolutely fixed. So that a tying up of an appreciable amount of it in what they termed long-time paper left us really in serious danger of a famine. It is not so under the provisions of the new system. We may have under it, as we have heretofore experienced, a commodity panic, but I defy any Senator upon the floor to say that it is remotely possible, if indeed at all possible, that we should have a money panic under the present system.

As long as the country produces the marvelous wealth that it does produce, as long as national and international trade shall exist at all, we can not have a money panic under the Federal reserve system. Of course, under the policy of the governors or the managers we could have a commodity panic. We may deny credit, but the basis of unlimited circulation, practically speaking, is always in the hands of those who are managing our system. I think that would go without a challenge from anyone on this floor.

Now, that being true, why are we afraid to provide in our law that agriculture shall have a credit rediscount or a credit—leaving out the term "rediscount" so confusing to the ordinary lay mind—a credit of 12 months as against ordinary commercial transactions of 30, 60, and 90 days? That was largely the product of the old system. It would not be necessary under the present system. The liquidity of paper is based upon the rapidity with which the ordinary business is transacted. No producer and no manufacturer wants to hoard up his manufactured goods when, by a rapid turnover of his capital within 12 months, he would make in the aggregate turnover more than he would if he were to pyramid his manufactures and raise the price. He would run too many risks and it would be too doubtful. But as long as he can, with a reasonable per cent of profit, turn over his holdings rapidly, he would prefer the 30-day sale to anything like pyramiding. I say that is generally true of the manufacturers of the country.

Under our standardized system, or, I should say, under the standardization of commerce, the perfection which it has reached came about naturally. Under our wonderful systems of communication, transportation, and manufacture we have almost approximated an ideal condition of standardization, not only nationally but internationally. I dare say the manufacturers of this country know to-day almost every 10 minutes practically the consumptive potentiality of every consuming spot in the civilized world. They know where and when and how they can turn over their manufactured articles and get a per cent which, if turned over rapidly in the aggregate, would grant them a large return. We say we accommodate him with 30-day paper, that is one character of manufacturer; another with 60-day paper, that is another character; and another with 90-day paper, or somewhat the same with some little exigencies he desires to meet. But I maintain that even that arbitrary limitation of prime commercial paper under the new Federal reserve system is not necessary. It was necessary under the old system to safeguard against tying up the limited available circulating medium. It is not necessary under the present system, because the very commodity that we produce is in itself, under the genius of the Federal reserve system, capable of liquefying itself under the proper policy of the Federal Reserve Board. Not only that, but it is really a money-making process for the Federal reserve system.

If that be true, and I maintain that I have given a brief outline of the difference between the present system and the old system, why do we hesitate at all to extend 12 months' time of credit to agriculture? I maintain that under section 16 of the Federal reserve act, without jeopardizing a single dollar necessary for ample accommodation of commerce, we could accommodate agriculture for 12 months.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STANFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMITH. With pleasure.

Mr. OWEN. What the Senator from South Carolina has said has very considerable force, because in reality commodities, under the modern system of banking, are substituted for gold.

Mr. SMITH. That is true.

Mr. OWEN. Forty per cent of gold is maintained, and then the commodity notes come in with 100 per cent commodities and 100 per cent of increased credit behind them in the Federal reserve system. So that, speaking apart from any other consideration, the securities would appear to be abundant. Since the securities are nonperishable, since they are marketable, since they are put in storage and are covered by

warehouse receipts, they themselves comprise as stable a form of security as gold itself, because they are convertible into gold upon the necessity arising.

The old system under which bankers thought that 30-day notes were more valuable than 60-day notes, and that 60-day notes were more valuable than 90-day notes, existed because they had no means by which they could get currency in case of a sudden demand. But now that currency is abundantly provided to expand in accordance with the needs of commerce, that requirement is abundantly met by the system itself, and the argument upon which the old theory was based that a 30-day note was better than a 60-day note has disappeared. I think it merely becomes a question of policy as to whether or not the credits should be extended so long a time that men might be induced to hoard commodities for a rise in value or something of the kind which can be controlled easily by the supervising powers conducting either one of the sets of banks.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to have the position I have taken indorsed by such an authority as the Senator from Oklahoma. He has put in another form the exact idea that I had. He suggests that we should not so extend the time of discount as to invite hoarding. I think it goes without saying, or I think I have made clear—certainly clear to my own mind—that there are very few manufacturers who would desire to hoard if the market would absorb their turnovers as rapidly as they within reason produce.

Mr. President, I challenge any Senator to stand on this floor and state a reason why under the present commodity basis of credit we may not amend the Federal reserve law, since it has been tried and now found to be so splendidly workable, and extend credit to agriculture for 12 months rather than for 6 or 9 months. The Senator from Oklahoma very rightfully calls attention to the danger that might arise by extending too long a time upon certain paper, which would invite hoarding; but the Senator will agree with me when I state that though a period of 30 days is ample for certain forms of artificial production in this country, 60 days for other forms, and 90 days for still other forms, with no limit whatever upon their access to the credit facilities of the country, yet agriculture, which requires 12 months for the production of its products in the great laboratory of nature, is given but 6 months as the limit for paper which may be used as the basis for the issuance of Federal reserve notes, and a 9-month limit is denied.

Mr. McLEAN. Under the pending bill 9-month paper is eligible for rediscount if it is secured.

Mr. SMITH. I had overlooked that. The Senator from Connecticut now states that under the pending bill 9-month paper is eligible for rediscount under the proposed amendment of the Federal reserve act for the application of the issuance of Federal reserve notes.

Mr. LENROOT. If secured.

Mr. SMITH. If secured. Mr. President, that is conceding something. The fact is, it is an extension of three months beyond what I had at first a right or any ground to hope for. However, why restrict the period to nine months?

It takes the average agriculturist 12 months to produce for the manufacturing and consuming world the subsequent 12 months' supply. I can not understand why there should be given to a manufacturer all the time he requires to produce his commodities and to dispose of them under the operation of natural law and deny the agriculturist the same right, when the power of the law could accommodate him just as readily as it accommodates the manufacturer without jeopardizing the credit of the country one iota. Why do we desire under the flexible system of our present Federal reserve act to restrict agriculture? When the wheat crop is made and put in an elevator, properly stored and properly insured, it is then ready for distribution over the next 12 months. Why not grant to the producer of that commodity, who by the law of nature has to take 12 months in order to produce a 12 months' supply, a credit based upon his commodity and give the Federal reserve system the power to issue a sufficient amount of Federal reserve notes guaranteed by that commodity so as to enable him to distribute it through sale over the 12 months, as it took him 12 months' time in order to produce it?

I myself, farmer as I am, should hesitate to say that we ought to grant the rediscount privilege to 12 months' paper on an agricultural commodity if the amount of circulation that could be issued were limited and restricted; but there is no such limitation; the only limitation is the wealth which agriculture can produce. It is like a cork on water—when the water rises the cork rises, and when the water recedes the cork recedes. With the volume of agriculture expanding, why come in here with little bits and chunks and chips and special little subterfuges for the farmer? Why not open the door to the ample credit provided under the present Federal reserve system and give the farmer the same access to the issuance of Federal reserve notes and the credit of the country as is given to others?

The farmer makes the basis of all our credit; and as the farmer increases the number of his cattle and the quantity of his wheat and of his wool and his cotton, the basis of the issuance of Federal reserve notes increases; so the farmer is producing the very basis upon which circulating medium shall be furnished to the country. Ample provision has been made under the 30 and 60 and 90 day issues of Federal reserve notes for those who convert the farmer's raw material into the finished product. By the same token, why should the farmer be denied accommodation for the time during which nature has provided in which he must dispose of his production, if he disposes of it profitably?

Why is a six months' limitation suggested? It is said, "We are afraid to tie things up"; but nothing is tied up, because the very commodity in the warehouses and in the elevators is the basic substitute for gold, for the issuance of credit to enable the farmer to dispose of his products in 12 months.

Let us be more specific and get right down to the real issue involved. A manufacturer in order to complete a certain form of transaction needs but 30 days. He has been amply provided for; all the credit of America is placed at his disposal on 30-day paper. Another manufacturer will require 60 days, and he has been amply provided for with unlimited credit and access to every member bank and trust company of the reserve system, which is as wide as is the credit of America. So has the manufacturer who needs accommodation for 90 days been provided for. Bear in mind that we had 30-day, 60-day, and 90-day paper, because previous to the passage of the Federal reserve act we had a fixed and limited amount of circulating medium. Under this bill the commodity itself—the volume and value of it—becomes the basis of the issuance of currency known as Federal reserve notes. In the case of the farmer it requires 12 months for him to produce; he labors for 12 months; he assumes liabilities for 12 months; and then within 30 days the accumulated fruits of 12 months are realized in the form of a crop that is harvested. It takes 12 months to dispose of that crop. Somebody must finance it. The Government has come royally to the support of commerce and has provided ample facilities in order that it may take advantage of the flexible features of the Federal reserve system; and yet it denies to agriculture the right to liquefy its assets, which it took 12 months to produce, and refuses to give to agriculture an opportunity to distribute the marketing of its product over the 12 months, for 12 months is the growing period of its product, and 12 months is its marketing period, as contradistinguished from the 30, 60, and 90 days. I maintain that it is an insult and a reflection on the agricultural and live-stock raising interests of this country that we stand here and stultify ourselves by denying them the use of the very principle in the bill that safeguards every penny of credit that might be extended while we pour out an unlimited volume to others.

I do not wish anybody to misunderstand the position I am taking. I am not inveighing against manufacturing and commerce; I am merely saying that we have provided ample means of credit of which they may take advantage in the shape of a splendid and flexible financial system, but for some inscrutable reason the door has been shut in the face of agriculture. Why? What danger would there be if we should write into the Federal reserve act a provision to the effect that the officers of a member bank in the system might apply to the Federal reserve bank for the issuance of Federal reserve notes for 12 months' time, based upon commodities in the warehouses and elevators of this country in which are stored farm commodities produced in the preceding 12 months' period, and thus give these producers credit and time sufficient to market their products? No one supposes that the farmer would attempt to pile crop upon crop, for he knows that when the day of sale comes the world can only consume a 12 months' supply. What he would do would be this: He would upon this credit thus extended to him be the financier of his own crop and sell it as his judgment dictated and not be forced to liquidate by virtue of the burden of debt incurred in its production.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KING. I was called from the Chamber and did not hear all of the remarks of the Senator. May I inquire whether his position is not this: That the Federal reserve system may be so amended and expanded as to furnish a basis for credit to farmers commensurate to that which is furnished to the manufacturing and commercial interests of the United States?

Mr. SMITH. Let me restate my position to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I am interested, though, in knowing whether the Senator thinks we ought to create more agencies or give the present agency greater power.

Mr. SMITH. This body and the one at the other end of the Capitol should take the present system and provide unchangeably and unmistakably that agriculture shall have equal access to the credit facilities of this country on the same footing as other industries, so that its peculiar needs may be accommodated as those of commerce have been accommodated.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator; but what I am trying to get at is: Does the Senator think that can or can not be done under the Federal reserve system by amending it?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly. I started to say we hardly need to amend it; but we ought to take away certain discretion that is now unfortunately exercised by those who have it in charge. I state without fear of contradiction that the five members of the present Federal Reserve Board could in 24 hours relieve agriculture and furnish it all the credit it needs safely and without jeopardizing a dollar, and do it at rates of interest that would make the country blossom like the rose.

Have we forgotten that the basis of the Federal reserve notes is the wealth of the country and that the volume of Federal reserve notes that can be issued is only measured by the production and actual wealth of the country? Then, why furnish ample facilities to one part of the producing and commercial element and deny them to another, when they could be granted to the other without jeopardizing a dollar or restricting the currency? Aye, there is the rub; it would not restrict the currency or the amount available for other people, but when the needs of agriculture shall be met by the temporary loan of the Federal reserve notes the volume will be increased and the lending of somebody else's money will be jeopardized. There is the rub.

The time is not far distant when the people of this country, understanding the principle of the Federal reserve system, will rise up and put it into operation, if they have to clean the stable from the house down. It is here, it is in the Federal reserve act, amply safeguarded.

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

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's contention, as I understand, is that the Federal reserve act does not need amendment, but does need different administration?

Mr. SMITH. I do make that contention in a way. I do not wish to put it exactly in that form, but I will say I do in a way; but we need to extend to agriculture the time that agriculture needs, which is at least 12 months. I said before the Senator came into the Chamber that the limitation of 30, 60, and 90 day paper was brought over from the old system, when we had but a very small volume of currency and no way to get any more. It was as restricted and rigid as the eternal law of gravitation; but when we passed this law we made the possible volume of currency in the form of Federal reserve notes as great as the volume of wealth produced in this country—no greater, but as great as that. Now, if agriculture produces its pro rata, under certain conditions, that bill would meet it if you and I understood it and had the courage to demand it. Thirty, sixty, and ninety day paper, as I said, was only arbitrarily prescribed because under the old laws of 1864 and 1870 they were afraid to give any longer time, for fear the majority of the currency might be tied up in 90-day paper and some fellow might corner the market and produce a panic. A panic can not be produced now. I defy any man to say that under the Federal reserve system a panic can be produced.

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

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. If I get the Senator's position—and I have talked with him privately about it a good many times, as he knows, and I think I understand what his views are—but to get it down to a concrete proposition there are two things we ought to do with the Federal reserve system in the Senator's estimation—to give ample relief to agriculture as well as to business. One of those is to have men in charge who have the right viewpoint, and the other is to amend the law so that the limitation that is now in the law will be extended to at least 12 months.

Mr. SMITH. Surely; that is right.

Mr. NORRIS. That will give a complete remedy.

Mr. SMITH. That is right. Now, just let me explain this to the Senator, because I may be a thousand miles away, but if I am my mental limitations are such that when I helped in part to frame this law, when I wrote part of one of the sections with my own pen at my own desk, I was delighted with the idea that we had at last, through the composite brain effort of loyal, patriotic citizens, cut the Gordian knot and turned the people loose; and how had we done it? In place of having a simple metallic basis for the issuance of currency, and no other, we had substituted a commodity basis for temporary currency, known as Federal reserve notes, to be extended for what length of time? For the length of time that ordinary business said was necessary between the time of production and the normal time of distribution and consumption. Then the amount of notes that had been issued to you for your accommodation during the period when you desired to market your stuff would be returned and a like amount canceled, so that as rapidly as the volume of the wealth was converted into consumption or passed into actual use the amount of Federal reserve notes was reduced by that amount.

That meant that if I went to the Federal reserve bank and through the application of the Federal reserve agent there was issued to me upon a commodity $1,000, when I sold that commodity for $1,000, or whatever margin I realized beyond that figure, and went to my bank and took up my note which secured the issuance of the Federal reserve notes for $1,000 there were canceled $1,000 of Federal reserve notes; so that the 30, 60, and 90 day paper is no longer a necessity in the ordinary transaction of business, because of the fact that the wealth in the process of consumption and use is represented by clearing-house certificates known as Federal reserve notes.

Now, I ask you this question: If a certain form of business which can turn over its affairs in 30 days comes and asks for a 30-day credit, covering the time in which the man buys his raw material, converts it into finished products, and sells it, we accommodate him. We open every avenue of credit in this country and turn him loose in it. We do the same for 60-day paper and the same for 90-day paper. We say: "We must have these short-time, quick, convertible assets," because we are afraid of what? We can not have a panic now—we could before—as a result of tying up our currency in long-time paper. We can not now, because as long as wealth is here, under the law we can issue a liquefying circulating medium to represent it, and we are on a commodity basis now as against a metallic basis before.

Now agriculture comes along and says: "Why, that is fine. It takes me 12 months to produce. I do not sell some along, but it takes me 12 months to get all my production ready for market. In that commodity I have a 12 months' supply for the next 12 months. It will take me 12 months to sell it. It takes this manufacturer 30 days, that one 60 days, and this one 90 days, but it takes me 12 months. Now, it is not going to jeopardize the volume of your currency a bit; it will increase it. I ask for the issuance of Federal reserve notes to me for 12 months to liquefy my production, as you give the other fellow 30, 60, and 90 days."

That is all there is to it. And whom have you hurt? I have produced the actual basis upon which the law says you can issue this temporary credit. The manufacturer simply converts it. I produce it; and yet the man who calls his wealth actually into existence where it did not exist before is discriminated against in favor of the man who simply changes the form of the wealth.

Instead of coming in here with an expedient such as the Capper bill—of course, if we can not get anything else we must take some crumbs that fall from our master's table—I maintain here this afternoon that we ought to sweep into the wastebasket every one of these subterfuges and write in three years for live stock and one year for agricultural commodities produced in the field and give them the same liberal advancement of Federal reserve notes or credit that we do the others.

What are we quibbling about here? Is it possible that those who have the volume of wealth, as evidenced by a hearing before a committee of which I am a member, in the oil business—God help us!—where fortune after fortune is piled up until it staggers the imagination, the men who furnish my tractors with the gasoline on which they run, the men who furnish the fuel for the trucks that carry in part the commerce of this country, shall have an unholy dividend and return while we, who feed and clothe and shoe the world, must come here on bended knees and beg for a crumb that falls from our master's table? It is a disgrace to the American Senate. It is a reflection on those who would stop us at the door of our opportunity. It is an everlasting reflection on those who put their hands on this flexible, splendid system, and distorted it to the sacrifice of American agriculture.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. I was simply going to observe that in the matter of letting credit by the banks of the country they loan credit to a borrower who comes in seeking credit, and they

manufacture credit by taking his note as a good security and entering a deposit and giving him a deposit slip. They create, then and there, a credit. The credits which are established under the Federal reserve act are safeguarded by that act with actual commodity values, merchantable and nonperishable. That act, by doing this, has converted merchantable, nonperishable commodities into valid credits, and therefore has increased the power of America as a creditor nation by building up credits on a gigantic scale, so that the resources of the banks, which were only about twenty-five billions when this system was established, are now over fifty-six billions, because credits have been created through a recognition of the merchantable value of commodities in transit. When these commodities are recognized as a proper basis of credit and when credits are issued against them they appear as deposits, and they may be loaned back and forth; and as long as they remain upon that basis of stability they are sound—just as sound as if they were based upon gold—because these merchantable, nonperishable commodities are convertible into gold at will.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator a question right there? The very moment that those who have the administration of this law begin to create a doubt in the minds of the people as to their willingness to recognize it as a basis of credit and to extend the credit, they destroy its credit basis and its market value and produce just what we went through in 1920-21.

Mr. OWEN. There is no question about the destructive effect upon the value of commodities when you deny credits, because you can constrict credits and thereby prevent the purchase of these commodities, you can constrict credits and thereby prevent the production of these commodities, and you can constrict credits and prevent the transportation and exchange of these commodities, all of these factors going to break down the value in the markets of these commodities themselves; and, therefore, striking at the very toproot of credit, you break down confidence in the country.

Mr. SMITH. And striking at the very genius of the present law.

Mr. OWEN. It strikes at the spirit and purpose of the Federal reserve act, which was intended to give stability to credits and not to be used as an agency by which credits could be impaired and broken down.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I had not intended to say even this much this afternoon. I wanted my constituents and my colleagues here to understand that before we do this thing we ought to be fully advised as to what we are doing. Before we place the devoted agricultural interests of this country in the attitude of mendicants in their own home, in the attitude of beggars at the door of their own production and wealth, we had better understand what we are doing.

I do not believe that the educated agriculturists—and they are all more or less educated now—will longer stand this condition under which they are suffering.

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to this fact, which perhaps we are overlooking; we are in a brand new world and do not know it. We are in entirely brand new circumstances and do not know it. We are in an age as divorced from every other as if we were in another world, and it seems as if our stupidity is forcing us to legislate for conditions which have passed and gone forever, and which our legislation will not fit.

Mr. KING. The Senator has in mind the fact that we are now a creditor nation, have most of the gold of the world, and that the rest of the world is in economic chaos.

Mr. SMITH. Precisely; that is one of the conditions, and another is this, that your grandfather and mine, if they were fortunate enough to get a college or a university education, found the training of their logical faculties devoted largely to a very scanty knowledge of philosophy, Greek, and Latin, and physics in a very crude form.

Mr. OWEN. The rule of three and the pons asinorum.

Mr. SMITH. They were attempting to train the mind of a young man in Greek, not that he expected to use Greek in his everyday affairs as Greek, but those who were doing the training knew that that was a language which expressed thought, a beautiful language, and that certain variable forms of words in a sentence determined the kind of a sentence it was, and they did not get the meaning unless their minds were so trained as to understand the logical relation of one word to another, and then they interpreted it and got the meaning. The young man did not use the Greek out in life, he forgot it; but the logical habit of his mind stood him in good stead in the conflict of life.

What about to-day? The most ignorant negro who works in a garage is coming in contact with the logical relation of facts more powerful and potent than ever a Greek accent or a Greek form, because if he puts together certain factors the engine runs; if he does not, it does not run. Even though he may not read and write, he is being educated logically more powerfully than were our grandfathers who studied Greek.

Mr. OWEN. I think that is true.

Mr. SMITH. In every department of our life science has established a practical university and made the veriest laborer a beneficiary of logical reasoning. That would be enough to advance us materially beyond our forebears, but in practically every State there is compulsory education.

As I have said before, knowledge of figures and letters no more constitutes education than fruit jars constitute fruit. Real education is the power to think logically, reasonably, and consecutively, and the even step of science with the unfolding of education has given the power to learn the forms in which education may be preserved, as well as giving the substance of it in practical illustration, and from the lowest hut to the highest castle we have unequaled opportunity for real education, and you will not hold the man in bondage by juggling words over a Federal reserve act. That is what I have come to. It can not be done. I am not here holding any brief for anything except the good old democratic doctrine, clear-cut and contradistinguished from socialism or communism, that each man under the law has an opportunity as God has invested in him, and not as somebody happens to invest in the Standard Oil Co. or in a national bank; that every door of opportunity shall not be shut because a certain percentage must be made by the capitalists regardless of whether or not agriculture falters and dies.

That is the plea I am making, and I have not come here with some wild-eyed scheme. I hailed the advent of the Federal reserve system as the liberation of the toiling masses of this country, by making it possible for credit to be extended to the producers of wealth, those entitled to it, and not distorting the policy so that its wonderful power and flexibility makes a money panic impossible, but makes a commodity panic imminent. Those who own the banks may go on and do this thing, but they are piling up wrath against the day of judgment.

As I sat and listened to those enormous, staggering figures of profits made out of one of the ordinary necessities of modern organized life, I thought how foolish those men were. Are they going to force us to choose between two evils, the concentration and control of the necessities of life by the greedy individual, or control by the Government? It is not the people clamoring for Government control; it is these everlasting profiteers and greedy men, who are laying such burdens on the people that we are driven to either pay tribute to them in unholy amounts or turn the industries over to the Government and risk our chances with that policy.

If they are wise in their day and generation, they will be perfectly satisfied with a reasonable return, which we want them to make, and would like to encourage; but these colossal fortunes are piled up, and you and I are denied even the very credits provided for, and are told to come in at some back or side door, or, perhaps, we are told, "We will let you have $5,000,000 under certain good conditions, providing you go through a bank, and then through that bank to a trust company, then through that trust company to another one, and shed some of the money as you go. If you open your mouth, sir, you are ruined."

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, in drawing the alternative between Government ownership and private ownership as a means of correcting this evil, unless these gentlemen who have been drawing extraordinary profits are willing to take a reasonable profit, I think perhaps the Senator overlooks the power and the ability, and perhaps the duty, of the Government of the United States and the State governments, to say to those who are exercising monopolistic powers that they shall be content with a reasonable profit, and to provide the mechanism by which to restrain them, leaving the ownership in private hands, but protecting the public by a reasonable allowance of profit to those who are conducting these enterprises which control the necessaries of life.

Mr. SMITH. We have not been very successful with that process. It seems as if the enactment of every law for the control of human greed is seized upon by the nimble wits of those men in the employ of those making inordinate profits to be turned into a breastwork behind which they are then immune from the law. Witness the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. OWEN. If the Senator will pardon me, the Sherman antitrust law proceeded upon the theory that a monopoly was a public enemy, and that a monopoly ought to be treated as a criminal. That has never been successfully carried out as a matter of fact. In Germany, where they use the cartel system,

they recognize monopolies as having been constructed under modern conditions, and they insist upon a fair charge to the public, which will give a fair reward to capital and safety to capital, while protecting the public. We never have really established that system in America, or anything which compares with it.

Mr. SMITH. That is true. That distinction ought to be made whenever we are discussing the Sherman antitrust law, because the distinction between the German form under the cartel and the American form was that the German form allowed the individual to go on but restricted the return he might make, while here in America we look upon a combination as a criminal thing, when it may not be.

Mr. OWEN. In the comment of Mr. Rowe on the testimony given by Mr. Stewart of the Indiana Standard Oil Co., he called attention to a computation made by him that $100 invested in that company some 10 or 12 years ago was now worth $37,000, because of dividends, and then dividends upon dividends, until the investment multiplied itself. Whether that computation is accurate or not I do not pretend to know, I am merely calling attention to it, and to what Mr. Stewart himself said in the public press immediately afterwards. I will not attempt to give his words, but the substance of what he said was that the time had come in this country when capital must recognize the rights of other people; the rights of those who labor, the rights of the consumers; otherwise that it was laying up a day of wrath for itself, just as the Senator suggests.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, apropos of what was said by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] in referring to the cartel system in Germany, I would like to have the RECORD show that notwithstanding the cartel system, which did attempt to restrict profits, the Thyssen group and other groups have accumulated stupendous fortunes, perhaps as fabulous and as colossal as those which have been accumulated by the Standard Oil and other corporations and individuals in the United States. How they have done it I am not quite able to state, but it is a fact that Hugo Stinnes, for instance, accumulated, before the war and since the war, a fortune perhaps larger, in proportion to the wealth of Germany, than the fortune of any man in the United States.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that under the cartel system, under which a reasonable profit is charged, those who handle any commodity find that there is an enormously increased consumption of that commodity, because it is sold to the people at a fair rate, and therefore while their percentage of profit on the turnover may not be very large, the volume of their business being greatly expanded, they make as much money that way as they would in any other; but they do it by rendering service to the country, and not by interfering with production, and by preventing people from being able to get the necessaries of life except by paying two or three or four hundred per cent. They really make a surplus under that system which the public can afford to pay them.

Mr. KING. I do not doubt that what the Senator has said is accurate. I am merely calling attention to the fact that even under the cartel system of Germany the accumulation of large fortunes has been permitted. The huge turnover and the profits derived in the packing business is an example in the United States. The enormous turnover, notwithstanding a very small amount is made upon that turnover, in part, it is said, accounts for the huge fortunes which have been made by those interested in the packing business.

Mr. SMITH. I think perhaps I shall have occasion to say something more on this subject before the pending bill shall pass. I honestly confess that I feel humiliated, as a Member of the United States Senate, that I have to be forced to be a party protesting against the humiliating spectacle, to which we have been subjected for the last two or three years, of trying to get some roundabout way to serve the basic industry of this country. It is a reflection, if not a disgrace, upon every Senator sitting upon this floor that we have not fearlessly fixed this splendid system so that it would serve the purpose for which it was created.

Why, Mr. President, to show how there gets to be a habit of thought in reference to the man in the sticks, we provided under the rehabilitation of the War Finance Corporation that agriculture should have 12 months' credit through its cooperative societies. Senators will remember the fight we had as to whether the War Finance Corporation should cater to the individuals, or should cater to the individuals through a bank and through their cooperative society. At that stage of development I stood for the cooperative plan. There is a form of contract now existing with reference to the cotton cooperative marketing association, providing that the farmer must dispose of one-eighth or an average of one-eighth of his holdings each month, which means that he must dispose of all of it within eight months, when the law was supposed to give him 12 months. What better advertisement for the exploitation of the poor fellow whose cotton constitutes that pool than to serve notice on the public that each month one-eighth must go on the market? It is compulsory. What better advertisement would we want to put his head in the halter than that?

Now, I propose, unless that contract is modified, to offer an amendment to the War Finance Corporation act, providing that the cooperative society deriving financial loans from the War Finance Corporation shall have the right to sell in such quantities and at such times as they see fit within the 12 months. Of course it would be the duty of the War Finance Corporation to watch the trend of the market or to make loans upon such a margin as that they would be secure. Surely the net is spread in vain in the face of the bird. If we are going no further than we have, and if we compel him to sell one-eighth of his crop each month, he will be certain to have the prices so fixed that it will not be disposed of for his benefit.

Mr. President, I must apologize to the Senate for the length of time I have taken. I hope I have contributed something to clarify the situation, and I shall again speak upon the subject before the bill becomes a law.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, there is one item in the bill which I can not approve, although I would like to say that I regard the bill itself as a distinct step forward. I regard it as providing a number of exceedingly useful features, and while it might be accomplished in some other way I am grateful for the opportunity of participating in passing a measure which I believe will be of service to the country, although I do not think it meets the conditions as fully as it is highly desirable they should be met. If there were proper time and occasion, I think it could be very much improved. I think that the granting of the primary credits, for instance, of $5,000,000 to each of the banks and the establishment of a farm-credits department are very useful and valuable features, and I give it full-hearted approval both as to the purpose and as to the belief that it will serve a very useful end.

I have always thought of the reserve act, however, as an act intended for public rather than private purposes, as an act which ought to give stability to credits rather than to be used to destabilize credits; that the banks were not intended to be money-making banks, but that the capital which was furnished by the members of the system in the form of the reserve should be content with a reasonable profit upon the reserve. But they already, in the short time since the banks were established, have earned 100 per cent. That has been employed as a surplus and has been passed into the capital as a part of the earnings of the bank. That has already been accomplished. Six per cent interest has been earned besides, which has been paid to the banks, I believe, without exception. I have not recently examined the figures, but I think that has been done without exception.

Mr. McLEAN. May I say to the Senator that the Dallas bank has not earned a surplus of 100 per cent?

Mr. OWEN. It has not?

Mr. McLEAN. No.

Mr. OWEN. I did not intend to say that the banks had all earned 100 per cent. They had all earned 6 per cent and I thought nearly all of them had earned 100 per cent which had gone to surplus.

Some time ago the Congress provided that the banks should be content with 6 per cent earnings, but I observe that a 3 per cent additional earning has been given in the pending bill, on the theory that the banks, I suppose, ought to have a larger return.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no.

Mr. OWEN. I shall be very glad to know what the theory is.

Mr. LENROOT. The only theory or purpose of that was to give an inducement or incentive to the smaller State banks which have not come in to come into the system. There was no other purpose than that. There are, I believe, some 9,000 State banks not yet members of the Federal reserve system.

Mr. OWEN. Most of those State banks make their terms for accommodation through some national bank with which they are affiliated in one way or another, and while they do not pay directly to the system, I take it that the national banks which extend accommodation in the matter of existing rates see to it that they get their compensation from that source. Many of the State banks, I know, put their deposits with the national banks, and the national banks, out of their deposits thus obtained, expand the deposits in the reserve system.

Mr. LENROOT. It is true a great deal is done in that way, yet I think the Senator will agree that it would be very desir-

able to get the small State banks directly into the reserve system.

Mr. OWEN. I think it would be desirable to have them come in. All the great State banks and great State trust companies, of course, are in the system now. The Senator undoubtedly is referring to the little banks with small capital.

Mr. LENROOT. I am; and they are the ones who are primarily serving the agricultural needs.

Mr. OWEN. Those small banks have not come in to any great extent. But the provision to which I have referred gives a charge of 3 per cent additional upon the entire capital which is invested, which includes, I take it, the surplus which has already been accumulated of 100 per cent.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true.

Mr. OWEN. It means in reality more than 9 per cent upon the capital which is invested in the bank, so that the 3 per cent in reality represents twice that amount.

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator that 9 per cent is, however, below the average earnings of the banks of the country. We felt that it was important to invite the eligible State banks into the system and also to prevent banks which are already in the system from going out, as some of them are doing.

Mr. OWEN. I am very sure, although I have not seen the figures recently, that there can not be any substantial loss of membership in the system.

Mr. McLEAN. Nothing very substantial.

Mr. OWEN. Only enough for argument, perhaps.

Mr. McLEAN. One or two banks within the last two or three months.

Mr. OWEN. There must have been some particular reason why they left, and not because they were not receiving the additional 3 per cent on their ownership.

Mr. McLEAN. Probably that is so, but 9 per cent is below the average, which did not seem to the committee to be unreasonable.

Mr. OWEN. Six per cent is regarded by all the States of the Union, nearly without exception, except where the element of insurance enters into the question of the loan, as being a fair rate to earn.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes; a fair rate, but we are talking about profits now.

Mr. OWEN. I am talking about profits, too. This is an investment in the stock of the reserve banks which already has been doubled by the earnings in a few short years.

The reason why I call attention to the purpose of the Federal reserve act being to stabilize credits is because we saw that an inflation period took place. That was unavoidable because of the war, but it was not restrained as it might have been if we had had a sufficiently extended period of experience in handling the reserve system. We permitted an inflation period to go on, and we found that that went to an extreme, so that when the reaction of prices took place immediately following the war in 1919 and 1920, we reversed that policy rather suddenly and the consequence was we made an industrial depression more severe than otherwise it would have been. But if we hold out the idea of using the banks for the purpose of making profits, I think it would have a tendency on the part of those who are controlling the banks to extend credits for that purpose in order to earn profits, which I do not think ought to be done. I do not believe any credit should be extended by the banks except where it is essential to protect our industrial life and our commerce, because they are the reserve of business. They are not like the ordinary bank capital.

Mr. LENROOT. I am entirely in agreement with the Senator upon that point. It is just a question of whether the benefits to be gained by getting the small State banks into the system are sufficient to warrant the increase in the rate of dividends.

Mr. OWEN. I do not believe the State banks who are now not coming into the sytem would be led in by an increase of 3 per cent in the amount of interest they would get on what they might hold. For instance, let us take a bank with $10,000 capital and with, perhaps, $50,000 of deposits. Such a bank, putting in a reserve of 10 per cent, would have——

Mr. LENROOT. But a bank with $10,000 capital would not be eligible.

Mr. OWEN. Under the system it would be increased to $25,000, I believe?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. Then, take such a bank of $25,000 capital, with $150,000 deposits. Nine per cent of that would be about $13,000, and 3 per cent on $13,000 would be really a very small amount. I do not think it would be sufficient to induce the small banks to come into the system. When we come to take that out of the commerce of the country on the gigantic amount which is already in, it is imposing a tax upon the commerce of the country for the favor of the banks at large that does not justify the purpose in view. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. McLEAN. Does the Senator think that would be reflected in the discount rate?

Mr. OWEN. I was not speaking of the discount rate.

Mr. McLEAN. That is where they get their profits. Does the Senator think an additional 3 per cent on the capital——

Mr. OWEN. I was only speaking of 3 per cent on the investment of a $25,000-capital bank. It would be a very limited amount that they would get from it.

Mr. LENROOT. The profit comes out of the discount rate.

Mr. OWEN. But the Senator was speaking of inducing them to come into the system by giving them this additional rate. I am pointing out that it would be so small that I doubt if it would accomplish the end in view.

Mr. LENROOT. On the other side the query comes, Would the inducement of a 3 per cent rate influence the bank to give a lower rate of discount than it otherwise would for the purpose of making additional profits? I am frank to say I do not consider that vital.

Mr. OWEN. I do not think it is important to the bill at all. I think it might be very readily augmented. I am making this comment on it now because I know that the farmers of the country feel that the banks are already taxing commerce beyond the point of endurance. I, of course, have a very sympathetic relationship with the banks themselves. I established the first bank that Oklahoma had. I am still a director of it. I have been a stockholder in it and I am still interested in the banks from that end. But I do not believe it is a wise thing to put such a provision in the bill. A similar provision, in substance, has already passed in the Capper bill.

I merely wanted to express my dissent. That amounts to about all I wish to do, yet I would move, in order to modify the dissent, to strike out in section 7, page 13, in lines 16, 17, and 18, the words "when net earnings exceed 12 per cent an extra dividend of not to exceed 3 per cent may be distributed to stockholders, and" so that it would read:

> And thereafter the remaining net earnings, if any, shall be paid to the United States as an additional franchise tax.

I offer that as an amendment and ask that it may be printed and lie on the table for the present. I shall bring it up later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, a few days ago my friend, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who, I observe, is now in his seat, made a statement concerning appointments in the Post Office Department. It was very interesting, but I felt sure at the time that the Senator was somewhat mistaken as to the facts so far as they related to the State which I in part represent. I immediately called upon the Post Office Department and asked them for a statement of the facts touching appointments showing the percentage of appointees who had been taken from the highest on the list, and so forth. I ask unanimous consent to have that statement from the Postmaster General printed in the RECORD.

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

The statement is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1923.

Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with your request on the 19th instant, I am furnishing certain data regarding the appointment of postmasters at offices of the first, second, and third classes from March 4, 1921, to and including January 20, 1923.

The total number of appointments was 9,465. Of these appointments, 1,353 were promotions from the service, 276 of those promoted being women and 6 ex-service men; there were also 1,126 women appointed from eligible registers, 1,250 ex-service men appointed from eligible registers; and of the total number of 7,493 appointments from eligible registers 4,166 were the first on the register. Four hundred and fifty appointments were made where no eligibles were secured, 98 of these being women and 5 ex-service men. One hundred and sixty-nine appointments were made where examinations were not held, which included reappointments, appointments in the Territories of the United States, etc., 51 of these being women.

The total number of appointments in the State of Ohio was 336. Of these appointments 40 were promotions from the service, 11 of those promoted being women. There were also 34 women appointed from eligible registers, 46 ex-service men appointed from eligible registers, and of the total number of 281 appointments from eligible registers 142 were first on the register. Ten appointments were made where no eligibles were secured, one of these being a woman. Five appointments were made where examinations were not held, which included reappointments, etc.

In this connection my attention has been called to statements regarding the appointment of postmasters at Gainesboro and Rutherford, Tenn.

Regarding the appointment of a postmaster at Gainesboro, the records show that only one eligible was certified as a result of an

examination for postmaster at this office. In view of this fact the department recommended the promotion of Mr. Joseph M. Dudney, a rural carrier at Gainesboro since September 1, 1907, his record being clear. As the Civil Service Commission reported that he was eligible for promotion, his nomination was submitted to the Senate on December 20.

Regarding the post office at Rutherford, Tenn., the records show that as a result of an examination held on August 13, 1921, the following were certified as the highest three eligibles:

William W. Taylor (preference).
Lowell C. Rickman (preference).
Terrence A. Bone (preference).

Subsequently the Civil Service Commission requested that the papers of the examination in this case be returned to that office for review. After reviewing the papers in the case the commission advised that all of the ratings previously given had been changed, and submitted a revised register, as follows:

Mrs. Claris E. Akin.
William W. Taylor (preference).
Lowell C. Rickman (preference).

Mr. Lowell C. Rickman withdrew his candidacy in a telegram dated March 27, 1922, making Terrence A. Bone third on the register.

Mrs. Claris E. Akin, the first eligible, was nominated on April 31, 1922, but failed of confirmation, and she was appointed acting postmaster, effective July 17, 1922. Again on November 23, 1922, Mrs. Akin's name was submitted to the Senate, but was rejected by that body on December 4 last.

The question of the appointment of some other person as postmaster at this office is now receiving consideration by the department.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WORK.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in reference to the statement presented by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] I wish to call attention to a statement that was made here by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] the other day in reference to the appointment of postmasters through civil-service examination, in which, as I recall, the Senator from Nebraska said that both parties had violated the civil-service rules.

Just before the last administration went out of power the then Postmaster General sent out a letter in order to ascertain the political affiliations of postmasters who had been appointed under civil-service rules during the Wilson administration. Some time ago the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] placed in the RECORD a statement which shows that substantially about 45 per cent of all the postmasters appointed under the civil-service rules under the Wilson administration were Republicans and about 55 per cent were Democrats. That included, of course, the 11 Southern States, where a very large preponderance of Democratic postmasters were appointed. Not counting those 11 States, in the remainder of the country a majority of the postmasters appointed were Republicans in their party affiliations. I should like to have printed in the RECORD, so that it may appear in connection with the statement which has been printed at the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], the statement to which I have referred.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
February 26, 1921.

Since the President's order of March 31, 1917, applying the nonpartisan civil-service test to the selection of presidential postmasters, appointments to these offices have gone to the candidate first on the list of eligibles furnished by the Civil Service Commission, and the Post Office Department has had no record indicating the political affiliations of the several successful candidates.

The assertion has frequently been made that this order has not been conscientiously administered. To show whether this charge is true and to ascertain just how the application of the civil-service principle has operated in eliminating partisanship and establishing service as the standard of fitness for appointment, the following letter was, on February 12, 1921, addressed to postmasters who have been appointed under this system:

"On March 31, 1917, the President issued an Executive order whereby appointments to presidential post offices were made as the result of an open competitive examination, the result thereof being certified by the Civil Service Commission to the Postmaster General, who submitted to the President the name of the highest qualified eligible for appointment, unless it was established that the character or residence of such applicant disqualified him for appointment.

"In accordance with this order you were appointed postmaster, the appointment being based solely on merit, as shown by the result of the examination. It is now claimed by some that in making these appointments the department has shown discrimination for political reasons. The department is without knowledge of the political affiliations of those appointed under the Executive order, as politics was not considered. It will be to the interest of the service to demonstrate that there has been an impartial administration of this order. As all appointments have been submitted to the Senate, it can not affect the selection or appointment of anyone, and in order to enable the department to answer this charge, which is unfounded, you will state in the space below your political affiliations.

"It is not desired to know how you voted in any particular election or whether you voted for any particular candidate, but the party with which you usually affiliate."

There have been three points of attack upon the Post Office Department in an effort to discredit the sincerity of the President's order applying the civil-service principle to the appointment of residential postmasters. This disposes of the last of these attacks.

The first allegation was that the eligible having the highest standing was set aside and some one of lower standing appointed where party politics could be served by the attack. This charge was disposed of by citation of the record, which showed that of 1,560 appointments then made 1,454 had gone to persons whose names appeared first on the eligible list submitted by the Civil Service Commission, and that where the first eligibles were not appointed it was because of their death, declination, or some disability.

The next false accusation was that the Post Office Department failed to recognize the preference given to ex-service men under the law. In response to a resolution of the Senate on this subject the Postmaster General submitted a list showing the names of applicants for these offices who passed successfully the examination held by the Civil Service Commission. Applicants certified to the commission as entitled to preference on account of military service having been nominated to the Senate for confirmation, the department appointed either first eligibles or gave the preference over first eligibles to veterans according to the demands of the best interest of the service.

The Postmaster General's reply to this resolution gives a list of 218 nominations sent to the Senate, but not confirmed, who were entitled to preference for military service, 90 of the nominees not being the highest eligibles. There is also given a list of 49 who for sufficient reasons were not given preference over the higher eligibles, some having declined or withdrawn their applications, some disqualified by age, some being canceled by the Civil Service Commission, and some for some other disqualifying cause.

The records show statistically that there has been no political bias in making appointments under the President's order of March 31, 1917; that the first eligible has invariably been appointed unless disqualified, and that preference has been given to eligibles with military service except where this could not be done without injury to the service.

Replies have been received from 2,103 postmasters to the letter above set forth, which, of course, removes beyond cavil the question of their party affiliation. These replies cover every State in the Union and show that, including all sections, 1,012 appointees were Democrats, 907 were Republicans, 32 were independent, 10 were Prohibitionists, 3 were Socialists, 129 had no affiliation, and 10 failed to state their affiliation.

Omitting the 11 Southern States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia—overwhelmingly Democratic in their population—the equation stands 598 Democrats, 846 Republicans, 26 independents, 9 Prohibitionists, 3 Socialists, 95 without affiliation, 9 blank, and 6 dead.

Even in the 11 almost solidly Democratic States a considerable number of Republicans received appointment as postmasters under the application of this civil-service order. In Alabama 6 Republicans were appointed postmasters, in Arkansas 5, in Florida 7, in Georgia 6, in Kentucky 5, in Louisiana 4, in Mississippi 1, in North Carolina 9, in South Carolina 2, in Texas 11, and in Virginia 5.

In States where the population is more evenly divided between the two great political parties, the appointment of Republicans frequently preponderated. In California, 33 Republicans and 14 Democrats were appointed; in Colorado, 10 Republicans and 15 Democrats; in Connecticut, 10 Republicans and 5 Democrats; in Delaware, 1 Republican and 2 Democrats; in Idaho, 11 Republicans and 5 Democrats; in Illinois, 62 Republicans and 33 Democrats; in Indiana, 19 Republicans and 29 Democrats; in Iowa, 63 Republicans and 19 Democrats; in Kansas, 29 Republicans and 20 Democrats; in Maine, 18 Republicans and 10 Democrats; in Maryland, 4 Republicans and 10 Democrats; in Massachusetts, 20 Republicans and 6 Democrats; in Michigan, 46 Republicans and 16 Democrats; in Minnesota, 55 Republicans and 15 Democrats; in Missouri, 18 Republicans and 54 Democrats; in Montana, 25 Republicans and 10 Democrats; in Nebraska, 55 Republicans and 21 Democrats; in Nevada, 2 Republicans and 1 Democrat; in New Hampshire, 7 Republicans and 4 Democrats; in New Jersey, 21 Republicans and 11 Democrats; in New Mexico, 3 Republicans and 7 Democrats; in New York, 40 Republicans and 36 Democrats; in North Dakota, 26 Republicans and 16 Democrats; in Ohio, 34 Republicans and 29 Democrats; in Oklahoma, 26 Republicans and 61 Democrats; in Oregon, 11 Republicans and 5 Democrats; in Pennsylvania, 55 Republicans and 37 Democrats; in Rhode Island, 1 Democrat; in South Dakota, 27 Republicans and 18 Democrats; in Tennessee, 8 Republicans and 24 Democrats; in Utah, 4 Republicans and 4 Democrats; in Vermont, 3 Republicans and 3 Democrats; in Washington, 23 Republicans and 10 Democrats; in West Virginia, 10 Republicans and 31 Democrats; in Wisconsin, 54 Republicans and 7 Democrats; and in Wyoming, 10 Republicans and 3 Democrats.

One Prohibitionist, 1 Socialist, and 1 having no affiliation were appointed from California. One Prohibitionist and 1 of no affiliation were appointed from Idaho. In Illinois there were 1 Independent, 1 Prohibitionist, and 7 of no affiliation. In Iowa there were 2 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 9 of no affiliation. In Kansas, 1 prohibitionist and 9 of no affiliation. In Massachusetts, 2 Independents. In Michigan there were 2 Independents and 4 of no affiliation. In Minnesota, 2 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 7 without affiliation, In Missouri, 1 Independent and 4 without affiliation. In Nebraska there were 2 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 11 without affiliation. In New York there were 1 Independent, 1 Socialist, and 3 without affiliation. In Ohio, 2 Independents and 5 without affiliation. In Oklahoma there were 2 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 3 without affiliation. In Texas there were 2 Independents and 8 without affiliation. In South Carolina, 1 Prohibitionist and 1 without affiliation. In Vermont, 1 Independent. Virginia, 2 without affiliation. In Washington, 1 Independent and 1 without affiliation; and in Wisconsin, 3 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 4 without affiliation.

The nonpartisan operation of the President's order applying civil-service rules to these appointments is indicated by the correspondence conveying this information, as well as by the statistics assembled. One postmaster writes, "At time of my appointment I was Republican county chairman," and another says, "Have been Republican county chairman for 10 years." Another Republican postmaster says, "The charge of political discrimination by your department is unfounded."

Another Republican postmaster writes:

"I was one of the six who took the examination for this position. I was the only one who was a Republican; the rest were Democrats; two boasted of party influence. I simply took the exam. I had taught in grammar and high school; been superintendent of schools for 25 years, and for 2 years had been treasurer and head bookkeeper of a corporation doing some thousands of dollars a week of business. I felt if I did not get the position there must be something wrong about

"civil service," but I got it, although in the "wrong" party. I never voted a Democratic ticket in my life." * * *

Another Republican writes:

"I am returning to-day answer to your inquiry as to my party affiliation. I do not think, however, that the mere statement that I am and always have been a Republican is sufficient answer in my case to the inquiry.

"For 40 years I have edited Republican newspapers in * * *. More than 30 of those years I edited newspapers in this city. They were not merely Republican in name. I was regarded as a radical, uncompromising, "stand-pat" Republican. With that record I entered the contest for the * * * post office when it was announced that civil-service rules would govern the appointment.

"When the Civil Service Commission made its report I was the highest on the list, and my name was certified to Postmaster General Burleson, who promptly recommended me for appointment, and President Wilson at once made the appointment as recommended. If there is any question or doubt as to the fairness or consistency of the administration in living up to its pledges in this line, my own case should be sufficient to prove the doubt groundless. I desire to give my testimony as to the absolute fairness of the department in making these appointments."

After stating his party affiliation, one says:

"I feel that I should further state that I have affiliated with the Republican Party for the past 20 years.

"So far as I have been able to ascertain, the question of politics did not enter into either the examination or my subsequent appointment to this office."

One of those who disavowed any political affiliation said:

"The commission certainly never showed political favoritism in my appointment. The other candidate was a Democrat, while I lived with my father, who is a lifelong Republican and has been the judge of every election in this place for 20 years."

Another letter from a Republican shows that a very narrow margin of superiority in his rating was sufficient to secure his appointment. He says:

"I wish to state that I was appointed because I made the highest grade in the competitive examination, beating the next highest by only fifty-five one-hundredths of a point.

"This appointment came promptly and without the use of any outside influence, and I consider that the department has lived up to the letter and meaning of President Wilson's wise order."

A Republican writes:

"I received the appointment but did not accept; but I always felt that the order was administered impartially."

Another Republican says:

"I believe it my duty to express my candid and sincere belief in the impartial administration of the Executive order of March 31, 1917. Long before I received my appointment and up to the present time I have followed through the press the action of the department in making appointments, and it is my frank belief that it has been impartial in every respect."

A postmaster who reports himself as being a Democrat says:

"William took the examination at the same time I did. * * * We were competitors for the office. He was an ex-service man, wounded in 'no man's land,' and a Republican. My standing was much higher than his in the examination, but he was appointed postmaster at this office. I was glad of it; would not have taken the examination had I known he was going to take it. He resigned and I was appointed in his stead."

A Republican writes:

"I was treated with absolute fairness in every step of procedure from the time of taking the examination until I received my appointment as postmaster. I shall be glad to render any further aid in this matter that you may see fit to ask. The merit system as established by Executive order should be retained as a permanent thing or part of the Postal Service."

An independent writes:

"The records of the department will show that my appointment was bitterly opposed by the pie-eating Democrats and indorsed by the leading business men regardless of political faith. * * * On account of this opposition there was one or more investigations, and your inspector called on every business house in the city and got a personal expression from them on my appointment. * * *

"Have voted for the following men: Bryan, President Wilson, Senator CAPPER for governor and Senator, and Governor Allen. This is why I was not considered a deserving Democrat, and the chairman of the Democratic central committee did all in his power to prevent my appointment."

Another postmaster says:

"I have always been a Republican, first, last, and all the time, and nothing was said in my application or any correspondence from the department relative to my politics, and if the matter was ever discussed at any time I had no knowledge of it and am sure that the department did not know my party affiliation at the time of my appointment."

One postmaster says that prior to his appointment it had been reported in his community that appointments were being made without regard to the civil-service order, and that he was urged to believe that he would stand no chance of appointment on account of not being a Democrat:

"I refused to believe such information"—

he says—

"for, having read the Executive order very carefully, I reached only one conclusion, that merit alone would be the deciding factor. And the results proved my decision, for had it not been for the Executive order under which I took my examination with an equal opportunity with all the other candidates, I would not be the postmaster at * * * today. For, being a Republican, I would have had no chance if the matter was to be decided politically.

"I am frank to say that I fail to see where there are any facts to base this criticism upon. In fact, if it was to be political and one party favored, then why was the order issued?

"In the judgment of the writer, while a Republican, and should any changes be made, the postmaster stands in line for continuous service, yet I believe the order was one of the finest things issued from the Executive Office, for it removes all political squabbles for the postmasterships and places them upon a competitive basis. The result will be, not as often would happen, incompetency, but highest efficiency. I sincerely hope that the new administration will go one step farther and place the postmasters under the classified civil service. This will be a great step forward.

"I will further add that when I took my examination I was warned in writing by the commission not to mention religion or politics anywhere.

"It would certainly be of interest and value, I think, if the result of your inquiry could be sent to all the postmasters."

Another Republican whose appointment came as a surprise says:

"The inclosed communication does not call for more information than stated on the blank spaces, but I think my case is just a little different than most appointments. I served four terms as postmaster in this office from 1898 to 1914. When the postmaster who succeeded me resigned I was requested by patrons of the office to take up the examination. I could not see any reason for appointing a Republican, but to test the new rule of civil service I submitted my papers and was very much surprised when I received notice that I was at the head of the list and was appointed postmaster. There certainly was no political influence in my case. Had I known that the post-office appointments were going back to politics, I never would have given up a good position to come back."

Another says:

"I desire to advise that absolutely no political, religious, or fraternal affiliations were mentioned in the appointment of the postmaster at * * *. I have been a lifelong Republican and received my appointment solely on merit after passing the highest grade in the civil-service examination for the position."

One postmaster says:

"I am in possession of three commissions signed by Republican Presidents for postmaster at another office of the third class, and at the examination held for postmaster at * * * the other applicant was a Democrat and chairman of the precinct committee, so I can truthfully state that there was no discrimination shown in this case for political or other reasons. The Hon FRANK W. MONDELL will verify that he has recommended me to the previous appointments as postmaster under a Republican administration, and am satisfied that the ruling of March 31, 1917, was strictly adhered to in this case. Any further information will be cheerfully supplied."

One of the postmasters who is a Democrat writes:

"I am glad to state that in making my appointment the department adhered strictly to the presidential order of March 31, 1917. The department had no knoweldge at that time of my party preference, as I made no reference thereto on the papers I submitted with my application. As a matter of fact, I had the combined opposition of both major parties in my own town, and also the opposition of the Congressman from my district. Had the appointment been made from a political standpoint I certainly would not have received it. My appointment was due to the fact that I received the highest grade in the competitive examination."

An independent says:

"Have always been strictly an independent in politics, not affiliated with any political party, but guided entirely by the issues and men presented in each campaign. Have twice voted for a Republican President and three times for a Democratic President. During the past 20 years, with one or two exceptions, I have supported the Republican Members of Congress, and generally speaking have supported the Republican State ticket. At the time I was appointed postmaster here my appointment was strongly opposed by every Democratic politician in the State." * * *

In another instance of a Democrat being appointed the postmaster writes:

"When the civil-service examination was held to fill the position as postmaster at this office four applicants contested; three Democrats and one Republican.

"The Democrat who had the indorsement of the Democratic organization, and who had secured the appointment as acting postmaster at this office, stood third in the examination, and the Republican stood fourth, and I stood first, and in compliance with the Executive order I was nominated for the position.

"The department did not know or ask what my political affiliation was. I am convinced I could have never secured the appointment on a political basis."

A Republican writes that he was rejected by the local board in August, 1917 (draft), because of bad eyes and that his attention was called to the President's Executive order relative to the competitive appointment of postmasters and advised to take the examination. Of the four applicants who took the examination, he says:

"The other three were affiliated with the Democratic Party and two have been candidates for other offices. I and my father before me have always been affiliated with the Republican Party.

"No information was asked of me at any time as to my political affiliations, and I can say further that the Democratic committeemen from this precinct worked for one of the candidates and that a friend of another of the candidates who happened to be at the Capitol, made a special call in the interests of his friend, and I can also say further that one of the applicants also had petitions signed by about 25 asking for his appointment."

A Democrat, explaining how he got into office says (names being omitted):

"Politics did not enter into the appointment of the postmaster at * * * in any way.

"* * * A Republican had charge of the office at the beginning of the present administration. Soon after his time expired and an examination was held to fill the vacancy.

"He * * * and I * * * took the examination. His grade was three or four points higher than mine and he was given the position and held it five years. His health failed and he appointed his son * * * assistant.

"The office was then raised to the third class and an examination was held for third-class postmasters to fill the position at * * *. This son * * * and I took the examination. But before the appointment was made * * * resigned to take a better position in a bank, and I was appointed postmaster.

"There was no politics in it at all. It was not even suggested. The same thing happened at * * *. A Republican and a Democrat took the examination. The Republican was given the position because he passed the best examination."

It is frequently said in letters by postmasters who avow themselves to be Democrats that no political influence was used to secure their appointments and that though they were Democrats their political affiliation was not known or inquired into. One Democrat says:

"In connection with the inclosure I might say that I filed my application for the local post office, passed the examination, and was appointed and confirmed without at any time writing or asking anyone either in public or private life for any assistance. My politics could

not have been known to anyone handling the matter unless such persons on his own initiative discovered what my politics were and if this was done I do not know anything about it."

One Republican postmaster closes his communication with this suggestion:

"The Republican Party will do well to copy the Democratic Party in the matter of post-office appointments. A lot of my friends thought there would be no use for me to take the examination for postmaster on account of being a Republican, but politics did not enter into the matter at all. The Democratic Party has been very fair, as far as I am concerned, and the Republican Party will make a mistake if the old political spoils system is employed in making post-office appointments."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. Has the Senator from Tennessee separate figures as to first, second, and third class post offices as distinguished from fourth-class post offices?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not examined the statement with care, but I think so. However, I call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the statement which will be found printed in the RECORD in the morning.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate now by going into the civil-service question, which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] have incidentally brought up, but the Senator from Tennessee referred to a statement made by me the other day and has offered some document to be printed in the RECORD, to which I have no possible objection, I presume in partial answer to what I stated.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that so long as Senators and Representatives defend the party to which they belong in the administration of the civil service law and only complain when the opposite political party is in power we will never get very far in a fair administration of the civil service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope I did not misquote in any way the Senator from Nebraska. I did not intend to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think the Senator did.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator that I think he is correct in his statement. I think it is the duty of Senators on both sides of the Chamber to see, to the best of their ability, that the civil-service rules are carried out, whatever may be the administration in power. I merely produced the figures embodied in the document presented by me because they seemed to give the other side. I have no doubt that under the Democratic administration there were violations of the civil-service rules when there ought not to have been.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have called attention to many such violations from time to time, and I do not intend to go over them again now, but I wish to call attention to just one instance of the many to which I have heretofore called the attention of the Senate. I refer to the Government Printing Office. I presented to the Senate or had printed—and I think the statement was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; it ought to have been, if it was not—two columns from the page of a newspaper referring entirely to the Government Printing Office and showing demotions and promotions, and in every case a Republican was demoted and a Democrat promoted. That was under a Democratic administration. It has been the same way, to a great extent, everywhere; and one reason why is because, although we promise the people that we will enforce the civil service law fairly, when we get into power we forget our promise and do not do it.

I have, Mr. President, not defended my own party in that respect. I said the other day on the floor of the Senate that I thought we had done worse than the Democrats, so far as post offices were concerned; that it looked that way to me. We either ought to make good our promises or stop making promises, one or the other, and we ought to be just as ready to condemn violations of the civil service law where they are perpetrated by members of our party or officers of our party as though they were perpetrated by somebody else. But whenever a charge is made against a Democratic administration we see Democrats coming to the relief, and whenever a charge is made against the administration of a Republican official of the civil service we see Republicans coming to the relief.

I believe in the civil service; I think we must have it in order to have an efficient Government, but I have repeatedly stated that I have perfect respect for those who do not agree with me; they may be right, but I think they are wrong. If, however, a majority of Congress thinks they are right, then we ought to wipe off the statute books the civil service law and stop pretending something which we do not believe and claiming a virtue which we do not possess.

CORWIN'S ARTICLE ON TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this week's issue of the New Republic contains a very able article on "Tax-exempt securities," by Edward S. Corwin, professor of jurisprudence at Princeton University and the author of several books on constitutional law. The article reviews the decisions of the Supreme Court on this question. In view of the constitutional amendment in reference to tax-exempt securities which is now pending in Congress, it seems to me that the article is a valuable contribution to the discussion of the subject, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type.

There being no objection, the article referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES.

That a Constitution framed for an agricultural community with a population of 3,000,000 should still, after 135 years, furnish the basis of government for a highly industrialized Nation of 110,000,000 souls, the majority of whom are city dwellers, is a frequent theme for marvel; and the explanation usually forthcoming is that the decisions of the Supreme Court have kept the Constitution flexible—have, in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, "adapted" it "to the various crises of human affairs." The explanation has unquestionably this limited truth: The Supreme Court has not always, or even generally, followed the narrowest possible reading of the Constitution. On the other hand, it should be remembered that the court is not an originating body, that the utmost it can do is to ratify what Congress or the President has initiated, and that its distinctive rôle is one of control rather than of instigation. Furthermore, there are occasions when desirable policy encounters constitutional difficulties which are clearly not due to the Constitution as it would be construed by an intelligent man reading it at first hand, but to a sophisticated gloss upon it to be found in the decisions. For instance, consider the growing embarrassment with which the ever increasing quantity of governmental bonds exempt from taxation confronts both the National and the State Governments to-day. I venture to suggest the question whether a constitutional amendment is really necessary to meet this situation—whether, in other words, the Constitution is not already a good enough Constitution so far as this matter is concerned.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land; constitutional law—the decisions of the court—is only derivative law. The whole body of doctrine upon which the exemption of governmental securities from taxation rests—so far as such exemption is not a voluntary donation from a State or the National Government—is simply judge-made law, for which the text of the Constitution furnishes not a single peg; and what is more, it is to-day judge-made law which later law from the same source goes far to discredit.

The starting point is furnished by the famous decision in McCulloch *v.* Maryland (4 Wheaton, 316; 1819), in which the court, speaking through Marshall, held that Maryland was not entitled to tax the business of a branch of the United States Bank at Baltimore. In the course of his opinion the Chief Justice advances three different reasons for this holding: First, he says, it would be wrong for one sovereignty to tax the agencies of another; but then "waiving this theory," he, in the second place, invokes the supremacy of the National Government within its sphere of action; finally, he indicates that Congress impliedly exempted the bank from State taxation in the act of establishing it.

But in the later case of Osborn *v.* The Bank (9 Wheat. 738, 1821) he bases the bank's exemption exclusively upon this last ground; and this is obviously the correct ground, invoking as it does no extraconstitutional theories but simply the power of Congress to pass "all laws necessary and proper" to keep the National Government and its agencies functioning efficiently. And this, moreover, is the doctrine to-day so far as national banks are concerned, their taxation by the States being regulated in all respects by section 5219 of the Revised Statutes. Why, then, should not the same rule apply to national bonds? And if it does, why a constitutional amendment for the purpose of subjecting such bonds to taxation by the States as property in the hands of their owners? It may be added that even as matters stand they are taxable as part of an inheritance.

Let us now turn to the other side of the problem—the exemption of State and local bonds from national taxation. The leading case is Collector *v.* Day (11 Wall. 113, 1870), in which the court held that the salary of a State judge was not subject

to a national income tax. The argument of the court owes something to the first of the three grounds advanced by Marshall in the McCulloch case, but flatly contradicts the second ground and ignores the third. Far more important, however, as a source of this decision was Marshall's celebrated dictum in the earlier case that "the power to tax involves the power to destroy." This being so, the court argued in effect: If we permit Congress to tax the salary of a State judge at all, it may tax all salaries of all State judges to extinction, and thus destroy the State judiciaries. Unfortunately the court overlooked the obvious fact that in taxing the salaries of State judges to the point of extinction by a general income tax Congress would be taxing all other incomes to extinction also, and so nobody would have any money left wherewith to pay State judges their salaries. The doctrine of the decision is in truth the veriest nonsense and is not supported in the remotest way by a single word in the Constitution; on the contrary, as already suggested, it flies in the face of the supremacy which is guaranteed by the Constitution to acts of Congress made in pursuance of it, "anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The one thing that may be urged in partial extenuation of the court's action in Collector *v.* Day is a possible fear on its part that Congress might some time undertake to tax the salaries of State officials as such; but it should have waited for that highly improbable situation to arise, when it could have reminded Congress of the guaranty which by Article IV of the Constitution the United States extends to every State in this Union of a republican form of government.

But remote as the danger was in 1870, it is still more remote to-day on account of the principles which have been since developed against all sorts of rankly discriminatory legislation. In the light of recent doctrine it may indeed be questioned if an act which imposed a special tax upon salaries of State officials or upon incomes derived from State and municipal bonds could be considered a tax in the constitutional sense, such a classification not being a reasonable one for purposes of taxation. (See Brushaber *v.* Union Pacific Co., 240 U. S. 1, and the recent Child Labor case.) The doctrine of Collector *v.* Day and of the decisions following in its track is in short out of date. Furthermore, the logic of it has been abandoned by the court itself. Thus in Flint *v.* Stone Tracy Co. (220 U. S. 107, 1910) the Supreme Court sustained the right of Congress to tax the privilege of doing business as a corporation. It is difficult to see how a general income tax which incidentally taxes incomes from municipal and State bonds is a tax on the State's borrowing power if a special tax on the privilege of doing business as a corporation is not a tax on the power of the State to charter corporations. As a matter of fact, any such view of the effect of a general income tax involves a fine-spun theory of the incidence of taxation which may be interesting for purposes of speculation, but from a practical point of view is deserving only of impatient rejection.

But at this point in my argument I can see the widows and orphans—who are invariably the owners of governmental bonds when any question of their taxation is to the fore—showing signs of acute nervousness, and presently an indignant protest is launched against any attempt to discredit a principle on the faith of which, first and last, billions of securities have been bought and sold. Is the Supreme Court, the question is put, which stands by to see that the States pass no laws impairing the obligation of contracts, to be asked to do that very thing by overturning a decision of half a century standing? The question seems a formidable one, but I believe it can be met. There is really no need of overturning Collector *v.* Day and its successors to date, thus canceling the immunities they confer upon earlier issues of securities, provided only the Supreme Court, recognizing the inherent weakness of those decisions, repairs with a fresh mind to the interpretation of the sixteenth amendment as cases affecting issues of later date come before it.

The sixteenth amendment reads as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

That this language should not be given a retrospective application has just been conceded, but why should it not be held to determine the law in all other respects? What could be more comprehensive than the words "from whatever source derived"? Nor is it perceived by what rule of logic or syntax the ensuing phrases subtract from the literal force thereof.

Nevertheless, it is insisted that it was not the intention of those who framed the amendment to enlarge Congress's power in the way of taxing incomes, but only to relieve it of a certain mode of procedure; that the immediate occasion of the amendment was the decision in Pollock *v.* The Farmers Loan & Trust Co. (157 U. S. 429; 158 U. S. 601; 1895) that taxes on incomes derived from property were "direct," and so required apportionment; that the objection was raised against the amendment while it was pending that it would enable the National Government to tax incomes from State and municipal bonds, and was refuted by supporters of the amendment. However, the answer is clear. It was in this very Pollock case that the doctrine was first explicitly announced—on the basis of Collector *v.* Day, to be sure—that incomes from State and municipal bonds were exempt from taxation by the National Government; and if it was the intention of the framers of the amendment to overcome that decision in part, why not in whole? Why should they have wished to make two bites of the cherry? Again, the objection mentioned was raised by quite as good authority as that by which it was answered—perhaps better, since Mr. Hughes has subsequently sat on the Supreme Court, an honor which has never befallen Mr. Root. But finally, in view of the explicit language of the amendment, the intentions of its framers are a matter of absolutely no importance. For the court to abandon the solid footing of the words of the amendment in order to embark on a voyage of discovery for the intentions of the Congress which proposed it and the 40 or so legislatures which ratified it would be an outright repudiation of the rules of constitutional construction (see e. g. Addystone Pipe & Steel Co., 175 U. S. 211).

But it is urged further that the Supreme Court itself has adopted the view that the sixteenth amendment was not intended to enlarge Congress's power of taxing incomes. What is meant is that certain justices have expressed this view obiter, for the point has not been directly involved in any case to date. The most debatable case is that of Evans *v.* Gore (253 U. S. 245; 1919), in which the court held that to assess an income tax against a salary of a judge of the United States who was in office when the tax was enacted would amount to a dimunition of salary contrary to article 3, section 1, of the Constitution. In other words, the general terms of the sixteenth amendment leave this more specific provision still operative. But that is far from saying that the amendment leaves standing a mere doctrine which can claim no such support from the language of the instrument, albeit this doctrine was brought sharply to the attention of the framers of the amendment, so that they might easily have chosen terms to safeguard it.

Approached without preconceptions, the sixteenth amendment clearly gives the power to tax incomes from municipal and State bonds, as well as the salaries of State officials, by a general income tax. The perplexity of otherwise intelligent citizens when they are told, on the authority of Collector *v.* Day and the Pollock case, that the contrary is the fact is ample proof of this assertion. Nor, indeed, is there any good reason why the owners of such securities or the recipients of such salaries should not be called upon to discharge to the full the normal duties of national good citizenship. As was remarked above, any attempt by Congress to discriminate unfavorably in such cases would raise radically different questions, but, contrariwise, there is no constitutional reason why it should discriminate favorably.

To sum up: The question of tax-exempt securities presents four aspects: (1) The exemption of national securities from national taxation is obviously a matter which rests with Congress alone, consequently no constitutional amendment is necessary to cure this phase of the mischief. (2) The exemption of State and municipal securities from local taxation is likewise a matter which rests with the State; so again no constitutional amendment is demanded. (3) The exemption of national securities from State taxation is, it seems clear, a matter to be determined by Congress within the broad limits set by the "necessary and proper" clause; consequently no constitutional amendment is required to abate this phase of the evil. (4) Finally, the exemption of incomes derived from State and municipal bonds, from national income taxation, which never rested on any better foundation than a highly vulnerable precedent of constitutional law, has been done away with by the simple, literal reading of the sixteenth amendment. By this amendment Congress may tax incomes "from whatever source derived." Words could not be clearer unless, perhaps, to adapt a saying of the late Judge Gaynor, Congress had chosen to add, "these words mean what they say."

In short, no constitutional amendment dealing with this subject is necessary, and none should be proposed by Congress which might in any way prejudice the speedy determination of the question on the basis of the existing Constitution, the way

for which should be facilitated by the necessary changes in the present income tax law. If in reaching a proper result the court should find it desirable to overrule Evans *v.* Gore, that, too, would be all to the good.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

MUSTAPHA KEMAL—CONDITIONS IN NEAR EAST.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a remarkable address to the American people by Mustapha Kemal, leader of Turkey. I do not wish to take up any time of the Senate to read it, but it is something which every Senator and Member should see, for here is a man who speaks the American language, though he be a Turk; a man who is highly educated; one who is informed with regard to the history of the nations of the world; a man who declares with authority the purpose of the nationalists of Turkey, what they are trying to accomplish. He is entitled to a hearing. What he declares, in substance, is that they are striving to get rid of outside domination so that the Turks may develop their own life in their own way, just as our forefathers established this Republic. I believe that the American people are in favor of having Turkey enjoy territorial integrity and political independence; and that the American people do not wish to see the Allies or any nation in the world invade Turkey and deprive the Turks of their political independence in any way whatever. I ask, without reading, to have printed in the RECORD this address, together with the interview of Mustapha Kemal, with regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

KEMAL DEMANDS ABSOLUTE INDEPENDENCE FOR TURKEY—IS READY TO RESUME WAR—TURKISH NATIONALIST LEADER, WHO SELECTS GEORGE WASHINGTON AS HIS MODEL, URGES AMERICANS TO UNDERSTAND TURKS' INTENSE DESIRE FOR LIBERTY—SAYS FOREIGN PROPAGANDA BLINDS EYES HERE—FREEDOM FOR ALL, BUT NO SPECIAL PRIVILEGES, ESPECIALLY FOR CHRISTIANS—ASKS JUSTICE, BUT RELIES ON ARMY—PLANS FOR NATIONAL REJUVENATION.

TEXT OF MUSTAPHA KEMAL'S ADDRESS TO AMERICAN PEOPLE.

(By Mustapha Kemal.)

To the great American Nation:

You have expelled tyranny and despotism from your country. You have obtained and established your freedom and independence after a long and sanguinary struggle, and you have built up a civilized, strong, democratic State based upon the sovereignty of the people.

On the opposite side of the earth there is to-day another nation that is struggling and shedding blood for the same aims of freedom, independence, and democracy. They seek to blind your eyes to the purity and elevation of those aims. The authors of this propaganda are either ignorant fanatics or the agents of those who are openly or secretly fighting against us to frustrate and destroy our newly won liberty. Do not believe calumniators.

Keep your hearts open to the Turkish people, who are fighting for freedom and independence, and sincerely striving to become an element of progress and justice in the world, like yourselves.

(Copyright, 1923, by the New York Herald.)

[Special cable dispatch.]

ANGORA, January 24.—To be registered in history as the George Washington of his country is the characteristic ambition best picturing the personality of Mustapha Kemal Pasha, the national hero of Turkey resuscitated.

"The great George Washington, foremost modern pioneer of liberty, who won independence for his country by driving out the foreign despots oppressing it, is the man whose example inspires and influences me most deeply," was Kemal's spontaneous reply to the question which great character in history he chiefly admired.

Those words are a revelation of Kemal's past achievements as well as future hopes. Like that great American whom he passionately desires to emulate, he has vanquished the foe in the field and is ready to devote his genius to peaceful organization of the nation he has liberated, but nothing except complete and absolute independence of his country will satisfy him, and if the great European powers can not yet bring themselves to recognize it he is prepared to resume and carry on the struggle until force of arms imposes it upon their comprehension.

FROM OBSCURITY TO MASTERSHIP.

This man who has led the Turkish people to final victory after 10 years of misfortunes and defeats is not quite 43 years old. Three years ago, although his brilliant defense of the Dardanelles during the Great War had attracted the attention of military specialists, his name was practically unknown to the world. Disgraced by Enver Pasha, who sensed a dangerous rival, he lived apparently an idle life of pleasure in Constantinople during the early days of the allied occupation while secretly forming a nucleus of devoted patriots with whose aid he suddenly launched that desperate coup in Anatolia which was eventually to make him master of the situation in the Near East.

No visitor upon whom Kemal fixes the strange, concentric gaze of steel blue eyes, rendered uncannily intuitive and inscrutable by the slightest possible squint, can doubt for an instant he is in the presence of a born leader of men. There is no escaping that enveloping omniscient squint, which seems to have the power to read all hidden thoughts and penetrate all the secrets and motives of men, and it must be an alarming experience indeed to come before him with a bad conscience or an insincere heart.

IS "GUEST" OF HIS ARMY.

Kemal's house in Angora is called "Echoing Rock," because of the isolated stony eminence upon which it stands, dominating the sprawling town on the flat plain. It was presented to him by the grand assembly, but he immediately transferred the gift to the army, so he resides there as the guest of his soldiers. The approach is guarded by volunteers, wild but faithful fellows from Trebizond, clad in the sinister black nationalist costume.

Angora is by no means a "forbidden city." Kemal mixes freely among its inhabitants, taking any seat happening to be vacant in the crowded little hall of the National Assembly, like an ordinary deputy, but foreigners are stringently and efficiently probed before they are allowed to visit the capital or enter Kemal's presence.

Like all really great men, Kemal is no extremist. There is no mental affinity between him and the Russian Bolshevist leaders. His views are moderate, and he expresses them with moderation. So, when he says a thing can be done, you feel it is capable of realization, not a fanatical dream. Even in denouncing what he believes to be injustice he strives to avoid injustice himself. While formulating his appeal to the American people he criticized America's attitude toward the Near East crisis, but tempered his censure by expressing the belief that it was not at all America's fault, and that it occasioned surprise rather than anger among his fellow citizens.

FIGHTING FOR THEIR FREEDOM.

"Americans," he declared, "seem not to realize the sacrifices the Turkish people have made, the trials through which they have passed in order to reconquer their long-lost liberty. Otherwise the United States Government and the press surely had shown greater fairness in judging events in the Near East. The Turkish people are fighting for freedom from foreign domination and exploitation just as the Americans fought 150 years ago, for Turkey has been reduced during the last century to the conditions of a colony of the great European powers.

"But the American people have not been allowed to discern the similarity between the struggle of the Turks to-day and the war of independence of the American colonists.

"Foreign propaganda, ignorant fanaticism, and prejudice have blinded the eyes of America to the truth. If she should open them without heeding insidious falsehood propagated by foreign agents, she would see valiant people risking its all against a world of enemies for the conquest of the same rights that found immortal expression in the American Declaration of Independence."

A NEW ORIENTAL TYPE.

Kemal appears to be the ideal representative of an entirely new type of oriental, whose existence the west is only dimly beginning to realize, but which it will be forced to take into account very seriously in the future.

Till now the western mind has been accustomed to regard the oriental patriot, whether Turk, Arab, Egyptian, or Hindoo, as a fanatical dreamer prone to sudden wild outbursts of enthusiasm and energy, but incapable of sustained effort, not amenable to disciplined organization, and easily corruptible by European gold. The type still exists—there are idle boasters and traitors even in Angora, but it is rapidly becoming extinct and its place is being taken by men like Kemal and his associates, calm, efficient, incorruptible hard workers.

DISPLAY TRUE EFFICIENCY.

The most convincing evidence that a new era has dawned for the East over the barren table-land of Anatolia is the efficiency and strict attention to business displayed by everyone in Angora, army officers of all ranks, deputies, and high and low governmental officials. Here, as in Asia Minor, removed from corrupting influences which for 50 years have come to the oriental in the guise of western civilization, a new race of men has developed, amid the sacrifices and hardships of an originally almost suicidal struggle, whose bravery, honesty, and abnegation of self justify belief that the renaissance of the East is no longer an empty dream.

It is needful to comprehend this fundamental change which the oriental mentality is undergoing in order to realize that Kemal's plan for instituting in Turkey the most democratic régime in the world is practical to-day. Before the nationalist movement in Anatolia it would have been madness.

"Turkey's future form of government," Kemal explained, "will be democratic in the fullest sense of the term. The right of sovereignty will be invested in the people and exercised by the national assembly, composed of members elected by the people. The national assembly will in turn exercise its authority through the council of commissars whom it chooses among its members."

WILL HAVE NO PRESIDENT.

The system differs from both the American and Swiss forms of republican government, for there is no President. Kemal himself, though president of the national assembly, has no special authority beyond that inherent in his dominant personality.

"For more than a century," he continued, "the Turkish people have desperately striven to establish their own Government upon a democratic basis like this; they tried to assimilate the scientific and political progress achieved by western countries during the nineteenth century. Turk intellectuals attempted to introduce reforms by bringing specialists from Europe. Not a few of Turkish enlightened sons sacrificed their lives for this end.

"But European diplomacy placed innumerable obstacles in the Turkish people's path to progress; did everything in its power to retard and prevent Turkey's growing strong and prosperous, fearing she might cast off the yoke of Europe's exploitation and domination. However, this selfish hostility of Europe toward everything spelling reform and revival in Turkey overshot its mark, for it inflamed the Turkish people with a passionate desire for freedom, which has found its final expression in Angora.

"To-day victorious Turkey takes herself, without asking permission, political and economic liberties enjoyed by all civilized nations."

TURKEY'S CULTURED FUTURE.

The correspondent was curious to know Kemal's opinion on a question that is considerably agitating the patriots in Angora and all oriental nationalists, as to whether the Turks or other eastern peoples should seek salvation in the assimilation of western civilization or hold themselves aloof and rather try to recreate a civilization of their own based upon their ancient culture. As always, his reply was characteristic of the moderation of his well-balanced intellect.

"My earnest desire," said Kemal, "is that Turkey will profit by the scientific and commercial progress of the west and by western civilization generally in so far as is compatible with her own national culture. The ancient civilization of Turkey was halted in its development by the continual clash of political ambitions in Europe, which forced the Turks in the time of their greatness to devote all their energies to war, and later by the intrigues of European statesmen who

wish to keep Turkey in subjection. But now these obstacles are being removed, one by one, and Turkey will be free to perfect her ancient culture while adopting all that is most valuable of the modern civilization of the west."

Asked whether there was any prospect of Americans being called upon to assist in the modern reconstruction of Turkey, Kemal replied:

"We shall gladly welcome the help of the American specialists. I particularly hope the Turks may learn American business methods through the establishment of close trade relations between the two countries. American commerce may always be assured of full protection in Turkey."

Kemal is keenly aware that the chief obstacle to American appreciation of the effort the Turkish people are making to regain the former greatness is the situation of Christian minorities in Turkey. He unhesitatingly expressed the most solemn assurance that Christian citizens of the new Turkey will enjoy the same protection and rights as Moslems, provided they obey the laws of their country and refrain from revolutionary activities.

NO PRIVILEGES FOR CHRISTIANS.

"All Christians in Turkey," was his declaration, "will enjoy equal rights and protection with Moslems. They will be safe from persecution. But to no Christian minority will ever again be granted privileges exceeding the rights of the Moslem majority. The greatest blunder the Turks ever made was when, centuries ago, they conferred privileges and favors which no other nation ever dreamed of giving aliens upon Christians who entered the Turkish dominions.

"The Turks were actuated by a love for freedom and deep respect for the rights of others, which are great virtues from an idealistic point of view. But in practice they proved disastrous, and the Turkish Empire's decline and misfortunes date from this ill-advised preferential treatment of foreigners. Turkey is determined to grant no other rights in the future to foreigners within her borders, save those which are enjoyed by aliens in all other civilized countries. The same applies to scientific institutions and schools established by foreigners in our country. They will have full protection as long as they respect our laws by including the teaching of the language, history, and geography of Turkey in their educational program, and accepting our control and inspection."

On the wall of Kemal's library hangs a great crooked saber presented to him after the Battle of Sangaries by the famous sheik of the Senussi, the most powerful and most fantastical Arab chieftain of the present day. It is a symbol of what the Turk leader represents in the eyes of millions of Moslems impatient of European rule.

Angora is the great center of oriental nationalist activities—Afghan, Arabian, Egyptian, and Indian missions are continually arriving—and the atmosphere is impregnated with the problem of pan-Islamism, the menace of a great war of independence of the East against the West. But questions regarding these dark possibilities for the first time drew a diplomatic reply from Kemal:

"If the principle of self-determination established by Woodrow Wilson is admitted, it is manifestly impossible that Turkey should not wish to see all Moslem peoples become free and independent," was his cryptic statement. Likewise, with reference to Turco-Russian relations, all he would say was, "There is no reason why the relations between Turkey and Russia should not be as friendly in the future as they have been up to the present."

In the field Kemal is as frugal and inured to hardships as any Anatolian peasant or soldier—he and his staff lived on baked beans 14 days during the campaign that ended with the capture of Smyrna—but in his Angora home he does not disdain a certain refined elegance. His library is tastefully furnished with fine carpets; curious old daggers and pistols hang on the walls, and well-bound books are scattered over the table.

CONVERTED TO PROHIBITION.

In his days of misfortune under Enver Pasha's despotic and corrupt rule he was famous for the variety of pink, yellow, and green liquors with which he furnished his sideboard, but to-day he is an earnest advocate of prohibition as decreed by the national assembly. Undeterred by America's experiences, he declared, "The Turks by nature are not a drinking people, wherefore the enforcement of prohibition in Turkey can present no difficulties."

In a land that admits polygamy, Kemal has remained single up to the present day. It is rumored he is engaged to a beautiful, wealthy young lady of a good Turkish family in Smyrna, and it was stated even that the wedding would take place upon his arrival in that city on his present tour of inspection, but the death of his mother, who was particularly desirous of bringing about the match, may have changed his plans. His conception of the rôle of women in society is diametrically opposed to traditional Turkish views. He will have none of the veil of the harem, which, indeed, is fast disappearing. His declarations on this subject were categorical:

"One of the most important problems confronting the Turkey of to-day is to secure absolute legal and social equality for women and men. Our women have displayed the highest qualities of courage and self-sacrifice in the war of independence in which we have been engaged. They are eager to acquire education and learning, and some of them already are achieving success in the fields of science and literature. Women also already are working in many industrial establishments throughout Anatolia. No progress is possible where the forcible seclusion of women destroys family life."

Kemal is frankly skeptical of the pacifist movement that has held the western world in its grip since the Great War.

"Disarmament and permanent peace," he said, "will be possible when particularly the statesmen of the great powers have learned to recognize the equal rights of all nations, great and small, to prosperity and independence—and not before."

DARKNESS SHROUDS ITS FUTURE.

The future of Turkey is still shrouded in the darkness that is ominously spreading over the whole Eastern Hemisphere, and it remains to be seen whether Kemal's great projects for the renaissance of the Turkish people will be realized or will once again be retarded and frustrated by war. War would delay and cast into jeopardy all the great plans for the reconstruction of his country which are dear to his heart. But it is equally certain he is determined to take the field again if he fails to obtain such peace terms for his country as he considers necessary in order to effect this reconstruction successfully.

Ending the interview, this victorious general, who is most often seen in civilian clothes, declared:

"The happiest moment of my life was when I smashed the Greek Armies in the pitched battles of Afium Karahissar and Dumlu Pinar and I knew my country was saved. Our army is even stronger to-day than then, and is ready to do duty again if needful. The Turkish people is so passionately attached to its liberty that it is prepared to make every sacrifice in order to safeguard it. The best qualities of the Turks are fidelity to their promises, faithfulness to their friends, and unfaltering devotion to the independence of their country."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has offered for the RECORD what he denominates a remarkable address issued by Mustapha Kemal to the American people. The Senator refers to this revolutionary Turkish leader as a man of education and one who is advised concerning the "history of nations."

And, with a fine sense of justice, the able Senator declares that the Ottoman Turks are entitled to a hearing before the bar of public opinion and are also entitled to liberty and to the enjoyment of political rights. I will not disagree with the distinguished Senator in these views, but in determining what attitude should be taken toward the Turks and what restrictions, if any, should be imposed upon them by the allied and associated powers, many facts and circumstances must be taken into consideration. Of course, speaking academically, the Ottoman Turks have the right to freedom and independence and to establish a form of government which to them seems best, but that is not the paramount question at issue now between the Turks and the allied nations and the United States.

The appeal by Kemal Pasha, to which the Senator refers, is a most adroit and intriguing document. One would suppose that it emanated from a man who had been schooled in democracy and who was guided by the spirit of a Hampden or a Chatham or a Patrick Henry and was seeking to extend the principles of liberty throughout the world. It is a subtle appeal, which undoubtedly, it is hoped, will temper the sharp edge of world-wide criticism because of the barbarities perpetrated by the Kemalists and the Turks upon Christian minorities within what have been and doubtless will be the boundaries of the Turkish Empire. It is likewise an appeal to justify the refusal of the Turks to abide by the treaty of Sevres or to enter into a fair and just treaty with the allied representatives during the protracted negotiations at Lausanne.

Mr. President, the publicity given to this statement by Mustapha Kemal calls for some reply and justifies a discussion, within proper limits, of what is known as "the Turkish question," which comprises the issues presented in the Near East. I read in this morning's paper the statement the Senator from Oklahoma has just placed before us and am somewhat surprised that it so soon finds its way into the RECORD. In order that we may have a better understanding of the situation and be better prepared to determine just what the rights of the Ottoman Turks are it is proper that a hasty though obviously an imperfect review of certain historical facts should be made, and in so doing I want to present the cause of the Armenians and show what they have suffered at the hands of the Turks, including this same Mustapha Kemal.

Kemal Pasha assumes that the Turks rightfully occupy the territory which constituted the kingdom of Armenia and all of Asia Minor and are entitled to the possession and control of Thrace and perhaps other territory in Europe; and he assumes the competency of the Turks to govern and to extend freedom and justice to all races and creeds within the boundaries of Turkish authority. Perhaps title to land, if not to peoples, may be acquired by prescription initiated by force and violence and maintained by cruelty and bloodshed. But one can be forgiven for questioning the validity of such title and requiring that other muniments of title be submitted in the court of public opinion and before the bar of international justice. A discussion of the Turkish question compels an examination of conditions in western Asia and in what we call the Balkan territory, anterior to the appearance of the oriental hordes which swept down from central Asia in more recent times.

We have heard much of the Armenians and have for many years protested against the cruel policies executed by the Turks, which had for their object the extermination of this splendid race. But there are many who do not know the history of this brave people, and there are some who are inclined to think that they have sought to intrude themselves into Turkish territory and usurp the authority exercised by the Turkish Government. The fact is that the Armenians migrated to Asia Minor from southeastern Europe more than 2,500 years ago. They belong to the Aryan race and find their roots in the same soil from which sprang European peoples. Philologists declare their language to be Indo-European and their literature gives support to that view.

The historian Strabo declares that they migrated from Thessaly and established themselves in the country which for cen-

turies has been called Armenia. Professor Ripley, in his valuable work The Races of Europe, states that:

The second racial type in this borderland (Armenia) between Europe and Asia we may safely follow Chantre in calling Armenoid, because the Armenians most clearly represent it to-day. * * * The similarity of this to our Alpine races of western Europe has been especially emphasized by the most competent authority, Von Luschan. * * * Were it not for the potent selective influence of religion (Christianity and Mohammedanism) complete rupture by the invading Tartar-Turks might conceivably have taken place. As it is, the continuity of the Alpine races across Asia Minor can not be doubted.

I mentioned the historian Strabo. He refers to the origin of the Armenian people and speaks of Jason and his expedition into Armenia, and states that from "Armeus the country had its name."

Some historians of note claim that the progenitors of the Armenians migrated from Thrace about 1,400 years B. C., and after crossing into Asia they passed through Bythnia and entered Cappadocia and Cilicia, from which countries, some time in the seventh or eighth century, B. C., they reached the broad plateau upon which is Mount Ararat. In this region they remained and extended their occupation until they brought within their authority that vast region which was known as the kingdom of Armenia, and with the boundaries of which, generally speaking, we are familiar.

I think it is now accepted by historians and philologists that the Illyrians, whom we now know as the Albanians, the Phrygians, the Greeks, and the Armenians all belong to the same branch of the Aryan family. At one time it was believed by some writers that the Armenian language was a branch of the Persian, but that view is discredited and is no longer accepted by authorities who have written upon the origin of races and the development of languages. The earlier boundaries of Armenia may not perhaps be definitely determined, but it is generally agreed by historians that Armenia at one time embraced that vast domain extending from the Black and Caspian Seas southwesterly to the Mediterranean Sea, comprising an area of approximately 150,000 square miles. Cilicia, or, as it is sometimes called, Lesser Armenia, which borders upon the extreme northeastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea, constituted its southwesterly extremity.

To the west of Armenia is Anatolia, which we commonly call Asia Minor. The greater part of Armenia is a vast plateau from which rise mountains and within which are found valleys and deserts. It possesses varied resources and contains extensive and valuable agricultural lands and rich mineral deposits. The Armenians were in contact with the Potian Greeks, who occupied a portion of Asia Minor to the west of Armenia and along the southern littoral of the Black Sea, as well as with the Hellenic peoples of the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas. To the south and east were the Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes, and Persians, and the various races and peoples who inhabited the successive kingdoms that rose and fell in Persia and Mesopotamia.

The Armenians were known to be a strong, vigorous, intellectual, and progressive people. Long prior to the days of Cæsar and the dawn of the Christian era their fame had spread throughout the civilized world. During the ministry of St. Paul they were visited by the Apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew, who introduced Christianity among them. The new faith spread throughout the land, and about the year 300 A. D. it was accepted by the King of Armenia, who established it as the State religion. From that time until the present, the Armenian race have persevered in their adherence to the Christian faith.

Some historians state that the inhabitants of what is called Armenia are first mentioned in the annals of the Assyrians many hundred years before Christ. The Assyrian armies made war upon them, but in the ninth century before Christ the Armenians united and formed what was called the Kingdom of Urartu. These same historians contend that the powerful Kingdom of the Medes made war upon the Kingdom of Urartu and brought its inhabitants under rule of that powerful nation. It is further shown by these historians that later King Darius of Persia asserted dominion over the great plateau north of Mesopotamia and south of the Caucasus Mountains, and which was inhabited by the Armenian race.

During the period of Persian domination Armenia was divided into two satrapies for administrative purposes. But these political subdivisions were practically independent, the people paying but a small tribute to the Persian Government. In the second century before Christ the Armenians revolted from the authority of the Seleucid King of western Asia. A few centuries later Tigranes the Great became King over Armenia. He possessed great executive and administrative ability and brought honor and fame to his country. He was related to Mithradites, the famous Pontic King, who sought to build an empire uniting the Hellenic and Iranian peoples. The Roman power, however, shattered his dream and also constituted an impediment to the growth and development of the Armenian Kingdom, which now became a buffer State between Rome on the west and the Parthian rulers of Iran.

Tigranes developed the spirit of Armenian nationality and linked the Armenian people to the West, removing from them any veneer of Persian Zoroasterianism.

For several centuries Armenia was in the eddy of the great contending forces of the East and the West. It was besieged and assailed by the Parthian armies, and upon the death of King Tiridates, who had accepted Christianity and established it as the State religion, his kingdom fell, a portion of the people coming under Persian rule and the residue acknowledging Roman authority.

But the Armenians remained devoted to the new faith which they had espoused, and no persecution was sufficient to alienate them from that faith. For several centuries the conflicting tides of the East and the West rolled over them, but they clung to their national church and to their political ideals, whether their rulers were Persians or Romans.

In the seventh century the control of western Asia passed to the Arabs, and in the eighth or ninth century the power of the caliphate declined and the Armenians established a Christian principality which survived for several centuries. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries nomadic Turkish tribes marched from Asia and fell upon Persia and Armenia and countries which had been controlled for several centuries by the Arabs. The Armenian rulers sought protection from the Roman Empire of the East, but its lethargy and inherent weakness afforded but slight protection against the savage assaults of the barbarous Asiatic Turks in their western movements.

Near the end of the thirteenth century the Karluchs and other wild Asiatic hordes invaded western Asia and the barbarous Mongols, who destroyed civilization wherever they found it, swept through Persia and over the Armenian plateau during the same century. For several centuries anarchy and chaos reigned in western Asia. Then came the Osmanli to power. This was a Turkish clan which attempted to bring under its authority western Asia and eastern Europe. It expanded across the Dardanelles and extended its authority as far as the gates of Vienna. Armenia was completely overrun as early as 1514, and in the sixteenth century the eastern world from Vienna to Persia was linked under one control. From that time until the present, broadly speaking, Armenia, except the Province of Erivan, which was conquered by the Persians in the seventeenth century and held until 1834, when it was ceded to Russia, and the Province of Kars, which was acquired by Russia in 1878, has been under Turkish rule.

It will thus be perceived that the Armenians for centuries constituted the outer bulwark of western civilization, against which the invasions of Mongols and Turks and Tartars and Saracens and barbaric hordes were directed. They occupied the great highways leading from southeastern Europe to Asia, and along these highways wild Asiatic hordes traveled like successive billows of the sea seeking the conquest of superior races and the acquisition of the lands which were the homes and countries of other races.

The pages of history do not record a more courageous and valorous people than the Armenians. None have exhibited greater fidelity to their religious convictions and to their ideals. Besieged upon every hand, robbed and plundered and butchered by successive invading hordes, they survived; however, millions were killed, and the tragedies and sorrows with which they were visited only strengthened the faith of survivors, increased their tenacity, and nerved them for still greater sorrows and heavier persecutions. The Ottoman Turks, when they inundated their territory, destroyed hundreds of their towns and cities, and slaughtered hundreds of thousands of their people. They conquered Mesopotamia, Armenia, Syria, Palestine, the country we call Asia Minor, and pushed on into western Europe. It was the Armenian people who held back for many years the Tartars and the Turks, and thus enabled the peoples of Europe to prepare themselves for the final contest before the gates of Vienna in 1683. The victorious march of these barbarous hordes was stayed and they were thrown back into the Balkan Peninsula. Greece, Constantinople, Thrace, and the territory which we now know as Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia, all passed under the crescent of the Turk. The heavy hand of Turkey was laid upon the Armenian people. Wild bands of Kurds and Turks and Tartars settled in their midst, robbed them of their lands, plundered them of their property, and inflicted upon them cruel persecutions. The Turkish Government, controlled often by

fiends and monsters, imposed upon them oppressive burdens and enforced cruel and merciless edicts.

Under the rule of their own kings and rulers the Armenians enjoyed a large degree of freedom and reached a high place in the civilization of nations. Their frugality and industry, their love of home and country, their earnest application to the development of their fields, and their industrial life gave them a preeminence among the nations and peoples surrounding them which was not denied by their contemporaries and which historians have affirmed. They built cities and towns, established industries, and developed a large domestic and foreign trade and commerce which added to their wealth and influence. Upon the shores of three seas they built ships and constructed ports from which rich argosies came and went, adding to their wealth and national prosperity. They developed remarkable ability in business pursuits and enterprises and pioneered the way into other countries for the sale of their products. They brought remote peoples together and nations into contact, through trade and by means of commercial transactions. While possessing a strong nationalistic spirit and a pride in their own land, they were catholic in their views and sought to break down narrow and provincial prejudices and those extreme racial antipathies which have been provocative of so much controversy and, indeed, bloodshed in the past. As I have indicated, for centuries prior to the conquest of their country by the Turks they had been assailed by the wild, barbarous tribes and the nomadic forces from western and central Asia and had sustained losses and been the victims of cruel and rapacious raids and destructive ravages.

The topography of their country, with its lofty mountains and mighty valleys and plains, influenced the character of the people. The historian Buckle, in his monumental work, attempts to establish the thesis that physical surroundings and climatic conditions not only influence but perhaps determine the thoughts, characters, and lives of the people. He attributes the characteristics of the Scotch, as exemplified in such men as John Knox and the Covenanters, to the bleak highlands and the rugged conditions of Scotland. Nature was harsh and stern and relentless as he perceived her manifestations in the cliffs and rocks and sterile lands of Scotland. He found in this remarkable race a reproduction of nature's inflexible form and frowning face.

Be that as it may, the Armenians in many ways reflected their physical surroundings. The noble mountains, reaching into the skies, and the far-reaching plains and the deserts fading into the horizon were ever before them as objects, or subjects, rather, which influenced their lives. They saw in these great works of nature the creative power of an Omnipotent One.

After Christianity had been accepted by them and had become a State religion, they were imbued with the thought that they were the guardians of immortal truth and were to be ambassadors of the risen Lord for the salvation of man. Their literature and art reveal how strongly their lives were influenced by Christianity. Historians refer to the wonderful developments of music and art among the Armenians following the acceptance of the teachings of the Apostles. Mr. Henry F. B. Lynch, in his work upon Armenia, refers to the architectural development among the Armenians and ascribes to them the origin of the gothic style. They erected thousands of churches which exhibited the most beautiful forms of architectural design and testified to the religious devotion and spiritual aspirations of the people.

The Armenians gave attention to education, established schools and seminaries of learning, and applied in their community life those policies and virtues and charities which have demonstrated a high degree of culture among Christian nations. They possessed a respect for the law and established courts which administered justice among the people. Many of the young men of Armenia attended the great centers of learning in Athens, Rome, and Alexandria, and thousands of them found positions of trust and responsibility in the business activities of other nations as well as in the governments to which they went. They became financiers, generals, statesmen, and teachers in other countries than their own. Some of the greatest military leaders of Russia and other near-by nations were Armenians. In the days of the Byzantine Empire many of its emperors and empresses were Armenians, among them being Maurice, Philip, Leo, Basyl, Alexander, and Constantine. The Armenians have furnished prime ministers for Persia, Egypt, and Hungary, and they have also filled high administrative positions, even under the Turkish Government. Armenia has furnished the world with brilliant poets and musicians and painters, and has taken high rank in all intellectual fields.

When we recall the vicissitudes through which this noble race has passed and the persecutions and woes which have pursued it for centuries, we can only express wonder at the mighty record of achievement and the imperishable legacy which it has left for the enrichment of the world. Our admiration for the Armenians is increased when we remember the awful conditions which have surrounded them, particularly under Turkish rule.

It is not too much to say that if Armenia had not been invaded and the Armenian race had been permitted to pursue its destiny unmolested by the Tartars and Kurds and Turks, and the Asiatic tribes that were ever at their door, they would have developed into a mighty nation with millions of inhabitants who would have challenged the admiration of the world and been a beacon light to the peoples of the Near East and, indeed, to eastern Europe and western Asia.

If the Christian nations of Europe had given help to Armenia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, there would have been no Turkish question. The Pan-Turanian movement would have been halted at the eastern borders of Armenia. Greece would have become a mighty nation, and history would not have recorded the centuries of bloodshed and oppression to which the Christian peoples of Greece and the Balkan States have been subjected.

As I have indicated earlier in my remarks, there has not been an understanding by Americans or Europeans of the great contributions made by Armenia to the cause of Christian civilization and to the progress and enlightenment of the world. Many have forgotten, if they ever knew, that Armenia was a well-organized nation administering justice and developing a fine culture at least 1,000 years before any other nation in Europe except Greece and Rome, and that her origin dates back to an earlier period than that of the Roman Empire.

Under the inspiration of the Christian religion the progress of Armenia was phenomenal. During the first two centuries of the Christian era an Armenian alphabet was developed, the Bible was translated into the vernacular of the people, the foreign trade and commerce of the country was increased, and great progress was made in education and culture.

Armenia has given more martyrs to the world in proportion to population than any other land. For centuries her valleys and plains have been incarnadined with the blood of her martyrs.

Under Turkish rule their property has been confiscated, their cities and towns have been burned, hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children have been deported to die of starvation in the mountain fastnesses and in the deserts or to be murdered by the wild and savage bands of Kurds that surrounded them. Their children have been butchered, their daughters and wives have been seized and taken to Turkish harems, and constant efforts have been made to bring about the complete extermination of the race.

Mr. President, at this point, without reading, I desire to place in the RECORD a few statements made by distinguished writers and statesmen who testify to the fine character and noble qualities of the Armenian people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

Mr. KING. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin states that—

> The Armenians are a noble race.

Prof. Karl Roth declares that—

> The importance of the Armenian people is often ignored. The Armenians have played in antiquity, and more especially in the Middle Ages, an important rôle. As a factor of civilization in the Orient the Armenian is more important than is generally realized. The Armenians are without doubt intellectually the most awake among all the peoples that inhabit the Ottoman Empire. They are superior to Turks and Kurds.

Dr. E. J. Dillon makes the statement that—

> The Armenians constitute the sole civilizing, the sole humanizing element in Anatolia; peaceful to the degree of self-sacrifice, law-abiding to their own undoing, and industrious and hopeful under conditions which would appall the majority of mankind. At their best they are the stuff of which heroes and martyrs are molded.

The late Andrew D. White, former United States ambassador to Germany, in his autobiography states that—

> The Armenians are a good people, of large and noble capacities. For ages they have maintained their civilization under oppression that would have crushed almost any other people. The Armenian is one of the finest races in the world. If I were asked to name the most desirable races to be added by immigration to the American population I would name among the very first the Armenian.

Lord Bryce, ex-ambassador of Great Britain to the United States, in speaking of the Armenians, declares:

> Among all those who dwell in western Asia they stand first, with a capacity for intellectual and moral progress, as well as with a natural tenacity of will and purpose beyond that of all their neighbors—not

merely of Turks, Tartars, Kurds, and Persians, but also of Russians. They are a strong race, not only with vigorous nerves and sinews, physically active and energetic, but also of conspicuous brain power.

Henry Morgenthau, ex-United States ambassador to Turkey, in his "Ambassador Morgenthau's Story," pages 287 to 289, states:

The Armenians of the present day are the direct descendants of the people who inhabited the country 3,000 years ago. Their origin is so ancient that it is lost in fable and mystery. There are still undeciphered cuneiform inscriptions on the rocky hills of Van, the largest Armenian city, that have led certain scholars—though not many, I must admit—to identify the Armenian race with the Hittites of the Bible. What is definitely known about the Armenians, however, is that for ages they have constituted the most civilized and most industrious race in the eastern section of the Ottoman Empire. From their mountains they have spread over the Sultan's dominions, and form a considerable element in the population of all the large cities. Everywhere they are known for their industry, their intelligence, and their decent and orderly lives. They are so superior to the Turks intellectually and morally that much of the business and industry has passed into their hands. With the Greeks the Armenians constitute the economic strength of the empire. These people became Christians in the fourth century, and established the Armenian Church as their State religion. This is said to be the oldest Christian church in existence.

In face of persecutions which have had no parallel elsewhere these people have clung to their early Christian faith with the utmost tenacity. For fifteen hundred years they have lived there in Armenia, a little island of Christians surrounded by backward peoples of hostile religion and hostile race. Their long existence has been one unending martyrdom. The territory which they inhabit forms the connecting link between Europe and Asia, and all the Asiatic invasions—Saracens, Tartars, Mongols, Kurds, and Turks—have passed over their peaceful country. For centuries they have thus been the Belgium of the east. Through all this period the Armenians have regarded themselves not as Asiatic but as Europeans. They speak an Indo-European language, their racial origin is believed by scholars to be Aryan, and the fact that their religion is the religion of Europe has always made them turn their eyes westward. And out of that western country, they have always hoped, would some day come the deliverance that would rescue them from their murderous masters.

Mr. KING. Permit me to direct attention to a later period in the history of Turkey and the Christians within her borders. Russia declared her intention of becoming the protector of the Christian races in the Near East. The European nations were beginning to learn of the martyrdom of the Christian peoples who lived under Turkish rule. They learned of the barbarous treatment accorded the Armenians, the Greeks, the Bulgarians, the Rumanians, and the Serbians, but were unwilling to protect them if in so doing it required war upon Turkey. Russia's professed desire to mitigate the horrors of Turkish misrule brought but slight alleviation to the suffering Christians. In 1821 Greece revolted and won her independence. Later Serbia and Rumania achieved their independence, and finally Bulgaria threw off the Turkish yoke. Senators will remember that the Russo-Turkish War ended in 1877 and was followed by the treaty of San Stefano, under the terms of which Russia was to occupy a considerable portion of the Turkish territory until massacres and rapine ceased and governmental reforms were put into operation.

Unfortunately Great Britain, fearing the dominance of Russia in the Near East and the possible effect of such preeminence upon her Indian possessions, interfered, and the treaty of Berlin superseded the treaty of San Stefano. The Berlin treaty promised Turkish protection to the Armenians, and Great Britain agreed to help the Turkish Empire in the event of a controversy with Russia. But Turkey, in violation of her solemn pledges, continued her persecution of the Armenian people and of the Christian minorities within her domain. In 1880 the powers joined in a note to Turkey, demanding observance of her promises and an immediate cessation of Armenian and Christian persecution. This demand was wholly ignored by Turkey, and the massacres continued periodically and the promised reforms were denied to the non-Moslem populations of Turkey. In 1894–95 the Sultan, Abdul-Hamid, caused to be murdered more than 100,000 Armenians. In 1908, 700,000 Armenians were destroyed. The awful carnage was continuing when the Christian nations of the world, horrified by wholesale massacres, protested, and secured promises of reform. The young Turks obtained control of the Government, and European nations, as well as the United States, hoped that the promises of a liberal government would be realized. The new régime solemnly agreed that there would be no further enslavement of the Armenians, no further confiscation of property, and a just system of taxation, the rights of the Armenians to be regarded as citizens and to bear arms and to have places in the army and a voice in the administrative affairs of the Empire. But none of these promises were fulfilled.

In 1914 the great World War began. It is difficult to ascertain the number of Armenians then living in Asiatic Turkey. It is estimated by some that there were 2,000,000. Other writers place the number at 2,500,000. Senators will recall that a portion of what had formerly been Armenia had been annexed by Russia and Persia had extended her dominion over still another portion. What is now known as Azerbaijan, which is under Soviet Russia's control, was at one time a part of the Kingdom of Armenia.

When the war broke out there were residing in what is known as Russian Armenia perhaps 2,000,000 Armenians. There were several hundred thousand scattered throughout Asia Minor, and approximately 150,000 resided in Constantinople. Cilicia, which borders the Mediterranean Sea and at one time was a part of the Kingdom of Armenia, and is still known as Lesser Armenia, contained many thousand Armenians, and tens of thousands resided in the Provinces of Broussa and Adin, which includes the Smyrna district. As I have heretofore stated, the portion of what was formerly the Armenian Kingdom constitutes a part of Russia.

At the outbreak of the World War the Armenian people were placed in a most unfortunate and, indeed, dangerous position. Turkey was under the influence of the Kaiser and the military elements surrounding him. After intriguing for some time Turkey joined the Central Empires. German diplomats were in Turkey directing her political movements and German officers were in her armies training and preparing them to support the Central Empires. When Russia mobilized her armies to repel the German and Austrian invasion of her territory the Armenians within Russia entered the Russian armies and rendered heroic service.

The sympathies of the Armenians, both in Turkey and in Russia, were with the Allies. They believed the contest was between democracy and liberty upon one hand and militarism and autocracy upon the other hand. They had struggled for centuries for liberty and realized that so long as the Turkish power existed they would be under the heel of the cruel Turks. However, when Turkey entered the war the Armenians residing within Turkish Armenia endeavored to discharge their obligations to their Government. Thousands of them were drafted into the army for menial service, and many were employed in the construction of roads and bridges and in transporting Turkish munitions and military supplies.

It is difficult to understand just what motives inspired the Turkish rulers to execute the cowardly and cruel purpose which soon became manifest. Authentic reports indicate that German military leaders who were in Turkey, if they did not direct, at least approved the plan for the wholesale extermination of the Armenian race within Turkish territory, or at least within Turkish Armenia.

At the time Turkey entered the war there were perhaps, as I have stated, more than 2,000,000 of Armenians under the Turkish flag. The greater part of them were in the seven Armenian vilyats or provinces, viz, Erzerum, Van, Bitlis, Trebizond, Manvouret-ul-Aziz, Diarbekr, and Sivas.

The census prepared by the Armenian patriarchate in 1912 shows the Armenians within the provinces just named to have been considerably more than 1,100,000. In addition, there were Nestorians, Greeks, and other Christians, numbering more than 200,000. The number of Armenians in Russian Armenia at that time approximated 2,000,000.

I should have stated that when the young Turks obtained control of the Turkish Government and promised reforms and a mitigation of the persecutions and political and economic discriminations to which the Armenian people had been subjected, the Armenians welcomed these promises and entered wholeheartedly into the plan for administrative reforms and for the execution of policies which would strengthen Turkey, increase her prestige, and augment her prosperity. They showed a loyalty to the Government that was most extraordinary, in view of the centuries of wrongs which had been burned into their very souls. But the new régime soon became more reactionary than Abdul-Hamid and inaugurated a systematic scheme for the Ottomanization of Turkey, which meant the extermination of the Armenian population.

As illustrative of the purpose of the Armenians to aid Turkey in becoming a better and a greater nation, I call attention to the fact that in the Balkan wars the Armenians fought side by side with the Turks against the Bulgarians and other Balkan States. While they regretted war with Christian nations, they observed their obligations to the Turkish Government and fought for its protection. Their bravery and heroism challenged the admiration of their Turkish military leaders.

With the entrance of Turkey into the World War the Young Turk régime, which controlled, conceived the plan of exterminating the Armenians. They had abandoned all pretense of reform and had committed themselves to the policy of Prussianizing Turkey and inaugurating a Pan-Turanian movement. They dreamed of a great Turkish and Moslem Empire controlling the east, allied to a military power—Germany—which would control the west. They planned to conquer Egypt and

Persia, and to bring under the political power of the Sultan at Constantinople the Mohammedan forces of the world.

The Armenians were Christians, and they clung tenaciously to the lands of their fathers and to the spiritual and moral inheritance which had come down to them from the past. They had resisted all efforts to bring them under the influence of the Moslem faith. Murder and rapine and persecution had not sufficed to extinguish their faith. Thousands of their children had been seized by the Turks and brought up in Turkish households. The tongues of fathers and mothers had been cut off by the Turks, so that they might not teach their children the Christian faith. Many of their churches had been burned and thousands had been forced to worship secretly in forests and in mountain fastnesses and underground caves. Their cruel masters had subjected them to the most inhuman and fiendish tortures and persecutions, and still the race survived and within the hearts of the people burned that living and inspiring faith that raises humanity to glorious heights.

As I have stated, the Armenians who were subjects of Turkey when the latter joined the Central Empires in 1914 gave no cause for complaint of disloyalty. Many were drafted into the army, and thousands, as I have stated, were employed in the construction of roads and in various activities connected with military operations. No authenticated charge has ever been made of treason by the Armenians to Turkish authority during the war. Various excuses have been offered for the diabolical plan which was devised by the Turkish authorities, and systematically executed, for the extermination of the Armenian race. These pretexts have been carefully examined by Viscount Bryce in his painstaking and carefully prepared volume of nearly 700 pages, which was printed in 1916 under the title "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915–16."

Let me add at this point that this monumental work demonstrates beyond the possibility of a doubt that the Turkish Government deliberately planned the destruction of all Armenians within the boundaries of the Turkish Empire. The accounts of the frightful atrocities perpetrated by the Turks in the execution of this plan caused a feeling of horror throughout the world. Many in the United States and in Europe could not credit the apparently authentic accounts of the butcheries and premeditated deportations which were being carried out under direction of the Turkish Government. Viscount Bryce undertook to sift the evidence and to assemble documents and facts bearing upon this horrible crime committed by the Turkish Government. He gathered more than 140 documents, and a vast amount of indisputable evidence, which he presented to Lord Grey, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Great Britain. Lord Grey, in thanking Viscount Bryce for the documents "on the Armenian massacres," described them as "a terrible mass of evidence."

In the preface to this exhaustive volume, Viscount Bryce states that—

> The record of the rulers of Turkey for the last two or three centuries from the Sultan on his throne down to the district mutessarif, is, taken as a whole, an almost unbroken record of corruption, of injustice, of an oppression which often rises into hideous cruelty. * * * Can anyone still continue to hope that the evils of such a Government are curable? Or does the evidence contained in this volume furnish the most terrible and convincing proof that it can no longer be permitted to rule over subjects of a different faith?

Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, who subsequently was a member of the British cabinet, as I recall, of Lloyd-George, in reviewing the volume states that—

> the evidence here collected with respect to the sufferings of the Armenian subjects of the Ottoman Empire during the present war will carry conviction wherever and whenever it is studied by honest inquirers. * * * It is clear that a catastrophe, conceived upon a scale quite unparalleled in modern history, has been contrived for the Armenian inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire. It is found that the original responsibility rests with the Ottoman Government at Constantinople, whose policy was actively seconded by the members of the committee of union and progress in the Provinces. And in view of the fact that the representations of the Austrian ambassador with the Porte were effectual in procuring a partial measure of exemption for the Armenian Catholics, we are led to surmise that the unspeakable horrors which this volume records might have been mitigated if not wholly checked had active and energetic remonstrances been from the first moment addressed to the Ottoman Government by the two powers who had acquired a predominant influence in Constantinople. The evidence, on the contrary, tends to suggest that these two powers were in a general way favorable to the policy of deportation of the Armenians.

Permit me to add, Mr. President, that since the war further facts have come to light which prove that German diplomatic representatives and German military leaders who were with the Turkish armies not only connived at these massacres and deportations but encouraged them.

Hon. Moorfield Storey, in a letter to Lord Bryce, after reviewing the records submitted, declares that they establish—

> beyond any reasonable doubt the deliberate purpose of the Turkish authorities practically to exterminate the Armenians, and their responsibility for the hideous atrocities which have been perpetrated upon that unhappy people.

If time permitted, I should like to read from this volume accounts of the deliberate and merciless manner in which the Turkish Government proceeded in the execution of its wicked design. I shall only present one paragraph, from page 627:

> There is no dispute as to what happened in 1915. The Armenian inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire were everywhere uprooted from their homes and deported to the most remote and unhealthy districts that the Government could select for them. Some were murdered at the outset, some perished on their way, and some died after reaching their destination. The death roll amounts to upward of 600,000; perhaps 600,000 more are still alive in their place of exile; and the remaining 600,000 or so have either been converted forcibly to Islam, gone into hiding in the mountains, or escaped beyond the Ottoman frontier. The Ottoman Government can not deny these facts, and they can not justify them. No precaution or misdemeanor on the part of individual Armenians could justify such a crime against the whole race.

The cumulative evidence shows that early in 1915 a decree was issued that all Armenians should be disarmed. Those who were fighting in the army were withdrawn and compelled to engage in road building, constructing fortifications, and in other work nonmilitary in character. Soon afterwards orders were issued and executed with methodical precision for the deportation of the male Armenians. No warning was given. They were immediately roped together or driven in groups from their homes in the cities and towns in which they lived into the deserts and mountains, where most of them were butchered. This fiendish plan was carried out in all of the vilayets to which I have referred, as well as in various parts of Anatolia. Some of the Armenians who belonged to the Catholic Church were exempted from the order, but in the main substantially all male inhabitants were deported and most of them murdered by the gendarmerie or by fanatical Moslems or by the wild and irregular bands of Kurds who infested the mountains and plains.

Later the women were ordered deported. Some, under promise of a renunciation of their faith, were permitted to remain. This meant that they were forced into harems or into marriage with some brutal Tartar. Many women and girls were ravished and butchered, and the long lines of deportees driven by cruel gendarmes and Turkish soldiers fell by the wayside and perished in the mountain fastnesses and deserts.

Thousand died of hunger, thirst, and exhaustion. Brigands and outlaws assailed them, murdering some, carrying others into captivity. This horrible picture can not be properly delineated. No language can overdraw it, no words can exaggerate its hideous outlines.

Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, of the United States Army, in 1919 visited many of the scenes of these massacres. He visited Cilicia and from there proceeded to various Provinces of Armenia, among them Sivas, Kars, Erzerum, Erivan, and Tiflis. Members of the mission visited other parts of Asia Minor and obtained evidence as to conditions there prevailing and bearing upon the massacres and atrocities of the Turks.

Under date of October 16, 1919, General Harbord submitted his report to the Secretary of State. It is a strong indictment of Turkish misrule, and corroborates the statements of Lord Bryce and the reports which have come to the United States of the cruelties to which Armenians have been subjected. In his report General Harbord, speaking of the policy of extermination in 1915, refers to it as the "last and greatest of these tragedies." He states that—

> massacres and deportations were organized in the spring of 1915 under definite system, soldiers going from town to town. The official reports of the Turkish Government show 1,100,000 as having been deported. Young men were first summoned to the Government building in each vilayet and then marched out and killed. The women, old men, and children were, after a few days, deported to what Talaat Pasha called "agricultural colonies," from the high, cool, breeze-swept plateau of Armenia to the malarial flats of the Euphrates and the burning sands of Syria and Arabia. The dead from this wholesale attempt on the race are variously estimated from 500,000 to more than a million, the usual figure being about 800,000.

He further states that the Armenians were—

> Driven on foot under a fierce summer sun, robbed of their clothing and such petty articles as they carried, prodded by bayonet if they lagged; starvation, typhus, and dysentery left thousands dead by the trail side. The ration was a pound of bread every alternate day, which many did not receive, and later a small daily sprinkling of meal on the palm of the outstretched hand was the only food. Many perished from thirst or were killed as they attempted to slake thirst at the crossing of running streams. Numbers were murdered by savage Kurds, against whom the Turkish soldiery afforded no protection. Little girls of 9 or 10 were sold to Kurdish brigands for a few piasters, and women were promiscuously violated. At Sivas an instance was related of a teacher in the Sivas Teachers' College, a gentle, refined Armenian girl, speaking English, knowing music, attractive by the standards of any land, who was given in enforced marriage to the beg of a neighboring Kurdish village, a filthy, ragged ruffian, three times her age, with whom she still has to live and by whom she has

borne a child. In the orphanage there maintained under American relief auspices there were 150 "brides," being girls, many of them of tender age, who had been living as wives in Moslem homes and had been rescued. Of the female refugees among some 75,000 repatriated from Syria and Mesopotamia, we were informed at Aleppo that 40 per cent are infected with venereal disease from the lives to which they have been forced. The women of this race were free from such diseases before the deportation. Mutilation, violation, torture, and death have left their haunting memories in a hundred beautiful Armenian valleys, and the traveler in that region is seldom free from the evidence of this most colossal crime of all the ages. Yet immunity from it all might have been purchased for any Armenian girl or comely woman by abjuring her religion and turning Moslem. Surely no faith has ever been put to harder test or has been cherished at greater cost.

Further on in his report General Harbord refers to the thousands of orphans who were receiving American aid. He states that at the time of his visit 20,000 were being cared for at the expense of various relief agencies in the Transcaucasus, and that 50,000 were receiving Government or organized care along the route traveled by the mission accompanying him. He described the condition of the refugees who had survived and who were found in Transcaucasus as "pitiable in the last degree. They were in rags and 80 per cent suffering from malaria and other diseases." He refers to the statement made by Damad Ferid Pasha, who represented the Turkish Government at the peace conference in Paris in June, 1919, in which he admitted for the Turkish Government the commission of—

misdeeds which are such as to make the conscience of mankind shudder with horror forever—

and that—

Asia Minor is to-day nothing but a vast heap of ruins.

He mentions the plea that the Grand Vizier made in behalf of the Turkish Empire and his promise of reforms in the government of Turkey and for amends for the crimes committed. A few sentences of the reply of the council to this plea are as follows:

Yet in all these changes there has been no case found either in Europe or in Asia or in Africa in which the establishment of Turkish rule in any country has not been followed by a diminution of prosperity in that country. Neither is there any case to be found in which the withdrawal of Turkish rule has not been followed by material prosperity and a rise in culture. Never among the Christians in Europe nor among the Moslems in Syria, Arabia, or Africa has the Turk done other than destroy wherever he has conquered. Never has he shown that he is able to develop in peace what he has gained in war. Not in this direction do his talents lie.

I have referred to the Russian Armenians. Perhaps I omitted to state that Russian Armenia contains approximately 27,000 square miles within which in 1914 there were nearly one and one-half million Armenians. There were also several hundred thousand in what is known as southern Caucasus, so that in Russia there were approximately 2,000,000 Armenians at the beginning of the war in 1914. Perhaps one-tenth of the entire population was in the Russian Army fighting for the same cause and the same principles as the United States contended for when it entered the contest.

The testimony is uniform as to the bravery of the Russian-Armenian soldiers. Kerensky, speaking of their services, stated that soon after the Turks entered the war their military forces were marching victoriously toward Russian territory, and that while the Russians were preparing for flight the—

Armenians alone stuck to their posts, organized volunteer forces, and by the side of their Russian comrades faced the formidable assaults of the enemy and turned his victorious march into a disastrous rout.

After the collapse of the Russian army, following the overthrow of Kerensky, it was the Armenian soldiers who heroically met the enemy upon the Caucasian front. For six months they held back the Turkish armies and thus materially aided the British forces in Mesopotamia. They also captured Baku and finally joined the British forces at that point in July, 1918. General Ludendorf in his work declares that—

the principal factor that forced the breakdown of the German army in the west was due to the lack of fuel supply, because the Turks did not get to Baku in time.

It will be recalled that the military leaders of the Turkish forces withdrew thousands of them from the Palestine front and sent them to the Caucasus to join the Tartars in their military operations against the Russian Armenians.

After the Turkish order for the extermination of the Armenians had been executed, many who escaped joined the English and French military forces in Palestine and Syria and contributed materially to the victory which was won by General Allenby. Thousands of American Armenians, and Armenians who were not naturalized but who were living in America, volunteered prior to and after the United States entered the war, and fought with the American and French and British forces on many battle fields of Europe.

In 1916 M. Briand, who was president of the Council of Ministers in France, proposed to organize a legion, to be known as the Legion of the Orient. Syrians and Armenians in large numbers became members of this military organization; and it was declared that one of the principal objects of the organization was that its members might aid the allied cause and free Cilicia and Syria from Turkish control. Military leaders and statesmen of the allied nations all testify to the valorous conduct of the Armenian and Syrian soldiers and to their material contributions to the allied victory.

For centuries the appeals of the Christian minorities within the Turkish Empire for succor and support have occasionally aroused the civilized world, and, as I have indicated, upon a number of occasions demands were made of the Turkish Government that its massacres and persecutions of the non-Moslem populations should cease. During the war, and particularly after it became known that Turkey had deported and murdered more than a million Armenians, the allied and associated nations, including the United States, demanded that when the war was over the remnants of the Armenian race should be freed from the tyranny of Turkey and that there should be assigned to them a portion of their former kingdom, within which they might establish a government of their own choice.

Lloyd-George stated in the House of Commons that—

recognition of the separate claims of Armenia shall constitute one of the aims of Great Britain—

And in July, 1918, Mr. Balfour stated that the British Government was following with—

sympathy and admiration the gallant resistance of the Armenians in the Caucasus in defense of their liberties and honor.

He declared, in substance, that the leading statesmen among the allied powers were in favor of a settlement of the Armenian case upon the principle of self-determination.

Clemenceau in July, 1918, said that one of the peace terms must be the—

liberation of oppressed nations.

He referred to the—

spirit of self-abnegation of the Armenians, their loyalty to the Allies, their contributions to the Foreign Legion, to the Caucasian front, and to the Oriental Legion, called later the Armenian Legion—

And stated that—

these contributions have strengthened the ties that connect them with France.

He further declared that—

it was the purpose of his government, as well as that of Great Britain, to settle the fate of the Armenian nation according to the supreme laws of humanity and justice.

In the same year the Italian Chamber of Deputies, by a practically unanimous vote, resolved in favor of the independence of Armenia. When M. Poincare was President of France he addressed a letter in February, 1919, to the Armenian archbishop of Cilicia and declared, in substance, that by reason of the—

joint sufferings and tribulations of France and Armenia the two countries would now commune with each other with common joy and common pride.

He further stated that—

France understood that Armenia was to enjoy the benefits of security, of peace, and liberty.

Premier Briand in the Chamber of Deputies in 1921 declared that France would fulfill her international duties, not only to satisfy her allies but also her associates, the United States. He was referring to Armenia and the independence which had been promised to the Armenian race.

Mr. Asquith, when prime minister, in a speech on November 9, 1916, speaking of the Armenians, promised—

An era of liberation and redemption for that ancient people.

Lloyd George, in addressing the Trades Union Congress January 5, 1918, declared that—

* * * especially Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine are, in our judgment, entitled to a recognition of their separate national conditions. It would be impossible to restore to their former sovereignty the territories to which I have already referred.

Mr. Lloyd George, in the House of Commons on the 29th of April, 1920, referred to the Christian minorities in Cilicia and stated that the French were to exercise "guardianship over them." He referred to the struggle which was going on and expressed the hope that the Armenians would secure sufficient protection. Continuing, he said:

We can not disassociate ourselves from the responsibility that is cast upon us by our pledges in respect to the Armenians. If the United States of America feel that they can not take direct responsibility, we shall have to consider the whole position and will undoubtedly take our share in the matter of helping the Armenian community to equip themselves for their very difficult task, a perilous task.

I could refer Senators to numerous other statements made by representatives of the allied and associated nations with reference to the guaranties and promises made in behalf of the Armenians, but time forbids.

Permit me to call attention to the statement of President Wilson, appearing in his 14 points:

> While the Turkish portions of the Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and absolutely unmolested opportunity for autonomous development.

During the war and following the armistice Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, declared in favor of a free and independent Armenian State, and announced that one of the objects of the war was to redeem the Armenians from the tyranny of the Turkish Empire. A great American, Theodore Roosevelt, in an address delivered by him at the Lafayette Day exercises in New York City, September 6, 1918, said:

> Germany has been able to wage this fight for world domination because she has subdued to her purpose her vassal allies—Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria. Serbia and Rumania must have restored to them what Bulgaria has taken from them. The Austrian and Turkish Empires must both be broken up, all the subject peoples liberated, and the Turk driven from Europe.

He referred to Czechoslovakia and Poland and the Baltic Provinces, and declared that their rights must be considered. Speaking of the Baltic Provinces, he said:

> They must be granted their freedom and independence.

Again, in this remarkable address, he said that—

> Armenia must be free, Palestine made a Jewish State, and the Syrian Christians liberated.

Colonel Roosevelt correctly interpreted the spirit of the American people with respect to the objects of the war and the peace terms which should be written following the triumph of the allied cause.

I distinctly remember that the leader of the Republicans in the Senate [Mr. LODGE] stated in substance that the Armenians must be freed from Turkish rule.

The present Secretary of State, in a speech delivered February 8, 1919, referred to the friendship which the Americans had always entertained for the Armenians and the admiration which they felt for the intellectual alertness and sobriety of the Armenians. He further stated that:

> We have revolted at the thought of such a people being under the yoke of the Turk. Now we rejoice that the hour of liberation has come. The vain ambition of brute force has overreached itself and has resulted in the emancipation of the downtrodden and oppressed of centuries. There is to be a settlement of this long account, and the credit balance is to be found in the opportunity for a free and independent life.

The Secretary then referred to the capacity of Armenians for freedom and self-government, and declared that:

> We propose to-night to throw such influence as we have into the scale for Armenian independence.

After the withdrawal of Russia from the war the Armenian military units which had opposed the Turkish forces continued the contest until the armistice. In May, 1918, the Armenians residing within what is known as Russian Armenia declared their independence and set up a Republic with its capital at Erivan. Recognition was accorded the new Government by the allied nations as well as by the United States. However, neither the allied nations nor the United States gave material aid or proper moral support to the Armenians in the perilous task before them. The Bolshevik leaders at Moscow sent emissaries to the new Republic to sow the seeds of dissension and followed them with military forces. The Turkish authorities at Angora sent Turkish troops to make war upon the Republic. These forces, cooperating with Bolshevists and Tartars and Soviet soldiers from Ajerbaijan, made war upon the Armenian Republic. Left without support by the allied nations and after valiantly struggling for many weeks, their resistance was finally broken down and the brutal and motley forces of the Bolsheviks, Kurds, Turks, and Tartars overran the territory of the Armenian Republic.

Thousands of men, women, and children were butchered; hundreds of villages laid waste, and all the horrors, except on a smaller scale, which had been witnessed in 1915 under the exterminating policy of the Turkish Government, were again reproduced.

Perhaps I should add that after the destruction of the Russian-Armenian Republic the Communist authorities of Moscow permitted the establishment of a Soviet government in Russian Armenia; but it was a mere creature of the Bolshevik leaders and in no sense represents the aspirations and ideals of the Armenians. I record, however, the fact that after it began to function there was less persecution of the Armenians who were within its borders than they would have been subjected to under Turkish rule.

In August, 1920, the treaty of Sevres was signed. While it recognized the independence of the Russian-Armenian Republic, it also provided that a portion of the Provinces of Erzerum, Van, Bitlis, and Trebizond, which were within the limits of the Turkish Empire, should be awarded to the Armenians in order that they might establish a government of their own. It was understood that Russian Armenia in time would be united with the portion of Turkish Armenia over which Turkish authority was extinguished, and that thus a strong Armenian Republic might be established. It was further provided that the President of the United States should delimit the southwestern boundary of the new republic, which he did in November, 1920, and under his decision approximately 42,000 square miles of the four Provinces before mentioned were awarded to the Armenians to constitute a part of their new State.

But even the treaty of Sevres failed to do justice to the Armenians. An important part of Turkish Armenia, to which they were entitled, and all of Cilicia, which is one of the richest Provinces within the Turkish Empire, were awarded to Turkey.

It is important to know that Turkey by the treaty of Sevres recognized Armenia as a free and independent State and agreed to accept the arbitration of the President of the United States upon the question of the boundary between Turkey and Armenia in the villayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis and upon Armenia's rights to access to the sea. At the time of the signing of the Sevres treaty Great Britain, France, and Italy entered into an agreement for the protection of the Armenians and other Christians in Cilicia, which was placed within the French zone. The Armenians had insisted that Cilicia should constitute a part of their Republic, but this claim was denied. However, it was understood that Cilicia would have an autonomous government under the protection of France. There had gathered into Cilicia many thousands of Armenians, Greeks, and other Christians, and they looked forward with faith and hope to the building up of a progressive and enlightened State in which liberty might be enjoyed.

Soon after the execution of the treaty of Sevres jealousies entered into the councils of the allied nations in respect to the Near East. France and Italy were not in accord as to their respective spheres of influence in the Near East, nor were they satisfied with the attitude assumed by Great Britain toward the treaty of Sevres and the obligations of the signatories thereunder. I shall not attempt an analysis of the causes leading to these jealousies and controversies. Perhaps they were inevitable, although I have felt that selfishness and greed influenced the conduct of each nation. However, I do feel free to say that Great Britain more earnestly sought to protect the Christian minorities in the Near East and to preserve the Armenian Republic. She has been criticized because of her desire to restore to Greece territory which formerly constituted a part of Greece and within whose boundaries the Hellenic peoples were predominant. Undoubtedly Great Britain was desirous of building up a strong Hellenic State, and she was likewise committed to the policy of establishing a strong and vigorous Armenian nation. Undoubtedly both Italy and France did not feel that this program was to their advantage in the Near East.

The Armenians had cooperated with France in driving back the Turkish armies and in conquering Cilicia. She had accepted by the treaty of Sevres a solemn obligation to protect the Christian minorities within Cilicia. But after she had signed the treaty she gave notice of her purpose to withdraw all military forces. Terror seized the Armenians and Greeks and the Christian minorities within Cilicia, because they knew that the gathering Turkish forces under Kemal Pasha would subject them to the same fate which had overtaken so many hundreds of thousands of their race.

When the Turks perceived the disunion and jealousies among the allied nations they became truculent and avowed their purpose to ignore the treaty of Sevres, and, if necessary, engage in further military operations. They established a revolutionary government at Angora and began the mobilization of the defeated Turkish armies.

I have referred to their invasion of the territory of the Armenian Republic, in cooperation with the Bolshevists, the Tartars, and the Kurds, and the slaughter and the indescribable butcheries which followed their military successes. They now directed their attention against the Greeks who inhabited that part of Anatolia bordering upon the Black Sea and which was known anciently as Pontus.

Senators are familiar with the fact that hundreds of years before the Christian era a branch of the Hellenic race had settled along the southern littoral of the Black Sea. They organized a great and powerful State which represented Hellenic thought and Hellenic culture. The Greeks in those remote ages carried their laws and culture and civilization beyond the Greek States and free cities in what is known as Greece proper. Thrace, including Constantinople, was Greek; northern and

western Anatolia was Hellenic; the islands of the Aegean Sea were peopled by the Hellenic race, and to the east on the mainland Greek cities and colonies were founded. There Homer was born, and many of the greatest philosophers and statesmen and leaders of the Hellenic race were cradled on the western shores of Asia Minor, in what are now known as the Provinces of Adin and Broussa and the district of Smyrna.

In 1920 there were about 1,500,000 Greeks in Asia Minor and nearly 800,000 in Thrace and the region of Constantinople. There were approximately 1,000,000 Greeks in the vilayets of Adin and Broussa (including Smyrna), the number exceeding the Turkish population within the same territory. In 1914 there were nearly three-quarters of a million Greeks in Pontus and in other portions, not heretofore referred to, of Asia Minor. In 1919, in the vilayet of Constantinople, which comprises Stamboul, Pira, and Scutari, and the suburbs as far as Chatalja, there was a total population of 1,174,000. Of this number only 449,000 were Turks.

In the city of Constantinople there were at that time fewer Turks than there were Christians. In Constantinople proper there were approximately 308,000 Turks and 250,000 Greeks, 140,000 Armenians, 38,000 Jews, and in the neighborhood of 135,00 belonging to other nationalities. There were fewer Turks in western Thrace than there were Greeks and Bulgarians.

I mention these facts for the purpose of calling attention to the justice of the treaty of Sevres, which awarded western Thrace to Greece, and reserved that part of eastern Thrace consisting of Constantinople and a few square miles east of the Chattaqua line for further action by the allied and associated powers.

The government of Constantinople and environs was placed temporarily in the hands of a commission, but it was hoped that this district would be internationalized or placed in the hands of commissioners to be named by the League of Nations or by the allied and associated powers. At any rate, none of the victorious nations or their people conceived it possible that Constantinople would be returned to Turkey or that the Turkish Government would ever be permitted to exercise political authority in Europe. Gladstone had declared in his day that the Turks must be driven from Europe "bag and baggage." I repeat that when the treaty of Sevres was written it was felt throughout the Christian world that the Turk would no longer be permitted to rule in Europe. He had been a cruel, incompetent master. He had failed to do justice to his own race and had been cowardly and cruel in his treatment of other races under his flag.

Former President Taft expressed the views of the civilized world concerning the Turks when he said:

> Speaking of the Ottoman Government, it is a lawless form of medieval autocracy, imposed on subject races by pressure from without; sustained by fraud and force; knowing no law; despising justice; alien to every instinct of humanity; deaf to sympathy; and glorying in the shame of the power to injure and destroy.

The Turks, realizing that they were in the minority in Thrace and in Constantinople, accepted the treaty of Sevres, and many of their leaders looked to the establishment of a Turkish capital at Angora or some appropriate place in Anatolia.

The allied nations were entirely willing that the Turk should have a home and a country. They were willing, notwithstanding the fact that there were hundreds of thousands of Christians within the boundaries of Anatolia, to incorporate them within the boundaries of the Turkish Empire and subject them to the rule of the Turkish people. They insisted, however, upon guaranties and reserved to themselves certain authority which would enable them to protect the Christian minorities from oppression at the hands of the Turks.

As I was preceeding to state, when it became manifest that the allied nations were drifting apart and that jealousies were separating them in the administration of Near East affairs, Kemal Pasha and other ambitious Turks began plotting and intriguing to destroy the treaty of Sevres, to further divide the allied nations, and to pluck victory from an admitted inglorious defeat. A rapprochement was made with the Bolsheviks, and material aid was given and promised by the Moscow government in the program which the Kemalist government was preparing to execute. May I add that the territory awarded to Turkey under the treaty of Sevres was rich and possessed many advantages as well as almost limitless resources. It was bounded upon the north by the Black Sea; upon the west were the Sea of Marmora and the Straits leading from the Aegean and Mediterranean Seas to the Black Sea. Its area was large—indeed so great as to afford for centuries to come homes for an expanding and growing population. But the defeated Turks planned for an ultimate victory, and responding to the sinister intrigues of the Bolsheviks soon developed grandiose schemes, and sought to embroil the Near East and Egypt and all Mohammedan lands in bitter and relentless war.

Their emissaries, joined by the secret agents of the Soviet Government, penetrated the new Arabian State and Egypt, Afghanistan, and far-off India, seeking to raise the standard of revolt and to precipitate a deadly religious war. France and Italy pursued a course that encouraged the military movements of the Turks. They sold them enormous quantities of military supplies, withdrew their armed forces from territory which they should have protected, and signified a willingness for the Angora government, under Kemal Pasha, to repudiate the Sevres treaty and to light again the fires of war.

In this situation the Turks continued their persecution of the Greeks and Armenians and other Christians who were within Anatolia. Hundreds of thousands of Greeks were deported and thousands of them butchered and subjected to privations and hardships which resulted in death. The history of the treatment of the Potian Greeks is as tragic as many of the pages which record the cruelties and persecutions inflicted upon the Armenians. Tens of thousands of them were driven to Russia, and large numbers, after their homes were pillaged and towns destroyed, succeeded in escaping from their cruel persecutors and finally found their way into Greece or Constantinople or other cities and sections where there was temporary relief at least from the vengeful hand of the pursuing Turk. Thousands of Greeks and Armenians were murdered in Cilicia and in districts to the north and west, and most of the remainder were driven from Turkish soil.

The victory of the allied nations over the Central Empires and Turkey did not change the mentality of the Turks. They remained, and still remain, the same cruel tyrants, the same fanatical persecuting fiends that they have been in the past. There can be no protection for Christians under Turkish rule. So successful were the Kemalists in their schemes that the Greek military forces were driven from Asia Minor.

A great portion of Smyrna was burned, hundreds of thousands of Armenians and Greeks were driven from western Asia Minor, from the Provinces of Broussa and Adin, and were forced to take refuge upon the islands of the Aegean Sea or in Greece, where they are destitute and suffering incredible hardships. Inflamed by these successes, the Kemalists forced the abdication of the Sultan and marched their victorious armies to the very gates of Constantinople. Great Britain sought in an honorable way to unite the Allies in some policy that would bring peace to the Near East and save the Allies from a humiliating and ignoble compact with the Turkish leaders. France, unfortunately, had entered into a separate treaty with the Kemalists shortly after the treaty of Sevres and Italy had signified negatively if not affirmatively her willingness for the Kemalist government to engage in military operations, destroy the Greek armies, and reconquer Constantinople. It is manifest that both France and Italy were jealous of Great Britain and were unwilling to see her dominant in the Near East or the controlling power in Constantinople and in the straits. The course of France and Italy, in my opinion, is regrettable, and has brought about the unfortunate conditions to which I have referred.

A united front upon the part of the Allies would have avoided all of these serious consequences. Great Britain indicated a willingness to defend important terms of the treaty of Sevres and to prevent the return of the unspeakable Turk to authority and control in Europe. France and Italy refused their support in the execution of this policy. As a result the Turk, arrogant and insolent, is again in Europe. The Turkish armies have marched through the streets of Constantinople and driven tens of thousands of Greeks from their homes in Thrace. These suffering people have been compelled to abandon their homes and their property and to seek an asylum in the congested lands, overpopulated and impoverished as the result of war and famine, to the south of them. The sufferings of these poor wanderers as they fled before their cruel dispossessors can not be described. Fleeing through the mountains, thousands of them perished and thousands who succeeded in reaching Greece found poverty and hunger and starvation awaiting them.

The allied nations have capitulated to the demands of the Turks. These demands prove that Turkey has won the war. The great western nations, whose representatives met the cunning Turk at the peace table at Lausanne, discovered that no matter what might be said of Germany or Austria or Bulgaria, it was apparent that Turkey was emerging from the World War as a victorious nation. Her representatives at Lausanne were truculent and were supported by Tchitcherin and

the Bolshevists of Moscow. They demanded terms which, in my opinion, self-respecting nations would not assent to.

The destruction of the Armenian Republic is confirmed and the remnants of the Armenians who were found in Asiatic Turkey are to be expelled. It is true there are but few remaining. The bones of hundreds of thousands of these martyrs lie bleaching upon the plains and in the mountain fastnesses of what was once the Armenian kingdom. The cruel Turk has at last triumphed. It has taken hundreds of years to accomplish his end, but now, with the connivance of Christian nations, he succeeds in driving from the land in which Armenians have lived for more than 2,500 years the few survivors there found. In the centuries since these Asiatic barbarians invaded the homeland of the Armenians millions have been butchered and wrongs and cruelties perpetrated which 10,000 historians can not record. Is it possible that wrong is to triumph and justice to be denied? I am reminded of the biting words of Wilde:

Christ, dost Thou live, indeed, or are Thy bones
Still straightened in their rock-hewn sepulcher?
And was Thy rising only dreamed by her,
Whose love of Thee for all her sin atones?

For here the air is horrid with men's groans,
The priests who call upon Thy name are slain;
Dost Thou not hear the bitter wail of pain
From those whose children lie upon the stones?

Come down, O Son of God! incestuous gloom
Curtains the land, and through the starless night
Over Thy cross the crescent moon I see!
If Thou in very truth didst burst the tomb,
Come down, O Son of Man and show Thy might,
Lest Mahomet be crowned instead of Thee!

Mr. President, one will be justified in condemning those nations which have permitted Turkey to write victory above her banners. For weeks their representatives, led by Lord Curzon, have been pleading and fencing to secure a treaty from a nation that has practiced the murder of helpless people and waged a war of extermination against Christian races. Lloyd-George, speaking of them and their statements, said:

I remember representatives of Turkey admitting that millions of Armenian Christians have been slaughtered, ravaged, outraged, and tortured. Yet I know of governments that have not hesitated to make agreements with the people who take a leading part in the direction of those outrages and murders.

Mr. President, France and Italy should cower under these stinging words. They cut like a lash. They reveal the selfish, if not imperialistic, policies that have guided some of the allied nations following the treaty of Sevres in their dealings with the Near East and the stricken, sorrowing non-Moslem peoples.

Mr. President, I believe that the majority of the American people felt, even though the Versailles treaty was rejected and we did not enter the League of Nations, that there was an obligation resting upon the United States to aid the Armenians in obtaining their freedom and establishing an independent government. It is true our Government did not declare war upon Turkey and Bulgaria. In my opinion that was a mistake. They were our enemies as much as was Austria, and our military forces were operating against them as they were contending against the forces of Germany and Austria, though, perhaps, there were no points of actual contact. In 1917 I insisted that our Government recognize a state of war as existing between it and Bulgaria and Turkey, and offered a resolution which was a declaration of war against these nations. I contended that if we failed to declare war and no declaration of war came from them, when hostilities ceased we would be denied the opportunity of participating in the peace conference and have no voice in dictating peace terms.

However, as I have shown, the American people recognized, and our Government recognized, that one of the objects of the war was the defeat of Turkey and the establishment of an Armenian Government. The duty rested upon the allied and associated powers to protect Armenia as it protected Belgium and Poland and Czechoslovakia. America failed, in my opinion, to do her duty toward the Armenians. We saw her abandoned by the allied nations and made no protest. Congress was apathetic and heard with apparent unconcern the piteous appeals from the Armenians for the redemption of the promises made by the victorious nations.

The American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, of which the Hon. James W. Gerard is and for several years past has been chairman and Hon. Henry W. Jessup has been secretary, and which has an executive committee composed of some of the most eminent statesmen of our country, including Secretary Hughes, Judge Parker, Elihu Root, Charles W. Eliot, Senators LODGE and WILLIAMS, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, and Hon. Edward P. Wheeler, has rendered invaluable and conspicuous service in behalf of the Armenians. This committee for several years has earnestly and faithfully labored to present the cause of Armenia and to compel our Government and the American people to discharge the obligations which they had solemnly undertaken for the protection of the Armenian people.

No praise is too great for the unselfish and noble work performed, particularly by former Ambassador Gerard and Mr. Jessup. No stronger papers have been presented in behalf of a worthy cause than those submitted by these men to the Chief Executive of the United States, the State Department, and to Congress and the American people. I wish time permitted the presentation to the Senate of some of the reports, addresses, and papers prepared by these two distinguished men. However, I shall ask permission to place in the RECORD without reading a statement found in one of the pamphlets submitted by Mr. Gerard under date of April 14, 1922, in which reference is made to America's responsibility in Armenia's tragedy. While I do not agree with all that is said, I recognize the splendid and logical presentation and gladly offer it for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY IN ARMENIA'S TRAGEDY.

Armenia joined the Allies in the war three years before we did and lost by actual fighting over 100,000 lives. Through the President of the United States we proclaimed to the world that the liberation of Armenia was one of the war aims of America, and later we reaffirmed the President's pledge by a congressional resolution. But we quit the war before we made any practical gesture to bring about the recognition of the rights of a little nation, which had fought on our side and which was no longer able to help itself. We did not forget, however, that the defeat of Turkey, to which we had contributed indirectly, had given us the right to claim, as we now officially do, certain economic advantages in Turkey. But this is not all.

When the peace conference was sitting the Armenians, relying upon the repeated and specific pledges of the allied powers that the creation of an Armenian State would be one of the fruits of victory, had no thought of turning to the United States for aid. They expected that the European powers would carry out both the letter and the spirit of their promises.

Indeed, during the winter of 1918–19 official spokesmen of France made deliberate and persistent intimations to the Armenians that they ask France to take a mandate for Armenia, of which nearly one-half part had already been allotted to France by the secret Sazanoff-Paleologue convention of 1915 and the Sykes-Picot compact of 1916. But our delegation to the peace conference conveyed to the Armenians the clear impression that America was favorably disposed to the assumption of that task. Manifestly it was not for the Armenians to question the constitutional authority of an official body, headed by the President of the United States, ostensibly representing America. That such an impression, amounting to a promise, was given the Armenians was subsequently proved by the fact that the President asked the Senate on May 24, 1920, for authority to accept a mandate for Armenia.

While we rejected the proffered mandate by numerous subsequent utterances, some of them made by our highest officials and others embodied in our national party platforms, we continued to hold out to them the hope that we would help them to become a nation.

When the Armenians turned their faces to us and we, without regard to party, officially and unofficially held out to them the hope that we would help them we actually induced them to relieve the powers from their own responsibility to help them and thereby assumed a fixed and binding moral and legal responsibility to help them to become a nation.

I shall herein below set forth a set of facts which constitute, in my opinion, the bases of our responsibility toward Armenia, a responsibility which we can not shirk without stultifying ourselves. They show that for a continuous period of over three years we have held out to the Armenians the hope that we would help them—we have made solemn promises to help them—and thereby deprived them of the opportunity of looking elsewhere for help.

1. In December, 1918, Senator LODGE offered a resolution in the Senate in favor of the independence of Armenia, and further expressing the hope that "the peace conference—of which America was a member—will make arrangements for helping Armenia to establish an independent Republic." (The peace conference did make the hoped-for arrangement.)

2. On February 8, 1919, at a banquet held in New York, a representative American audience, after having heard Mr. Justice Hughes and Mr. Bryan, adopted Senator LODGE'S resolution and cabled it to the President, who replied that "it struck a responsive chord in my heart."

3. On March 3, 1919, 20,000 ministers and priests, a cardinal, 85 bishops, 40 governors, and 250 college and university presidents subscribed to two petitions, addressed to the President, embodying Senator LODGE'S resolution.

4. On March 17, 1919, Mr. Byran cabled the President in favor of the inclusion of Cilicia in Armenia, and the President made a sympathetic reply. (Mr. Bryan suggested that we should keep the President's reply for future use and reference.)

5. During the winter of 1918–19, the American delegation to the peace conference conveyed to the Armenians the impression that America would accept a mandate for Armenia, relying upon which the Armenians refrained from responding to intimations made to them by France that they ask France to accept a mandate for Armenia.

6. On April 22, 1919, 75 bishops, by cablegram, expressed to the President the hope that America may accept a mandate for Armenia, to which the President replied that "You may be sure I share the deep interest in the fate of Armenia."

7. On May 25, 1919, 15 representative Americans, by cablegram, pledged to the President their sympathetic support in the matter of America's accepting a mandate for Armenia, in reply to which the President expressed "our deep appreciation of the trust reposed in us in a matter in which our hearts are very much enjoined."

8. On May 18, 1919, Colonel House assured us that the American delegation was giving necessary attention to the Armenian case and that it was in a satisfactory condition.

9. On May 21, 1919, the United States sent a warning to Turkey against her treatment of the Armenians.

10. On June 22, 1919, eight Americans, including Hughes, Root, LODGE, Eliot, Senator WILLIAMS, and others, by cablegram, urged the President that "either the Allies or America, or both, should at once send to Caucasus Armenia requisite food, munitions, and supplies for 50,000 men and such other help as they may require, to enable the Armenians to occupy the nonoccupied forts of Armenia, within the boundaries defined in the memorandum of the delegation of integral Armenia"; in reply to which message the President sent the Harbord mission to Armenia.

11. On September 8, 1919, Senator WILLIAMS offered a resolution in the Senate embodying the provisions of the Lodge resolution and, further, advocating the dispatch of troops to Armenia, etc. A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, headed by Senator Harding, held hearings in September and October, examined numerous witnesses, some of whom had come from Armenia to appear before that committee, but did not make its report to the Foreign Relations Committee until May 14, 1920.

12. In the fall of 1919 the Department of State intimated that the President was favorable to making remedial recommendations to Congress for Armenia, if he could feel that the Republican leaders would support him; whereupon, on December 18, 1919, 10 Americans, including Hughes, Parker, Root, Butler, Hibben, and others, with the full approval of LODGE, asked the President to abandon the proposition of America's accepting a mandate for Armenia—since we were not a member of the league—and urged him that "the administration declare itself in favor of America's extending direct aid to Armenia, and to that end formulate a definite, continuing policy."

13. On April 23, 1920, we recognized the independence of Armenia.

14. On May 21, 1920, the President accepted the invitation extended to him by the allied supreme council to define the southwestern boundaries of Armenia, which he did on November 22, 1920.

15. On May 24, 1920, the President asked Congress for authority to accept a mandate for Armenia. Before the President had sent in his message to Congress we informed him, on the basis of careful inquiries we had made as to the attitude of the Senators, that it would be overwhelmingly rejected, and that its rejection would, in effect, constitute an invitation to the enemies of Armenia to attack her; and after he had sent in his message to Congress we warned the Senators in charge of the resolution in reply to the President's message, and also several other members of the Foreign Relations Committee, that a rejection of the President's request, without a substitute plan for helping Armenia, would be fatal for Armenia, but they did not agree with our conclusion; and thus the steps taken by the executive and legislative branches of our Government, for which the Armenians were in no wise responsible, resulted disastrously for Armenia.

16. In June, 1920, the Republican Party inserted a plank in its national platform which declared that "we deeply sympathize with the people of Armenia and stand ready to help them in all proper ways"; and the Democratic Party inserted a plank in its national platform which declared that "we express our deep and earnest sympathy for the unfortunate people of Armenia, and we believe that our Government, consistent with its Constitution and principles, should render every possible and proper aid to them in their efforts to establish and maintain a government of their own."

17. When Armenia was invaded by the Turks in the fall of 1920 the administration, in reply to our urging that it warn the Turks and the Allies, intimated that it was reluctant to do anything that might embarrass its successor. Whereupon on December 17, 1920, the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, secured the approval of President-elect Harding to a note to be addressed to the powers, and copy thereof to be transmitted to the Turks, calling upon them to enforce and respect the Armenian provisions of the Sevres treaty, when the President would ask Congress for "such financial, material aid to the new Republic, when put in possession of its rightful territory, as will enable it undisturbed to attain in due time its proper development."

18. In May, 1921, the President expressed himself in favor of the independence of Armenia and of the American people and Government doing their share in the upbuilding of Armenia.

19. In May, 1921, Senator KING offered a resolution in the Senate in favor of the enforcement of the Armenian part of the Sevres treaty.

20. We have in our possession numerous letters written by the highest officials of the Government during 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922, all of which, without exception, favor America's helping Armenia by this or that method.

The major conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing facts are that—

(a) The American people, speaking through their leaders and chosen representatives, made specific and solemn promises to the Armenians, during a continuous period of over three years, that America would help Armenia to become a nation;

(b) Armenia, relying upon the promises thus made by America, refrained from asking the powers to fulfill the pledges which they had made to her, and in one instance turned down a specific offer of help made to her by one of the great powers, and, by so doing, antagonized her;

(c) The United States Government waited for a year and a half to inform the powers and the Armenians of its decision with regard to accepting a mandate for Armenia, and during that period held out to the world the hope that it would take a hand in the setting up of an Armenian State.

(d) The United States Government, after having waited for a year and a half to determine its course on the mandate proposition, in disregard of the warnings which have been given to it that a rejection of the proffered mandate without a substitute project to help Armenia would throw her upon the mercy of her enemies and of those whom she had antagonized by ignoring their offer of help, induced by our promises, made of the Armenia case a football of American party politics, with disastrous consequences to Armenia.

(e) In September–October, 1919, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings in connection with a resolution favoring measure of direct aid to Armenia, thus holding out to the Armenians the hope of help, and thereby depriving them of the opportunity of seeking help from the powers—a step which would have constituted a gross act of disrespect to the Senate had they taken it—and without any good reason, and notwithstanding the obvious and admitted necessity for speedy decision by the subcommittee, affirmative or negative, waited for eight long months to make its report.

(f) The United States Government, by its failure to inform the powers within a reasonable time that it would not accept the Armenian mandate and by its failure to act within a reasonable time on a resolution—Senator WILLIAMS'S resolution, referred to in paragraph (e)—delayed the settlement of the Armenian problem for a year and a half; and the President, who had accepted the invitation of the allied supreme council to define the southwestern boundaries of Armenia on May 21, 1920, by not rendering his decision until November 22, 1920, delayed the enforcement of the Armenian part of the Sevres treaty, which was concluded on August 10, 1920.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is well understood that President Wilson deeply sympathized with the aspirations of the Armenians. He was willing that the United States accept a mandate over Armenia. Let me emphasize a fact or two mentioned in the statement just placed in the RECORD. Our distinguished colleague, Senator WILLIAMS, offered a resolution early in 1920, which was referred to a subcommittee composed of President Harding, who was then Senator, and Senators WILLIAMS and NEW, extending congratulations to Armenia upon her independence and "recommending the dispatch of a battleship to the eastern waters and the landing of marines to aid in holding the Batum-Irivan line." A report was submitted, prepared, as I understand, by Senator Harding, which was ratified by the Senate, and it comprehended in its recommendation all that had been declared in the resolution. On the 24th of May, 1920, President Wilson, in a message to Congress, referred to Senator Harding's report and declares that it "embodies his own convictions and feelings with regard to Armenia and its people." He further stated that it was to the American people and their Government that the struggling people of Armenia turned—

as they emerged from a period of indescribable suffering and peril, and I hope that the Congress will think it wise to meet this hope and expectation with the utmost liberality.

The President asked for authority to accept a mandate for Armenia, but the Senate Foreign Relations Committee denied his request, and the Senate adopted a resolution refusing the Executive the power to accept a mandate as requested.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in view of the statement as to what has happened to Armenia since the war closed, I suppose the Senator and I ought to feel that we did the right thing when we voted in favor of a United States mandate over Armenia as I remember the Senator and I did vote.

Mr. KING. The Senator is correct as to our attitude upon that matter, and I do not regret that I was one of the 12 Senators who voted to authorize the President to accept a mandate for Armenia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nor shall I ever regret my vote.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, after the allied nations refused to enforce the treaty of Sevres and the Kemalist forces were encouraged, as I have shown, to engage in further military operations, it became apparent to the allied nations that a state of war still existed between them and Turkey, and that some form of treaty must be agreed upon and formally ratified. In the spring of 1921 Lloyd-George, speaking for the allied premiers, submitted proposals as a basis for a revision of the Sevres treaty. One of the proposals called for recognition by Turkey of the rights—

of the Turkish Armenians to a national home on the eastern frontiers of Turkey in Asia, delimitation of the frontiers to be decided by a mission appointed by the council of the League of Nations.

This declaration was followed by a memorandum later issued by the foreign ministers of the allied powers which confirmed the proposal for such a national home. This proposition proved attractive to some who were sincere friends of Armenia, but it was evident that the plan was not feasible, and that it would not cure the long-standing evil nor bring relief to the Armenian people. It implied a division of Armenia between Turkey and Russia and the separation of the Armenian people. It recognized as a fait accompli the rightful and permanent assertion of authority by Russia over the Armenian Provinces now controlled by the Soviet Government. It likewise recognized the sovereignty of Turkey over the so-called Turkish-Armenian "home" within which it was proposed that the Armenians scattered in Asiatic Turkey and in Europe would gather. It was a denial of independence to the Armenians and the consignment to the grave of their centuries of hopes and aspirations for freedom and independence.

And, in the meantime, the insolent Turk has continued his plan to destroy the Armenians. He has realized the weakness and impotency of the allied nations to afford them protection or to impose upon Turkey terms of peace which justice and righteousness demand.

And the present administration, regarding the rejection of the Versailles treaty as a mandate to do nothing for Europe or for the Armenians or to discharge those obligations which our association with the allied nations imposed, looks coldly upon all propositions to aid the Armenians in obtaining their liberty and in setting up an independent government. It has refused to even express to the allied nations the deep interest

of the American people in the fate of the Armenian race. It has refused to indicate to the signatories of the treaty of Sevres that in so far as that treaty protects the Armenians this great Republic, which has always championed the cause of the oppressed, is profoundly interested in its provisions, and views with deep concern any proposition looking to the modification of such terms and to the denial of freedom and liberty to the Armenian race, whose interests, it was understood, were involved in the World War.

Indeed, Mr. President, our Government apparently looks with unconcern upon the tragic conditions in the Near East. No voice of protest is raised against the deportation of Greeks from Thrace, the burning of Smyrna, the deportation of tens of thousands of Christians from the Smyrna district, and the deliberate execution of the cruel plan to accomplish the extermination of all non-Moslems now within Asiatic Turkey. It is quite likely, in view of this apathetic and calloused spirit, that we will soon be called upon to welcome the Turk into the family of nations, to resume intimate and most cordial diplomatic relations with him, and to accord to him the honors of a triumphant and victorious power. It seems as though but little is needed to complete the humiliation of the allied and associated powers.

Mr. President, the chapter will soon close. It will record the betrayal of a brave and heroic people, the denial of their aspirations, the crucifixion of their ideals, and it will show how great and mighty Christian nations, quarreling over the spoils of war and territorial concessions and spheres of influence, were willing to sacrifice a brave people who had fought with them for world liberty and the cause of civilization. It will likewise portray this Nation, the most powerful in the world—a nation which should exercise the authority of a moral and spiritual leader in the world—as having abdicated its high privilege and taken refuge behind the ramparts of materialism and alleged self-interest.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, much that has been said by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is quite apropos of a bill now on the calendar, the bill S. 4092, providing for the admission into the United States of certain refugees from near eastern countries. If it were not so late in the day, and if there was a somewhat larger attendance of the Senate, I would be tempted to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. But because of those conditions I shall not ask it. I hope Senators will give their attention to the bill, with the view on my part of moving its consideration at the earliest practicable time.

I wish to say with reference to the bill as it is now before the Senate, that it is for the relief of Armenian refugees to this country. The original bill introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] provided for the relief of all refugees of whatsoever nationality or racial group that might come from Turkish territory or territory occupied by Turkish troops or Turkish civilian population, and who had been compelled to flee from their homes on account of Turkish outrages. But the Committee on Immigration modified the bill so as to make it apply to Armenians alone. In their inquiry into the subject they found that the Armenians as a race were of that high character so well described by the Senator from Utah. Indeed, Madison Grant, in his book entitled "The Passing of a Great Race," pauses to pay a high tribute to the Armenian people and to their excellent qualities.

In addition to what the Commissioner General of Immigration estimates might be between 5,000 and 6,000 refugees, the bill provides for the admission of 25,000 homeless or orphan Armenian children, in both instances this country to be safeguarded against any adults or children becoming charges. It seems to me that the United States has at least the responsibility of doing that much for the relief of those people.

SPEECH OF EX-GOVERNOR JAMES M. COX.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in 8-point type a speech of former Governor Cox of Ohio, on the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner in Lancaster, Ohio.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, in 8-point type, as follows:

SPEECH BY EX-GOVERNOR JAMES M. COX AT LANCASTER, OHIO, ON THE OCCASION OF A JACKSONIAN OBSERVANCE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17.

The principles of our Democracy were written by the same hand that put into form the Declaration of Independence. The great Democrat who conceived them as essential to the perpetuity of free institutions translated theory into demonstration and turned preachment into performance. Under his beneficent rule the borders of our domain stretched to the western ocean, universal happiness grew from the consciousness and advantage of equal rights, and our country made an amazing growth in internal resource and international prestige. When the romance of what was then the western forests felt the touch of the pioneers of our modern civilization and the development of a great empire offered fruitful reward to individual endeavor, human greed asserted itself in the form of enterprises created to feed on governmental preference. But out of the wilderness came another great Democrat, who believed the first duty of government to be the maintenance of the sacred pledge of justice upon which it was founded. What Jefferson conceived Jackson preserved, and under the superb leadership of his honesty and his courage our organization took on a strength that has sustained the faith through the storms of years. Other political parties have come and gone, mere wreckage on the barren wastes of time. The historian writes of their failures rather than of their achievement. They were false to immortal truths.

We profane the underlying sentiment of this solemn occasion unless we pledge our efforts to make the Democratic Party an instrumentality of useful service. In reflecting upon our duty and our opportunity let us see what the present situation is. In the last presidential contest we lost the election, but history will certainly say of that campaign that the circumstances of our defeat were more creditable than the circumstances of the victory registered by the Republican Party. We are proud of the cause we espoused, while the opposition party is seeking to make a closed book of its sloganized misrepresentations. The campaign of 1920 created a very interesting historic analogy. The Whigs came into power as the result of the election in 1840. The contest was a veritable hysteria of hate. Heterogeneous groups had but one thing in common—an implacable dislike for Jackson. The Whig convention presented no platform of principles, for the very controlling reason that the malcontents gathered together could not agree upon a program of legislative or administrative action. They all hated Andrew Jackson, blamed him for the reaction that came from an unprecedented prosperity, and, as the records show, their orators urged "a change." The Whig victory was overwhelming—Jackson's State of Tennessee and Van Buren's State of New York were caught up in the political tidal wave. Confusion in governmental affairs came with the first days of the new administration. Cohesive thought or action was impossible. There could be agreement on no vital question. In 1844 the Whigs were defeated, and the party in a few years ceased to exist. A standard authority says of the movement:

"It was a heterogeneous party composed of diverse and conflicting elements. Its only bond of union was a common desire to gain political power. Had the party been one of fixed political principles it might have made a glorious record. But it was lacking in principles. It was faithful to no program. As a result it accomplished but little."

History repeated itself in 1920, but there was a difference in one detail. A platform in this instance was written, but it was with deliberate care made so ambiguous as to be innocuous, hence it offended none of the groups that followed the Republican standard, and sang together the hymn of hate. They were in agreement in their fancied grievances, and nothing else mattered. Again a plurality quite beyond precedent was recorded against the party in power. No sooner was the change in government made than the country began reaping, for the second time in history, the harvest of impulsive anger. Gestures were made now and then to one element or another, but protest from other quarters soon calmed the waters to a state of perfect tranquillity. There was no agreement at the outset on principles. Except for the element of hatred there was accord in nothing, and quite naturally nothing to speak of has been done. The currents of public opinion are running now against the Republican leaders as they did against the Whigs. There is open revolt in the ranks. Unless present portents are misleading the fate that befell the Whig Party may overtake its successor.

The present public indictment is that general incompetence is enthroned at Washington. We have the President's own official statement that the Congress has passed two measures that would have bankrupted the Treasury except for his own intervention. The executive and legislative departments are equally responsible for a tariff law that is condemned in every community, as a menace to our markets, a subsidy to campaign contributors, and the certain forerunner of industrial troubles. More lamentable is the failure in international affairs. Never since the dawn of civilization have the sons of man been so plagued with conditions that bring disaster to individuals and uncertainty as to the very existence of nations. We have indeed had a World War and the whole world suffers from it! Its awful reactions have spared no nation. The disaster is so

widespread that any attempt at piece-meal repair is but a pathetic evidence of national or racial endeavor.

The concerted labors of peoples everywhere are essential, and this is practicable only through governments. What fragmentary fortunes of war there are seem to be with us. We have a commanding gold supply and our agencies of productivity are unimpaired. However, we can not trade with our gold except across the seas, and there can be no trade with prostrate nations. Our fields and factories can produce, but normal production is useless unless we can find a market in which to sell. Our aims in the war were admittedly unselfish. We are not engulfed in the bitterness that has impaired reason elsewhere. Every element is present for a helpful leadership, spiritual and practical. The teachings of every religion tell what any nation so circumstanced ought to do. Every human conscience free from the poison of partisanship is moved by a common prompting, and yet in the sea of international responsibility we drift as aimlessly as a floating derelict. For two years the administration, Micawberlike, has seemingly lived in the hope that something would turn up. Doubtless its philosophy has been that matters could not get much worse and any development might improve the situation.

In the past few months the effort has chiefly been to sustain a theory of justification, and the propaganda reaching to communities has carried the expression often heard from partisans that "after all are we not fortunate to be out of the European mess?" For the time this may carry the intended appeal, but the facts underlying the Turkish imbroglio will in brief season be known. It may surprise some to discover that one of the trails of responsibility leads directly to our State Department in Washington. If we had not abandoned a responsibility assumed during the war the situation in the Near East would not now be so serious. Mr. Hughes's contention that we were not at war with Turkey is an evasion. We were in fact but not in law at war with Turkey. We were an ally of the nations fighting Turkey. We turned munitions over to our allies without question as to where they were to be used. When soldiers from our allied armies went to the scenes of Turkish hostilities our own soldiers took the places they gave up on the western front. Furthermore, one of President Wilson's 14 points expressly dealt with Turkey.

When we abandoned our allies in the forms and tasks of peace the Turk profited by this break in what had been a strong and effective association. But there came a later development, out of which grew a military offensive. Let us see whether anyone in truth can deny our share in the blame. Many years ago civilized powers sought to prevent the shipment of arms and munitions to so-called backward peoples, notably certain tribes in Africa. As a part of the movement we became a party to the Brussels act of 1890, which dealt specifically with this problem. In 1919 it became apparent that the Brussels act was inadequate and out of date, so the peace conference at Versailles drew up the new convention of St. Germain. An able American, Mr. Louis Beer, now deceased, became our representative on the commission. The convention continued a prohibition on arms and munitions shipments to certain African areas and enlarged the scope of the provision so as to take in specified regions surrounding Persia and the Red Sea. It went further and required that all shipments of arms should be given license by the national authority in any country in which these supplies originated. As an added precaution information bearing upon the traffic was to be promptly filed with the League of Nations. Mr. Wilson was unable to submit this convention to the Senate, and not until August, 1922, did our Government officially report its intention not to ratify the treaty. The assembly of the league adopted a resolution expressing the desirability of having the United States submit its objections to the treaty in order that an effort might be made to procure another treaty, one in fact that would meet the American view. So far as known Mr. Hughes has never responded to this suggestion. It will be seen that during this period of uncertainty and confusion there was no interference with shipments of war materials, and the Kemalists equipped themselves for the offensive movement which has resulted not only in an insolent attitude to the world generally but in the slaughter of thousands of men, women, and children as well. Not all of the war necessities were imported by the Kemalists, but most of them were. If this is not another tragedy to be charged against the policy of indifference and aloofness, then I mistake the plain significance of events. It is not unfair to assume that our failure to help create safeguards against an international crisis was directly in consequence of the fanatical policy of having nothing to do with any movement attached in any way to the league, even though the question of our membership was in no way involved.

There is another phase of the Near East situation which will doubtless enter into the public's final analysis. It presents the question of whether the administration's attitude of silence when women were outraged and thousands of adults and children killed squares with the time-honored American policy of protecting religious minorities. Secretary of State John Hay expressed it in a vigorous way when Jews were persecuted in Rumania in 1902. Other precedents are numerous in support of the American theory, which the administration ignores. Such distinguished premiers as Cass, Evarts, Blaine, and Fish felt no restraint in maintaining the Nation's self-respect through plain words to offending foreign authorities. When the slaughter of Christians was at its height, a committee of church ministers called on the President of the United States and urged some official expression of our people's outraged feelings. The Executive is quoted as saying that he did not favor any protest unless we were in a position to back it up. Within a fortnight our Government filed a protest but not in behalf of human life. Instead it was entered to protect oil interests in a part of contested territory.

It is now quite two years since the present national régime was installed. Certainly any public insistence upon a definite international policy can not properly be charged to impatience. The party in control gave three definite pledges.

The senatorial "round robin," formed in opposition to the covenant of the treaty of Versailles, professed a "sincere desire that the nations of the world should unite to promote peace."

The present Executive in his formal speech of acceptance as the candidate of his party declared for an "association of nations."

The committee of 31 leading Republicans, headed by Messrs. Hughes, Root, Hoover, Lowell, and Taft (Henry), in its appeal favored bringing "America into an effective league to preserve peace * * * by frankly calling upon the other nations to agree to changes in the proposed agreement which will obviate the objections now the subject of dispute."

To use a popular yet a comprehensive phrase, Is it not time for a show-down? Does the senatorial group believe that a promise to America on a most solemn matter is to be regarded as having no binding responsibility? Is the President not ready to report on the structural plans for an association of nations and at the same time advise his countrymen what steps have been taken to assure cooperation from abroad? The committee of 31 certainly did not assume to speak without the knowledge and consent of the candidate who, if elected, would possess in his official status the constitutional right to "call upon the other nations to agree to changes in the proposed agreement." Has the committee of 31 performed its part of the trust? It may be that the signers of the round robin, the members of the group of 31, and the President himself—all may have departed from their announced positions. If so, then in frankness their revised plans, if they have any, should be given to the public. If, on the other hand, they are without program or suggestion, a candid admission will reflect credit upon them. No one need fear either an accusing conscience nor the disrespect of his fellows by expressing an honest conviction.

Mr. Hughes very recently said that the question should be taken out of politics. No one questions the wisdom of this course, nor is any useful purpose served by any elaborate reminder to Mr. Hughes that the Republican senatorial conspiracy put it into politics at a time when the Nation's endeavors were purely nonpolitical. These are stressful times, and public officials in their arduous responsibilities deserve public cooperation so long as good faith is shown. The administration has forfeited the people's confidence because it has stubbornly held to views that common sense defied. Our people are tired of following a leadership that neither leads nor gets anywhere. The betrayal of the civilized powers in the St. Germain affair is followed now by the obstinate refusal to cooperate with the Reparation Commission. When the French-German crisis approached the administration met widespread criticism with the observation that we were not properly represented on the Reparation Commission. The Robinson resolution, providing the very thing Mr. Hughes said we lacked, was at once presented in the Senate, only to be met with Mr. Hughes's objection that its adoption now would be untimely. When positive action is proposed for remedial purposes there invariably comes a hint from the administration that something else is under way, but it never materializes. Can there be any more effective device to wear out the patience of a forbearing public?

Mr. Hughes will render a conspicuous service if the pressing problem of our international relationship is removed from poli-

tics; but if his labors are to be fruitful, he must bestir himself. Within another year we will be on the very threshold of another presidential contest. I most earnestly hope that solution will be so far under way that this subject matter of such widespread concern can not be thrown into a political campaign. I feel assured that the American people will not be hairsplitting in their consideration of details. They realize now from the bitter lesson of experience that we are a part of an economic unit that involves the markets, the human activities, and the well-being of our civilized world. We can not cut ourselves from it and thrive. Profound statesmanship is not so much the element necessary to a proper adjustment of our international affairs as are common sense and a disposition to forget fetish and any false pride in sponsorship of things behind us. If Mr. Hughes will forget his politics, strip himself of all thought of the alliances made in 1920 to win a partisan victory, and take a position determined by the single thought of serving humanity, he will save the world. We should be reminded that Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell in England made their places in history by forsaking the corn laws which they had espoused. Changed conditions justified their course. They may have been moved by the thought of Emerson that—

A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines.

Mr. Hughes should sanction without delay the congressional proposal to vitalize our participation in the affairs of the Reparation Commission. America should then, through her representative, bring about an economic survey of Germany. The suggestion of turning the problem over to a committee of bankers is putting the cart before the horse. Obviously, economic experts, including bankers, would serve in the survey, but as subordinates to the Reparation Commission their report would not only be presented to the public opinion of the world but it would be a base for action by a legally created body that has powers. Let us illustrate the point in this way: If a group of international bankers conducted an analysis, its conclusions would become merely a public document. It would be a process much like the gathering of evidence in a court trial without submitting it to either judge or jury. It would be but another development lacking the virtue of positive action.

The time is here for action. The fate of the world is imperiled and time is of the essence. If the Reparation Commission, on the other hand, makes its inquiry, and it can, as efficiently as the suggested international bankers possibly could, then the detail of procuring the facts will have been completed and the facts can go to the Reparation Commission—a body with power to act. The world wants the truth and action based upon the justice which truth would render clear would sweep away the rubbish of petty controversy. In these circumstances, if Germany refused to accept the award of the Reparation Commission, she would deserve no sympathy and get none. If all parties in interest except France were to accept it, then she would be an outlaw nation, because she would be regarded as having rejected the decree of a tribunal she had helped to create—a tribunal whose decisions she had pledged herself to respect. She is no way committed to any finding that might otherwise be made on reparations.

But if Mr. Hughes continues trying to strait-jacket the soul of America and if the administration goes on drifting, then what? In that contingency, this great question unavoidably becomes more of a political issue than it has ever been before.

When this comes, if it does, what will be the duty of the Democratic Party? Let us address ourselves seriously to this thought. We hear it said that the question was settled in 1920, and that a mandate was spoken against our entering the league. Let us see whether the facts justify that contention. Three distinct groups voted against our ticket because of purely racial grievances, untold thousands voted against us because of heavy taxes, others were controlled by a discontent growing out of internal war measures. Republicans in every community accepted in good faith the assurance of the committee of 31 that the surest way to get into the league was through the suggested compromise plan of the Republicans rather than by adhering to what was designated as the unyielding Democratic position. These votes more than made up the Republican plurality, and yet they were not directed against our membership in the League of Nations. The claim obviously falls before the facts.

Now, for the sake of argument, let us assume that a plain mandate was given. If so, was the mandate for the association of nations that the Republican candidate promised to create, or the League of Nations amended as Messrs. Hughes, Root, Hoover, Lowell, Taft, and others proposed? Since we have procured neither the amended covenant of the league nor the association, is it safe to assume that the people will just let the matter drop? If there was a mandate against the Democratic plan, then certainly the suggested Republican alternative was sanctioned. There is no escape from this conclusion. At all events, the matter stands just as it was two years ago. If any Democrat believes a verdict was registered against the league and that it should be accepted as conclusive, what about the tariff? We have been defeated in the past on that issue, but did the Democracy give up the faith? On the contrary, we continued to reaffirm it, and did so in 1920, while the Republicans stood for a protective tariff. Are we to accept the present tariff monstrosity as the expressed preference of the people, or will we renew the fight in 1924?

The condition of things in the world clearly makes an issue, and under our system of government if the contingency described arises this issue will be discussed in the same manner that vital questions always have been in this country. Certainly the points at issue are being clearly drawn. The world is slowly but surely drifting to a state of horror. When the war closed a going concern, the League of Nations, was formed to substitute reason for force. Nations bound themselves together in agreement to go to conference rather than war, and to put an end to the system of secret treaties that had plagued civilization. It is the only organized movement for this specific purpose. Men criticize it, but they have no substitute, either in created or creative form. The proposed Republican alternatives presented in the campaign of 1920 have come to naught. We must enter into some international arrangement or remain in isolation. There is no middle ground. Since those who suggested other plans have abandoned them, common sense opens the only avenue of service—service not only for Europe but ourselves as well.

You hear at times the partisan observation that the treaty of Versailles is responsible for the present confusion. Most treaties following severe wars have taken on some of the spirit of bitterness. They are concluded before the cooling-off process takes place. We need not go outside our own history to find where the element of hate brought on the awful days of reconstruction in the Southern States—an enforced cruelty that no one now even attempts to justify. If Lincoln had lived, it would not have occurred. Each day, because time heals wounds and softens asperities, would have helped to make his creed of "malice toward none and charity for all" an accomplished fact.

When the treaty of Versailles was concluded, even as strong an advocate as General Smuts, the eminent South African statesman, said that there were terms in it that ought not and could not be enforced. The time had come, however, bringing with it the dangers of starvation and disorder, when a start had to be made in organizing and administering the new order. We must not lose sight of the important fact that the treaty was assigned to the League of Nations, a body having elastic powers, rather than to an international court. The court would have accepted it as a decree to enforce. The league, on the other hand, possessed the discretionary right to act as developments suggested. Is it not true that chartered constitutions, laws, and regulations are refined in part by the sensible manner of their enforcement? Even courts in their liberal view of public policy have not interfered. Men of the type of Wilson, Smuts, Gray, Cecil, and others doubtless looked to the machinery of the League of Nations to work out the solution of problems as they arose, having in mind that accruing time would make the task easier. What Lincoln would have meant to the reconstruction of the American Union the League of Nations, in its administration of the treaty of Versailles, would have been to the reconstruction of the world.

The Reparation Commission, for instance, was clothed with broad powers. An outstanding virtue to the plan was the provision for American membership in the league. We were not infected with the bitterness that possessed Europe. We were asking for neither territory nor indemnity. Our good faith was recognized even by the vanquished nations. Our judicial attitude would at once have established our moral and constructive leadership. But America did not go into the league. At the very beginning of things we were separated from the whole enterprise. European nations were soon at each other's throats, and the golden opportunity for a service that would have had no historical precedent was lost. We are not in the International Court of Justice, nor have we any useful relation to anything that is going on in Europe. It is true that we have observers, engaged in the job of snooping around and making themselves and our Nation ridiculous in the view of the world. The reparations tangle could have been adjusted, but by America and America only. Last summer every national interest in Europe desired our offices of mediation. A peculiar psychology

made it possible for our Government to successfully intervene. At that time an economic survey of Germany's condition would have been welcomed by the powers in interest. Obviously then, as now, it was not a question of what Germany ought to be made to pay but how much she could pay and live. Chancellor Wirth in Berlin said that Germany would gladly subject herself to a careful economic examination, provided it was made under the impartial auspices of American leadership. He went so far as to say that Germany desired to enter the League of Nations when America did, but not before, for the reason, as he advanced, that under other conditions German membership would only mean her subjection to what was characterized by him as "the ruling intolerant bitterness of Europe."

The right to remain an active member of the Reparation Commission was never impaired, but the administration at Washington has not availed itself of it. Mr. Hughes, instead, had another plan—again it was to be something different. It failed in the "borning" and now the march of French troops is on German soil. Credits are affected. Upon our markets will fall another chill. Our farmers, now borrowing millions of dollars to meet losses already sustained, will face another unprofitabe season, and every home, in city and country, will have a quickened appreciation that a divine agency made us a part of the world and no human device can change the order of things.

Now, assuming that the administration will not settle this question—then what will we as Democrats do? What would Andrew Jackson have done in like circumstances? What did Jackson do when France violated her treaty with us, and even Clay, Webster, and Calhoun denied him congressional appropriations for the adequate maintenance of our self-respect? The timid said he should delay matters. He went forward and France settled. What did Jackson do when the franchise for the Federal bank was to be renewed or rejected? The timid, even in his cabinet, said he should go slow, but he went forward and crushed the monster menace. What did Jackson do when the Government funds were to be taken from the Federal bank? The timid again, even in his cabinet, urged postponement in order to avoid a panic. He went forward. The bank was closed, and when the Whigs later tried to resurrect it, John Tyler, the Whig President, recognized that Jackson was right, and twice vetoed the bill.

What would Andrew Jackson do now? He would follow the path which his clear vision always blazed for him, the path of duty. He would establish relationships with the nations of the world in order to save humanity. Recognizing the futility of waiting longer for alternatives he would ask America to join the only operating concern created for this critical need—the League of Nations. He would impose such conditions as would befit the dignity of our country and harmonize with the composite public opinion of our people. Andrew Jackson never retreated when duty faced him. He was unschooled in the art of retreat. A solemn duty confronts the Democracy now and we must not retreat.

INDIANS OF THE MESCALERO RESERVATION.

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President——

Mr. CURTIS. I will yield to the Senator if the bill he desires to call up will involve no debate.

Mr. BURSUM. If it does I shall not press its consideration. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6294) promoting civilization and self-support among the Indians of the Mescalero Reservation, in New Mexico.

A bill similar in substance passed the Senate last September, appropriating $250,000 to be advanced to the Mescalero Indians and to be repaid out of the sale of timber. The House passed a different bill, on the same line and for the same purpose, but did not pass the Senate bill. The House bill is different in that it simply authorizes the appropriation. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

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 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $250,000 for the purpose of promoting civilization and self-support among the Indians of the Mescalero Reservation, in New Mexico, to be expended or distributed in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, under such regulations as he may prescribe; to remain available for a period of five years from the date of the enactment of this act, and to be reimbursed to the United States from the sale of timber on said reservation.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, January 27, 1923, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXTRADITION TREATY WITH COSTA RICA.

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified, and, on motion of Mr. LODGE, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit an extradition treaty between the United States and Costa Rica, signed at San Jose on November 10, 1922, and, for confirmation by the Senate, copies of notes exchanged between the American minister at San Jose and the Costa Rican Minister for Foreign Affairs, by which assurance is given on the part of the United States that the death penalty will not be enforced against criminals delivered by Costa Rica to the United States for any of the crimes enumerated in the treaty, and that such assurance is, in effect, to form part of the treaty and will be so mentioned in the ratifications of the treaty.

The attention of the Senate is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, in which it is explained that a precedent for this course is found in the case of the extradition treaty between the United States and Portugal in 1908, where like notes were exchanged and were confirmed by the Senate.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 20, 1922.*

—

The PRESIDENT:

By its resolution of February 22, 1922, the Senate advised and consented to the ratification of the treaty of extradition signed between the United States and Costa Rica at San Jose on January 21, 1922. The treaty was amended by the Costa Rican Congress by the insertion of a supplementary article providing as follows:

"The delivery of a person by the Republic of Costa Rica in virtue of this treaty will be made under the condition that capital punishment shall not be applied to the criminal."

This Government was unable to agree to this modification, but the American minister at San Jose was instructed to indicate this Government's willingness to effect an exchange of notes similar to that which followed the signing of the treaty of extradition between the United States and Portugal in 1908, as set forth on pages 1475 and 1476 of the compilation entitled "Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols, and Agreements Between the United States and Other Powers."

This course being agreeable to the Government of Costa Rica, a new treaty, in substitution of the treaty of January 21, 1922, was signed at San Jose, and the exchange of notes mentioned made on November 10, 1922. This treaty of November 10, 1922, being word for word the same as the substituted treaty of January 21, 1922, the undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to its ratification, together, for the Senate's confirmation, with copies of the notes exchanged at the time of its signature between the American minister at San Jose and the Costa Rican Minister for Foreign Affairs, by which the understanding is stated on the part of Costa Rica, and the assurance is given on the part of the United States that the death penalty will not be enforced against criminals delivered by Costa Rica to the United States for any of the crimes enumerated in the treaty, and that such assurance is, in effect, to form part of the treaty and will be so mentioned in the ratifications of the treaty.

In its resolution of May 22, 1908, giving its advice and consent to the ratification of the extradition treaty between the United States and Portugal of May 7, 1908, above mentioned, the Senate stated its understanding "that it is agreed by the United States that no person charged with crime shall be extradited from Portugal upon whom the death penalty can be inflicted for the offense charged by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the charge is pending, and that this agreement on the part of the United States will be mentioned in the ratifications of the treaty and will, in effect, form part of the treaty."

A similar confirmation by the Senate of the notes exchanged at the time of the signature of the Costa Rican treaty is necessary.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 19, 1922.

The Republics of the United States of America and of Costa Rica, desiring to assure the prompt and efficient action of justice in punishing delinquents who attempt to escape the penalty prescribed by the laws of one country by taking refuge in the other, have resolved to conclude a treaty of extradition. For that purpose they have named as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Mr. Roy Tasco Davis, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America in Costa Rica; and

The President of the Republic of Costa Rica, the Secretary of State in the Office of Foreign Relations, Señor José Andrés Coronado Alvarado;

Who, after having mutually communicated their full powers, and they being found in good and due form, have stipulated as follows:

ARTICLE I.

It is agreed that the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Costa Rica shall, upon mutual requisition duly made as herein provided, deliver up to justice any person who may be charged with, or may have been convicted of, any of the crimes specified in Article II of this convention committed within the jurisdiction of one of the contracting parties while said person was actually within such jurisdiction when the crime was committed, and who shall seek an asylum or shall be found within the territories of the other, provided that such surrender shall take place only upon such evidence of criminality, as according to the laws of the place where the fugitive or person so charged shall be found, would justify his apprehension and commitment for trial if the crime or offense had been there committed.

ARTICLE II.

Persons shall be delivered up according to the provisions of this convention who shall have been charged with or convicted of any of the following crimes:

1. Murder, comprehending the crimes designated by the terms of parricide, assassination, manslaughter, when voluntary, poisoning or infanticide, as well as the attempt to commit these crimes.

2. Rape, abortion, carnal knowledge of children under the age of 12 years.

3. Bigamy.

4. Arson.

5. Willful and unlawful destruction or obstruction of railroads, which endangers human life.

6. Crimes committed at sea:

(a) Piracy, as commonly known and defined by the laws of nations or by statute;

(b) Wrongfully sinking or destroying a vessel at sea or attempting to do so;

(c) Mutiny or conspiracy by two or more members of the crew or other persons on board of a vessel on the high seas for the purpose of rebelling against the authority of the captain or commander of such vessel or by fraud or violence taking possession of such vessel; and

(d) Assault on board ships upon the high seas with intent to do bodily harm.

7. Burglary, defined to be the act of breaking into and entering the house of another in the nighttime with intent to commit a felony therein.

8. The act of breaking into and entering into the offices of the Government and public authorities, or the offices of banks, banking houses, saving banks, trust companies, insurance companies, or other buildings not dwellings with the intent to commit a felony therein.

9. Robbery, defined to be the act of feloniously and forcibly taking from the person of another goods or money by violence or by putting him in fear.

10. Forgery or the utterance of forged papers.

11. The forgery or falsification of the official acts of the Government or public authority, including courts of justice, or the uttering or fraudulent use of any of the same.

12. The fabrication of counterfeit money, whether coin or paper, counterfeit titles or coupons of public debt, created by National, State, provincial, territorial, local, or municipal governments, bank notes, or other instruments of public credit, counterfeit seals, stamps, dies, and marks of State or public administrations, and the utterance, circulation, or fraudulent use of the above-mentioned objects.

13. Embezzlement or criminal malversation committed within the jurisdiction of one or the other party by public officers or depositaries, where the amount embezzled exceeds $200 (or Costa Rican equivalent).

14. Embezzlement by any person or persons hired, salaried, or employed, to the detriment of their employers or principals, when the crime or offense is punishable by imprisonment or other corporal punishment by the laws of both countries, and where the amount embezzled exceeds $200 (or Costa Rican equivalent).

15. Kidnaping of minors or adults, defined to be the abduction or detention of a person or persons, in order to exact money from them or their families, or for any other unlawful end.

16. Larceny, defined to be the theft of effects, personal property, or money, of the value of $25 or more (or Costa Rican equivalent).

17. Obtaining money, valuable securities, or other property by false pretenses, or receiving any money, valuable securities, or other property knowing the same to have been unlawfully obtained, where the amount of money or the value of the property so obtained or received exceeds $200 (or Costa Rican equivalent).

18. Perjury or subornation of perjury.

19. Fraud or breach of trust by a bailee, banker, agent, factor, trustee, executor, administrator, guardian, director, or officer of any company or corporation, or by anyone in any fiduciary position, where the amount of money or the value of the property misappropriated exceeds $200 (or Costa Rican equivalent).

20. Crimes and offenses against the laws of both countries for the suppression of slavery and slave trading.

21. The extradition is also to take place for participation in any of the aforesaid crimes as an accessory before or after the fact, provided such participation be punishable by imprisonment by the laws of both contracting parties.

ARTICLE III.

The provisions of this convention shall not import claim of extradition for any crime or offense of a political character, nor for acts connected with such crimes or offenses; and no person surrendered by or to either of the contracting parties in virtue of this convention shall be tried or punished for a political crime or offense. When the offense charged comprises the act either of murder or assassination or of poisoning, either consummated or attempted, the fact that the offense was committed or attempted against the life of the sovereign or head of a foreign State, or against the President of either of the signatory Republics, shall not be deemed sufficient to sustain that such a crime or offense was of a political character, or was an act connected with crimes or offenses of a political character.

ARTICLE IV.

No person shall be tried for any crime or offense other than that for which he was surrendered.

ARTICLE V.

A fugitive criminal shall not be surrendered under the provisions hereof, when, from lapse of time or other lawful cause, according to the laws of the place within the jurisdiction of which the crime was committed, the criminal is exempt from prosecution or punishment for the offense for which the surrender is asked.

ARTICLE VI.

If a fugitive criminal whose surrender may be claimed pursuant to the stipulations hereof, be actually under prosecution out on bail or in custody, for a crime or offense committed in the country where he has sought asylum, or shall have been convicted thereof, his extradition may be deferred until such proceedings be determined, and, until he shall have been set at liberty in due course of law.

ARTICLE VII.

If a fugitive criminal claimed by one of the parties hereto shall be also claimed by one or more powers pursuant to treaty provisions, on account of crimes committed within their jurisdiction, such criminal shall be delivered to that State whose demand is first received.

ARTICLE VIII.

Under the stipulations of this convention neither of the contracting parties shall be bound to deliver up its own citizens or subjects. In each Republic, according to their respective laws, shall the citizenship of the delinquent be determined.

ARTICLE IX.

The expense of the arrest, detention, examination, and transportation of the accused shall be paid by the Government which was preferred the demand for extradition.

ARTICLE X.

Everything found in the possession of the fugitive criminal at the time of his arrest, whether being the proceeds of the crime or offense or which may be material as evidence in making proof of the crime, shall, so far as practicable, according to the laws of either of the contracting parties, be delivered up with his person at the time of the surrender. Nevertheless, the rights of a third party with regard to the articles aforesaid shall be duly respected.

ARTICLE XI.

The stipulations of this convention shall be applicable to all territory, whatever may be its situation, belonging to one or the other of the contracting parties or which may be occupied and under the jurisdiction of the same.

Requisitions for the surrender of fugitives from justice shall be made by the respective diplomatic agencies of the contracting parties. In the event of the absence of such agents from the country or its seat of government, requisition may be made by superior consular officers.

It shall be competent for such diplomatic or superior consular officers to ask and obtain a mandate or preliminary warrant of arrest for the person whose surrender is sought, whereupon the judges and magistrates of the two Governments shall respectively have power and authority, upon complaint made under oath, to issue a warrant for the apprehension of the person charged, in order that he or she may be brought before such judge or magistrate, that the evidence of criminality may be heard and considered; and if, on such hearing, the evidence be deemed sufficient to sustain the charge, it shall be the duty of the examining judge or magistrate to certify the same to the proper executive authority, that a warrant may issue for the surrender of the fugitive.

If the fugitive criminal shall have been convicted of the crime for which his surrender is asked, a copy of the sentence of the court before which such conviction took place, duly authenticated, shall be produced. If, however, the fugitive is merely charged with crime, a duly authenticated copy of the warrant of arrest in the country where the crime was committed, and of the depositions upon which such warrant may have been issued, shall be produced, with such other evidence or proof as may be deemed competent in the case.

ARTICLE XII.

If when a person accused shall have been arrested in virtue of the mandate or preliminary warrant of arrest issued by the competent authority as provided in Article XI hereof, and been brought before a judge or a magistrate to the end that the evidence of his or her guilt may be heard and examined as hereinbefore provided, it shall appear that the mandate or preliminary warrant of arrest has been issued in pursuance of a request or declaration received by telegraph from the Government asking for the extradition, it shall be competent for the judge or magistrate at his discretion to hold the accused for a period not exceeding two months, so that the demanding Government may have opportunity to lay before such judge or magistrate legal evidence of the guilt of the accused, and if at the expiration of said period of two months such legal evidence shall not have been produced before such judge or magistrate the person arrested shall be released, provided that the examination of the charges preferred against such accused person shall not be actually going on.

ARTICLE XIII.

In every case of a request made by either of the two contracting parties for the arrest, detention, or extradition of fugitive criminals, the legal officers or fiscal ministry of the country where the proceedings of extradition are had shall assist the officers of the Government demanding the extradition before the respective judges and magistrates by every legal means within their or its power; and no claim whatever for compensation for any of the services so rendered shall be made against the Government demanding the extradition: *Provided, however*, That any officer or officers of the surrendering Government so giving assistance who shall, in the usual course of his or their duty, receives no salary or compensation other than specific fees for services performed, shall be entitled to receive from the Government demanding the extradition the customary fees for the acts or services performed by them, in the same manner and to the same amount as though such acts or services had been performed in ordinary criminal proceedings under the laws of the country of which they are officers.

ARTICLE XIV.

This treaty must be submitted for approval in the form prescribed by the laws of the two countries, and shall take effect from the day of the exchange of the ratifications thereof; but either contracting party may at any time terminate it on giving to the other six months notice of its intention to do so.

The ratifications shall be exchanged in San Jose of Costa Rica or in Washington as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the above articles and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at the city of San Jose de Costa Rica this 10th day of November, 1922.

ROY TASCO DAVIS.
J. A. CORONADO.

—

EXCHANGE OF NOTES.

[Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores. No. 333, B.]

REPUBLICA DE COSTA RICA,
San José, 10 de noviembre de 1922.

Excmo. Señor ROY T. DAVIS,
Enviado Extraordinario y Ministro Plenipotenciario de los Estados Unidos de América, San Jose.

SEÑOR MINISTRO: Tengo la honra de informar a Vuestra Excelencia que he recibido instrucciones del señor Presidente de la República para hacer la manifestación, de parte del Gobierno de Costa Rica, con referencia al Tratado de Extradición que Vuestra Excelencia y el suscrito acaban de firmar, de que es entendido que el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos de América asegura que la pena capital no se aplicará a los criminales entregados por Costa Rica a los Estados Unidos de América, por cualquiera de los crímenes enumerados an dicho Tratado, y que esa seguridad formará efectivamente parte del Tratado y así se mencionará en su ratificación.

Aprovecho esta oportunidad para reiterar a Vuestra Excelencia el testimonio de mi màs distinguida consideración.

J. A. CORONADO.

—

[Ministry of Foreign Relations. No. 333–B. Translation.]

REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA,
San Jose, November 10, 1922.

Most Excellent Mr. ROY T. DAVIS,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, San Jose.

Mr. MINISTER: I have the honor to inform your excellency that I have received instructions from the President of the Republic to make the statement on behalf of the Government of Costa Rica with reference to the treaty of extradition which your excellency and the undersigned have just signed, that it is understood that the Government of the United States of America assures that the death penalty will not be applied to criminals delivered by Costa Rica to the United States for any of the crimes enumerated in the said treaty, and that such assurance will form in effect part of the treaty and will be so mentioned in the ratifications.

I avail myself of this occasion to reiterate to your excellency the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.

J. A. CORONADO.

—

[No. 63.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
San Jose, Costa Rica, November 10, 1922.

His Excellency Señor don JOSÉ ANDRÉS CORONADO,
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, San Jose.

EXCELLENCY: In signing to-day with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Costa Rica the extradition treaty which was negotiated between the Government of the United States and that of Costa Rica, the undersigned envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America has the honor to acknowledge and to take cognizance of the note of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of this day's date, stating that he desires to place on record, on behalf of the Costa Rican Government, its understanding that the Government of the United States assures that the death penalty will not be enforced against criminals delivered by Costa Rica to the United States for any of the crimes enumerated in the said treaty, and that such assurance is, in effect, to form part of the treaty and will be so mentioned in the ratifications of the treaty.

In order to make this assurance in the most effective manner possible, it is agreed by the United States that no person charged with crime shall be extraditable from Costa Rica upon whom the death penalty can be inflicted for the offense charged by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the charge is pending.

This agreement on the part of the United States will be mentioned in the ratifications of the treaty and will in effect form part of the treaty.

I avail myself of this occasion to renew to your excellency the assurance of my highest and most distinguished consideration.

ROY T. DAVIS.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 26 (legislative day of January 23), 1923.

POSTMASTER.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William K. Kaynor to be postmaster at Springfield, Mass., in place of T. J. Costello. Commission expired October 1, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26 (legislative day of January 23), 1923.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Herbert Warren Hardman to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.

Martin Douglas Mims to be first lieutenant, Medical Administrative Corps.

John Thomas Axton to be chief of chaplains, with rank of colonel.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Allie A. Dickerman, Tucson.

COLORADO.

Dixon D. Pennington, Victor.

FLORIDA.

Herschel C. Anderson, Hastings.
Elizabeth D. Barnard, Tampa.
Benjamin F. Hargis, Umatilla.

MARYLAND.

William L. Whittington, Crisfield.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William P. Parker, Kittanning.

VIRGINIA.

John R. Yates, Brookneal.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 26 (legislative day of January 23), 1923.

POSTMASTER.

Christopher G. Simpson to be postmaster at Springfield, in the State of Massachusetts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 26, 1923.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Bishop William F. McDowell offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, wilt Thou draw near to us and bless us as we undertake to-day's work in the name of the great worker for good in all the world. Grant to guide us in the way of truth and of righteousness and of human sympathy, and help us to do those things that will be good for the world. May we always remember our place as the servant of mankind, and may the Nation, whose we are and whom we serve, render its large service to the world to-day. Let Thy special tenderness and kindness abide with the Chaplain of this House as he sits in grief and loneliness. Pour back into his own heart something of the kindness and sympathy that he always poured out of his heart. And with him and with all Members of this body who carry great sorrows of any sort wilt Thou constantly abide. Hear us in our morning prayer, be with us in our work, and guide us always. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

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

VALIDATING BANK TAXES.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table the papers in reference to the bill H. R. 11939, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks to take from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference on the bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 11939. An act to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not get the whole statement as to the amendments. I understand this is a bill validating national bank back taxes.

Mr. McFADDEN. I will say to the gentleman I realize how important this is to the gentleman's State and the State of Massachusetts and several other States, with a view of harmonizing and getting a correction of the law, and realizing that his State and some of the other States are particularly interested in our permitting validation, I can assure him and the other Members of the House that the conferees will give the House an opportunity to vote on the validating clause in this bill.

Mr. SNELL. That will be very satisfactory so far as our State is concerned.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, as I understand the gentleman there will be no attempt, or will the House conferees be in accord with the Senate conferees as to the main part of the bill?

Mr. McFADDEN. Of course, I can not bind the conferees, but I believe I can say to the gentleman that we will be in accord. We have had, I can say, an informal discussion of this matter, and I can not see any disagreements concerning the bill.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit, I do not want a misunderstanding of the gentleman's statement to be in the mind of the gentleman from New York. Of course, I have no quarrel with my friend from Pennsylvania, but I, as one of the conferees, do not want the impression to be left that the House conferees are going to violate the judgment of the House by agreeing to any part of the Senate amendment. We are going into a full, free conference, subject to the agreement I understand the gentleman has made, that before final settlement of the so-called validation amendment the House will be given an opportunity to express itself upon that.

Mr. ANDERSON. With that statement I think I shall have to object to the conference at this time.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman does not want any legislation, the responsibility is on him.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think this matter can be adjusted. I do not think there is any real disagreement. What is insisted upon is that before the conferees have finally agreed upon the bill as a whole the conferees will return to the House and give the House an opportunity to pass upon the question of validation.

Mr. WINGO. I do not object to that. But I do not want anybody to think that I, as a conferee, am bound to agree to any part of the Kellogg amendment.

Mr. McFADDEN. I agree with what the gentleman from Wyoming has just said; that is exactly the position. I do not want to give the impression to the House, however, that I am in favor or that members of the conference committee are in favor of the validating clause.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that it is necessary for any one to express any opinion on the matter one way or the other. All the House desires is that before the conferees reach an agreement the House shall have opportunity to pass on the question of validation. I think we all understand that, and it ought to be stated.

Mr. ANDERSON. This proposition is not quite on all fours with some matters that come up before the House on the basis of the consideration of Senate amendments. This bill is on the House Calendar; it can be called from the Speaker's table, and the House can proceed to consider the Senate amendments without sending the bill to conference, so that the matter does not stand on the same basis, for example, as an appropriation bill. There are some of us who are interested in the Senate amendment as proposed. I hesitate somewhat to surrender the right which I think we have to call for a vote on the Senate amendment in order to send this bill to conference if it is understood that the House conferees are going to adhere to the position which the House took originally on this subject.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand, what the gentleman is thinking about is the dispute over the terms or the language of the validation provision. Is that what the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. ANDERSON. Primarily.

Mr. WINGO. Now the difference between the two is simply whether or not we shall accept one of the Senate provisions

on validation, which would authorize the legislative veto of a judicial decision. I will say frankly to the gentleman that if the House wants to vote on that I shall have no objection, but I will never agree to such a provision permitting a legislative veto on a judicial decision. I will not agree to that. I think the better course would be to pursue the course suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]; let it go to conference. The gentleman has assured you that you will have a vote on that proposition. If that is what you want, all right.

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, what is the regular order?

The SPEAKER. This is the regular order.

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. I can not understand what is going on, and I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the consideration of the conference report. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report, to the request that it be taken from the Speaker's table and sent to conference?

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the other provisions of the bill are acceptable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. McFADDEN, Mr. DALE, and Mr. WINGO.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 13481, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 13481, which the Clerk will report.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, 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 3, 4, 16, 17, 22, and 28.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 32, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "For the investigation and improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of cereal production, and for the study and control of cereal diseases, including barberry eradication, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, $697,505: *Provided*, That $425,000 shall be set aside for the location and destruction of the barberry bushes and other vegetation from which rust spores originate: *Provided further*, That $125,000 of this amount shall be available for expenditure only when an equal amount shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations, for the accomplishment of such purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,891,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$3,376,470"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,797,880"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$541,223"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$4,005,853"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 11, 31, 33, 34, and 35.

SYDNEY ANDERSON,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
EDWARD H. WASON,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
GORDON LEE,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHAS. L. MCNARY,
W. L. JONES,
I. L. LENROOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
WM. J. HARRIS,
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 (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On No. 1: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the appropriation for printing and binding shall not include work done at the field printing plants of the Weather Bureau and the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, in accordance with the act approved March 1, 1919, or emergency field printing and binding authorized by said joint committee.

On No. 2: Makes the appropriation of $30,000 for the interpretation, translation, and transcription of discussions and the printing, binding, and distribution of the proceedings of the World's Dairy Congress immediately available, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 3 and 4: Strikes out the language, proposed by the Senate, extending the activities of the Weather Bureau under the appropriation for frost-warning service.

On No. 5: Appropriates $250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the eradication and control of the white-pine blister rust instead of $200,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 6: Strikes out a comma in the paragraph appropriating for soil-fertility investigations, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 7: Appropriates $697,505 for the investigation and improvement of cereals, instead of $772,505, as proposed by the Senate, and $622,505, as proposed by the House, and sets aside $425,000 for the location and destruction of barberry bushes, instead of $500,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $350,000, as proposed by the House; and further provides that $125,000 of the amount thus set aside shall be expended only when an equal amount shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities for the accomplishment of such purposes, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the Senate. Eliminates the provision proposed by the Senate that $10,000 might be expended for investigations concerning rust-resistant wheat.

On No. 8: Appropriates $104,115, as proposed by the Senate, for sugar-plant investigations, instead of $94,115, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 9 and 10: Correct totals in the bill.

On No. 12: Inserts the State of Pennsylvania in national forest district 7, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 13: Appropriates $135,000, as proposed by the Senate, for silvicultural experiments and demonstrations, instead of $110,000, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 14 and 15: Correct totals in the bill.

On No. 16: Appropriates $123,000, as proposed by the House, for investigations of insects affecting truck crops, instead of $173,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 17: Corrects a total in the bill.

On Nos. 18 and 19: Appropriates $225,000 for the prevention of the European corn borer, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the Senate and $200,000 as proposed by the House, and provides that $100,000 of this amount shall be available for expenditure only when an equal amount shall have been appropriated by States, counties, etc., for the accomplishment of this purpose, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the Senate and $75,000 as proposed by the House.

On No. 20: Appropriates $30,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the control and prevention of the spread of the Mexican bean beetle, instead of $25,000 as proposed by the House.

On No. 21: Corrects a total in the bill.

On No. 22: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the Senate, that $150,000 of the appropriation for predatory animal work may be expended in the State of California.

On No. 23: Appropriates $700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the market-news service, instead of $426,400, as proposed by the House.

On No. 24: Corrects a total in the bill.

On No. 25: Appropriates $541,223 for the enforcement of the United States grain standards act, instead of $546,223 as proposed by the Senate and $536,223 as proposed by the House.

On No. 26: Corrects a total in the bill.

On No. 27: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the publications entitled "Diseases of the Horse" and "Diseases of Cattle" shall be deposited one-third in the folding room of the Senate and two-thirds in the folding room of the House of Representatives, and said documents shall be distributed by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

On No. 28: Strike out the word "blackleg," proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals.

On No. 29: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that mileage rates for motor vehicles shall include travel at official stations.

On No. 30: Inserts the language proposed by the Senate further limiting the payment of claims for damage to goods while in storage in Center Market that have accrued or may accrue at any time during the operation thereof by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe.

On No. 32: Inserts the title proposed by the Senate for the authority extended to the President in inviting other nations to appoint delegates to the International Farm Congress.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 11: Permitting the exportation of timber and other forest products from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated.

On No. 31: Relating to the maximum salaries of scientific investigators and employees engaged in scientific work in the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1924.

On No. 33: Relating to the appropriation for forest roads and trails.

On No. 34: Relating to the purchase of seeds for drought-stricken areas.

On No. 35: The total of the bill.

SYDNEY ANDERSON,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
EDWARD H. WASON,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
GORDON LEE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural appropriation bill as it passed the House carried a total of $69,068,053. As it passed the Senate it carried a total of $73,741,653, an increase of $4,673,600. If the House accepts the recommendations of the managers on the part of the House, the bill for 1924 will carry $69,536,653, an increase over the amount recommended by the House of $468,600 and an elimination of amendments in the Senate carrying $4,205,000.

I shall take up in detail only three or four amendments which the conferees considered and on which they have come to an agreement. The first of these items is Senate amendment No. 7, relating to the eradication of the barberry, on which the Senate increased the amount of $350,000, carried by the House bill, to $500,000. The conferees have agreed upon a total amount of $425,000; $125,000 of this sum contingent upon contributions by States, counties, municipalities, and other organizations of an equal amount.

On the European corn borer the Senate increased the amount of $200,000, carried in the House bill, to $250,000, and the conferees have agreed upon $225,000.

On the item for the control of the white-pine blister rust the Senate increased the amount carried by the House from $200,000 to $250,000, and the House recedes from its disagreement to that amendment.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I see on page 4, under Senate amendment No. 23, the House conferees agree upon $700,000 for the market news service, instead of $426,400, as proposed by the House. Do I understand this will take care of the news service in the country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that I understand exactly what the gentleman means by that, but what it is contemplated that the amendment will do is to extend the existing service to portions of the country not now covered. It does not include any service which is not now undertaken under this item.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The reason why I asked the question is that the Southeastern States at the present time have not the service that the other sections of the country have. This will extend the service to the entire country?

Mr. ANDERSON. This will extend the service to the entire country, including the Southeastern States.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. No agreement has been reached on the maximum salaries?

Mr. ANDERSON. No agreement has been reached on that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has the gentleman in mind the idea of discussing that after he gets through the report?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. We will take up the amendments seriatim.

Mr. HAUGEN. You have no objection to indicating the position of the conferees?

Mr. ANDERSON. I expect to move to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. That will increase the salaries of these 3,750 scientists about $7,500,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I will explain that in a moment.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I have to-day introduced a House concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to call a joint peace conference. I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to raise my voice for peace. I am to-day introducing a resolution providing for the appointment of a congressional committee to call upon the President, requesting him to call a world peace conference.

While I think there is no doubt about the sentiment in this country, that it is overwhelmingly opposed to the United States ever again entering European entanglements, in my judgment there is no power on earth that could keep the United States out of war if another world war is allowed to come.

Civilization is approaching danger. A fight is brewing on the international world campus. The United States is opposed to that fight. If it is to be stopped, it must be now. We must not sit supinely by and allow civilization to go on the rocks. The lives of your boy and my boy are at stake. Let us act vigorously and act now.

The following is a copy of the peace resolution:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 26, 1923.

Mr. CHALMERS introduced the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

House concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a congressional committee to call upon the President of the United States to request him to call a world peace conference.

Whereas European nations seem to be rapidly drifting toward war, and although the sentiment of this country is overwhelmingly opposed to our entering another world war, nevertheless, if war comes, probably no power on earth can keep this country out; and

Whereas the European nations are too close to get the proper perspective and the danger seems too real to them individually to view the situation reasonably; and

Whereas the United States is far removed and is universally held as the unselfish, impartial, and unprejudiced friend of all peoples working to stabilize civilization:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a congressional committee of 10, 5 from the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 5 from the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, call upon the President of the United States to request him to call a conference of leading world powers to consider and work out a specific plan for world

stabilization, and that the President of the United States formulate the agenda for said conference and issue the call in the name of the people of the United States of America.

I also want to call your attention to the following resolution adopted by the council of the city of Toledo:

Whereas international relations in Europe at present are such that a renewal of the World War appears imminent; and

Whereas it appears that the United States is in a position to, and should, assume the leadership in making plans to place the world on a basis of political, financial, and economic sanity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the council of the city of Toledo, State of Ohio, that President Harding should call a conference of leading world powers for the purpose of taking up economic problems, reparations, debts, limitations of land and sea armaments, and working out a specific plan for world habilitation, all compatible with existing agreements between the United States and other countries; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of council be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States of America.

I quote editorials from one of my home papers, the Toledo News-Bee:

DO YOU WANT TO KEEP THE UNITED STATES OUT OF WAR?

Every day conditions in Europe are growing worse.

Nations great and small are tottering, unable to pay expenses.

Suffering among the peoples is increasing. Famine threatens here and there. Unemployment is growing. A sort of suicidal desperation—a don't-care-what-happens mood—has settled down over half the world.

Say "Boo!" and a new world war will start which by comparison will bleach the red horror of the last one.

And if such a blaze is started, it will sweep everything before it—us along with the rest. Some of us honestly think we could "keep out." Impossible!

Yet we stand around and do nothing to stop it.

* * * * * * *

They say the time to convert a hardened sinner is right after he turns the corner of a dangerous illness but while he is still in fear of a relapse.

One of these days, if we are lucky, the present crisis in Europe may ease off a bit. Sobered over its narrow escape, the world may then be in the moment's mood for salvation.

Then will be the time for the United States to be ready with a plan to offer as a basis of world sanity—political, financial, economic. If it is not ready with such a plan then, it should forever after hold its peace.

"Plan? Plan? Have you anything constructive to offer?" That is the reply of our Government—Congress, the President, the State Department—when asked if we as a Nation have any plan or policy. They confess they have no plan; no policy.

Criticize? Oh my, yes! Say what ought not to be done? Washington officialdom is chock full of those ideas. But of anything constructive, never a word.

So one is offered by this newspaper. It is not pretended to be perfect. But it does contain the nucleus of an idea, perhaps a basis to work from. It is at least something, instead of nothing.

* * * * * * *

THE PLAN.

1. The United States must assume the leadership.

2. At the first possible opening, President Harding should call a conference of the leading World War powers.

3. The program at this conference should be in two sections:

I. Economic problems, reparations, war debts.

II. Limitation of armament—on land, on sea.

4. Instantly the conference is called to order, America's spokesman should lay before the assembly some specific plan of world rehabilitation. This might follow somewhat these lines:

SECTION I.

A. A general moratorium on reparations and war debts, so that no payments of principal or interest need be paid for from three to five years.

B. Full American participation in a reparations commission, which, freed of politicians and soldiers and guided by economic experts, should fix the amount Germany can pay, not what she ought to pay.

C. Germany should know that until this amount is paid in full France, under allied supervision, will remain on the left bank of the Rhine.

D. An international loan to Germany; part to go to France to help tide her over the next few years, the balance to be used to stabilize Germany's finances.

E. Willful default on the part of Germany to be met by sanctions as provided for under the treaty of Versailles.

F. The United States and Great Britain to agree to aid France in the event Germany attacked her without provocation. (Absolutely safe, since Germany would never attack France without provocation as long as such an agreement stood.)

G. Allied debts to the United States to be got into understandable form pending the general moratorium, and then refunded or revised or adjusted satisfactorily as between the nations concerned.

SECTION II.

A. The question of armaments might now be tackled. Europe could, should, and must demobilize most of her troops, and Italy and France must conform to the terms of the Washington naval agreements.

B. The great powers to agree on narrow limits for the number, tonnage, and armament of submarines and other naval auxiliaries and tackle other problems not settled at the Washington conference.

* * * * * * *

Then the world, solvent, with useful tools in hand instead of weapons, could set about earning its bread in the sweat of its brow and raise crops instead of hell.

* * * * * * *

KEEP OUR SONS OUT OF WAR.

We are unalterably opposed to American young men being sent across the seas again to fight in another foreign war.

We believe there is not a family in the United States, rich or poor, which does not whole-heartedly share this sentiment.

The duty of the Government at Washington, then, is clear. It is up to the officials to take the steps necessary to keep us out of such a war.

How can this be done? By preventing such a war—certainly not by continuing the policy of "isolation." We tried that from 1914 to 1917. We tried hard. And we failed.

A new war is brewing in Europe. If it comes, we will be dragged in again.

Americans are not servile cowards, and there is a point beyond which we will always cease to turn the other cheek.

Washington officials must choose between two courses. One, the easiest way, is to do nothing—let the war drift upon us; then try to keep out with every chance against our being able to do so.

The other, the harder way, the way which requires statesmanship, is to avert war, not wait until it comes.

Yesterday the News-Bee offered a plan to prevent another World War.

We suggested that President Harding call a conference of the chief World War powers and lay before them a definite, check-your-gun-at-the-door proposition for world sanity.

The plan involves no "meddling" in European politics; it suggests nothing to "entangle" us; there is nothing about it any more radical than President Harding has already undertaken in the four-power pact to keep the peace of the Pacific.

It merely means the United States, the greatest power on earth, and the one great disinterested power, would throw every ounce of its stupendous weight into the balance for peace and against war.

The American Government is in a position to lay before the world a peace program which no European cabineteers or politicians would dare refuse to support. The peace-hungry peoples over there would chuck them out on their heads if they did.

World peace means work instead of war. It means life instead of death; food instead of hunger; it means markets for the American farmer's surplus crops and the American manufacturer's surplus products. It means less unemployment; more money; better times.

It means keeping our boys at home.

* * * * * * *

PEACE OR WAR?—THE STAKE IS YOUR BOY'S LIFE.

Now and then somebody rises to say international conferences don't get us anywhere.

Simon-pure mossbacks! With a simple "pooh-pooh" they wave aside the efforts of several previous administrations, both Republican and Democratic, to have world powers agree to arbitration rather than go to war over their disputes.

The "pooh-poohers" point to the conferences of Europe, an endless series of which having accomplished little.

* * * * * * *

England is suspicious of France. France is even more suspicious of England. Belgium doesn't know which, if either, to rely on. Italy eyes them all with distrust. Germany is awaiting the day when she can "come back." Russia, jealous and desperate, is ready to join any combination which promises recognition. And so on.

Not one nation of Europe trusts any other nation of Europe. And with reason.

On the other hand, these nations are asking the United States to help. They know they can trust this country. We have nothing to gain but world peace, and they know it. So our word means something. That is why a conference with the United States taking a leading part would get somewhere.

But supposing it didn't. Suppose not a single agreement were reached by the great powers attending the conference. What would be the result?

This:

1. The world must at least credit the United States with having done everything it could to put civilization back on its feet. (Just now the world hates us because people are saying we can help them and won't.)

2. The world would know just which nation or group of nations is blocking peace, and why.

3. World opinion thus brought to bear on such a nation or group of nations would ultimately bring it to its senses.

In short, a conference would clarify the international atmosphere. Uncertainty, the greatest foe known either to business or to peace, would be swept away, whatever happened.

We would know where we are headed and could act accordingly.

There's everything to gain and nothing to lose by trying to avert the war now being cooked up in Europe.

* * * * * * *

If war comes, no power on earth can keep this country out. Make no mistake about that. The way to keep out of the next war is to prevent such a war. That is a job that Uncle Sam can do and that nobody else can.

* * * * * * *

"I am only stating quite frankly my view that unless America takes a hand * * * a real settlement will be postponed until the hour of irreparable mischief strikes." (David Lloyd-George, former Premier of Britain.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 15 minutes.

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, after 20 months of great patience in delay the House Committee on Revision of the Laws, which on May 16, 1921, passed through this House by unanimous vote House bill 12, a bill to establish a Code of the Laws of the United States, has for the first and only time received a suggestion of a mistake from the committee to which that bill was assigned some 20 months ago at the other end of the Capitol. That after the strongest pressure we could only secure a suggestion of one mistake is, of course, in effect a very great compliment to the bill, and as that is the only one specified, let us hope that the bill will be passed without further delay.

ONLY 1 SECTION OF 10,000 ALLEGED WRONG.

The claim is that the law with regard to foreign ministers and ambassadors in sections 3221 and 3214 is wrong. Section 3221 says that there shall be one minister resident accredited

to Guatemala, Costa Rica, Honduras, Salvador, and Nicaragua. We are told that there are now five and that our section is wrong. The Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 672, found in our section 3214, says that—

Hereafter no new ambassadorship shall be created unless the same shall be provided for by act of Congress.

It is claimed that that is not the law. As this is the only suggestion of error, we will take it right up. I urged upon the gentleman that if he would name 10 mistakes we would soon dispose of that number and it would be a better evidence of his good faith. My colleague, Mr. LONGWORTH, of Ohio, who was with me, will verify the fact that he only claimed to point out one mistake, to put his finger on one statement of the law that was wrong.

By the way, my colleague suggested that probably the committee was right, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], an eminent member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, said to me this morning that our committee did the only thing it could do, putting it in.

As you know, the purpose of House bill 12 is to present the law as made by Congress, unless it has been repealed or decided to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The committee has no earthly excuse for just quietly omitting some law, and we have had some considerable opposition because we declined to allow interested people to induce us to omit the law.

The situation is this: The Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 672, says:

Hereafter no new ambassadorship shall be created unless the same shall be provided for by act of Congress.

This is the law of the United States as made by Congress. No court, so far as I can learn, has ever held that it is unconstitutional. Therefore, in the judgment of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, it is still in force and effect and it is inserted as section 3214 of House bill 12.

While the other people have not directed our attention to the Constitution of the United States and probably had not thought of it in this connection, the basis of their suggestion, which they evidently got from somebody else, is Article II, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that the President shall appoint ambassadors and consuls, with the advice and consent of the Senate, but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

In the case of United States *v.* Eaton (109 U. S. 331–352) it was held that Congress may vest the appointment of a vice consul in the President if it wants to.

The act of March 1, 1893 (27 S. 497), authorizes the President to direct that the representatives of the United States to other governments shall have the same title that is given by the other governments to their diplomatic representatives to the United States, and this law was in force until March 2, 1909, when it was repealed by the specific statement of repeal in 35 S. 672, and Congress said what is embodied in section 3214 of House bill 12.

Nevertheless, the department and the President have acted on the theory evidently that it is unconstitutional, as many good lawyers have, and it is quite probable that the courts would so hold, but the Committee on Revision of the Laws does not feel that it is authorized to suggest to Congress that it repeal the law or hold it unconstitutional. We do not attempt to govern or even suggest the position that the President and the Secretary of State should take in enforcing the law or in not enforcing it, but we feel that it is our duty under our pledge to the House to repeat the law as Congress wrote it and make the same mistakes that Congress made, if any. [Applause.]

The President has appointed quite a number of ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary to various countries, which appointments are not authorized by any law except by Article II of the Constitution, if it governs. That article can be found by all comers in the Constitution of the United States, but it is not found anywhere in any laws enacted by Congress, and that is all the committee has reported.

There is in section 3221 of the proposed code a law providing that only one minister shall be sent to the five Central American Republics. The President has since provided a minister for each of them and Congress has made appropriations to pay them, but Congress has never amended the law embodied in section 3221 and in section 3222. This Committee on Revision is the servant of the House and therefore of the Congress, and until we are directed by Congress that there is an amendment of the law embodied in sections 3221 and 3222, it would seem to me that it is absolutely imperative that these laws shall be presented in any code that may be proffered in the House or in Congress.

The laws of the United States, as found in the Revised Statutes, 1682; 18 S. 484, and 40 S. 1326, embodied in section 3221 of House bill 12, state that—

There shall be but one minister resident accredited to Guatemala, Costa Rica, Honduras, Salvador, and Nicaragua.

THE SECTION IS AS MADE BY CONGRESS EXACTLY.

There has been no repeal of this by Congress; there has been no declaration that it is unconstitutional by any court. However, the President has appointed five ministers to those five States, and Congress has appropriated for them. As this law has never been repealed and never declared unconstitutional, it is, of course, still in effect, but the appropriations by Congress are paying the five gentlemen who go to Central America.

Having found no repeal and having learned of no decision declaring it unconstitutional, the committee had no option but to place it here in H. R. 12. It will not be any more in effect if the bill becomes a law than it is right now, and the situation will continue just as it is with five ministers being paid down there. That is a difficulty in the law for which the committee is in no way responsible. The Congress should keep the laws in better shape and more understandable.

We undertake to repeat what you have done, not to correct it. If there is a flaw in it, it is yours, not ours. [Applause.]

As to the ambassadorships, Thirty-fifth Statutes, page 672, which is presented in section 3214, specifically provides that hereafter there shall be no more ambassadorships after that date except by authority of Congress. There is not any other law on the subject except what is in the Constitution, which is quite accessible, and which will not be interfered with by anything Congress does any time. As the law in the Thirty-fifth Statutes, page 672, has never been repealed and has never been declared unconstitutional, as far as I can learn it is still the law and should be right where it is in this proposed legislation.

On November 22, 1922, the chairman of the Revision of Laws Committee wrote the solicitor of the State Department that whenever this H. R. 12 may become a law, having thus assembled all the statutory enactments on the subject, an amendment to the present laws should be arranged for by the State Department which would bring the ambassadorial appointments down to date and embody them in a statute.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Kansas is making a very important statement and we should all be able to hear it. This legislation is of great importance.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. LITTLE. All it is is all of the laws of the United States. That is all.

THEY CAN AMEND IN FIVE MINUTES, IF AN ERROR IS LOCATED.

If they wish to make an amendment, it can be done in five minutes. Let them bring it back here then, and we will see what we will decide about it. We will have no trouble in acting promptly on it.

It is the judgment of the committee and of every lawyer in the House with whom I have consulted that the law as presented in House bill 12 with regard to the ambassadors and ministers is the law just as it was made and just as it stands. If the other committee has any arguments to produce, they will, of course, produce them, because we will take it for granted that their chairman is acting in good faith and should be prepared to justify his position. No lawyer would ever announce that a statute was unconstitutional and expect us to believe him without argument, and of course no gentleman would endeavor to toss all this work by the House and its committee and its double vote of confidence in the bill into a wastebasket under some unsupported criticism of his, and we shall expect to hear the reasons why he thinks sections 3214 and 3221 should be eliminated or his frank confession that we are right.

WHY DELAY 20 MONTHS?

Furthermore, we must frankly say that nobody that has any respect for himself will stand on one objection like that if he really proposes to veto a bill of this extent and labor. We shall expect soon another statement of what specific section is wrong in this bill, and if we do not get it that will be equivalent to a confession that no other alleged mistakes have been found in any other sections.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman believe that is the real reason why this bill has not been reported and passed by the Senate?

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman excuse me from answering that at present?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly, I will; but I thought the gentleman ought to take the House into his confidence.

Mr. LITTLE. I will presently, if it is necessary.

Mr. GARNER. The matter has been threshed out pro and con, criticisms have been made, inferences have been drawn, but there has nothing been said about any book concern holding up this bill. I want the gentleman to tell the truth about it as far as he knows it.

Mr. LITTLE. They have presented just one objection, and I have disposed of it here to-day. I now await their next one. If they have but one, I will ask them to approve or give their reasons. As to any other objections, if they state them, I will take them up as soon as they are pointed out.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS. Anyone who asks the gentleman's committee to eliminate this controverted section is really asking the gentleman's committee to take the place of the Supreme Court of the United States, is he not?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; and asking us to violate our oaths. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. I should like to emphasize what the gentleman said in this debate. The other day the Committee on Appropriations had put in a provision creating an ambassador. At that time the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] called attention to the statute which said that the President was prohibited by Congress from creating an ambassador by the act of 1909. The gentleman from Indiana said that that had been declared unconstitutional. Now, the fact is brought out here that it has not been declared unconstitutional.

Mr. LITTLE. It never was.

Mr. FISH. That is the great objection to that kind of legislation. It is not referred to the proper committee, and it is passed hastily through the House without the careful consideration which this codification has received.

Mr. LITTLE. They decline to give consideration to a bill which has the unanimous indorsement of the House, 150 Members of which inspected the work with care when it was being done in the committee rooms and were its enthusiastic supporters. Is that chairman so much greater lawyer than the committee, the revisers, and the House?

This House has twice unanimously indorsed this bill and approved it. There have been two years of delay before we got a eommittee meeting at the other end of the Capitol, but practically no investigation, and only one mistake pointed out. To be honest about it, it has never had two hours' real consideration there, but he waves his hands and says, "Off with its head! So much for Buckingham!" [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARDY of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me this bill is one of the great constructive measures this Congress has had a chance to pass. The House committee has done its full duty in presenting this bill after exhaustive research and labor. The House has done its full duty in passing the bill more than 20 months ago. The Senate committee has utterly failed to act or to do anything. There is no justification or excuse for their nonaction and every court in the land is anxious for such legislation. But the public does not and can not know of its importance, and so it sleeps. As to sections 3214 and 3221 it is obvious that they are existing law and the gentleman from Kansas rightly left them in this bill.

Mr. LITTLE. They met a few days ago for the first time in 20 months. The chairman said he did not like the bill, and he thought just as much of the bill as I did of his judgment. [Applause.]

Herewith I add the letter from Secretary Hughes as extension:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 27, 1923.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 23, 1923, in which you state that in a communication dated November 22, 1922, to which no written reply has been received, you advised the department of the attitude of the House Committee on Revision of the Laws regarding certain suggestions which the department had made concerning sections 3214, 3221, and 3222 of bill H. R. 12, and that you understood that the department concurred in the view of the committee. You add that Senator ERNST, chairman of the Senate Committee on Revision of the Laws, has informed you of the receipt from the department of a communication criticizing sections 3221 and 3222 of the bill, and inclose a statement of the law as understood by your committee, concerning which you desire the department's comments.

I beg to inform you that in response to a communication dated November 10, 1922, from Senator ERNST, requesting that the department give to the Senate Committee on Revision of the Laws the benefit of any suggestions it might desire to make concerning bill H. R. 12, the department on December 7, 1922, stated that at the time bill H. R. 9389 was receiving the consideration of the House committee a memorandum had been prepared in response to a request from you containing brief comments on certain sections of the bill, A copy of the memorandum was transmitted to Senator ERNST for the information of the Senate committee and he was advised that the department at that time had no additional suggestions to offer concerning the sections covered by that memorandum.

It is observed that the title of H. R. 12 is "A bill to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws of the United States in force March 4, 1919." At the time the department's memorandum was prepared it was assumed that it was within the scope of the work of your committee in revising the laws of the United States to make all the changes suggested in the memorandum. In any event it was thought desirable to give your committee the benefit of such suggestions as occurred to the department with respect to the sections covered by the memorandum. The question, however, whether the scope of the work of the committee in revising the laws of the United States would permit the adoption of the suggestions which the department made concerning sections 3221 and 3222 of the bill (none was made respecting section 3214) is obviously a matter for determination by the committee, concerning which I would not feel free to express an opinion.

I have noted your statement that after the bill becomes a law you intend to suggest to the department that an amendment be prepared for the purpose of correcting such inaccuracies as may appear.

I am, my dear Mr. LITTLE,
Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

And I present the answer to the Secretary's letter from the chairman:

JANUARY 28, 1923.

Hon. CHARLES E. HUGHES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Replying to your favor of the 27th answering my letter of the 23d, I note that on December 7, 1922, the department in response to a communication from Senator ERNST dated November 10, 1922, sent him "a copy of a memorandum" and stated that "at the time H. R. 9389 was receiving consideration in the House, a memorandum had been prepared in response to a request from the chairman of the House Committee on Revision, containing brief comments on certain sections of that bill" and "that the department had no additional suggestions to offer concerning the sections covered by that memorandum."

I write to inquire whether you will kindly send me a copy of the memorandum that you forwarded him December 7, with the date thereof. H. R. 9389 passed the House December 20, 1920, and the memoranda with regard to that were long since utilized.

I note your remark that you say, "I have noted your statement that after the bill becomes a law you intend to suggest to the department that an amendment be prepared for the purpose of correcting such inaccuracies as may appear." I presume you refer to my letter of April 11, 1922, in which I said, "Our plan is simply to prepare a bill that contains the present law without any change whatever. This bill is now the law, and if it passes the Senate it becomes a law, and we will then have something to begin with, doing away with the past confusion. Our committee will then bring in a bill suggesting some changes correcting what appear to be errors in the present law." I was not referring to inaccuracies in our bill, but the errors in the present law, such, perhaps, as may exist with regard to these ministers and ambassadors, but which are errors by Congress—not in this bill.

Before the old Revised Statutes were fully printed a bill was passed correcting 34 mistakes in it, and two years later a bill was enacted which corrected 242 imperfections in the old Revised Statutes. In my bill to establish a code I have supplied 60 omissions in the Revised Statutes which still remain. If we adhere to the precedent set by the Revised Statutes people we will, as you suggest, introduce a bill to correct our mistakes, if any there be. I suppose we ought to adhere to that precedent, should we not? Our book is three times as large as was theirs, and if we adhered to their percentage of mistakes we would have over a thousand to correct, and with all the nervous assistance of young gentlemen admitted to the bar here and there, and people who want us to omit the law to make easy their social duties, we have been only able to locate 66 instead of over a thousand. I am glad you feel that what the committee did was just what it should have done.

Very sincerely yours,

———.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. HARDY of Texas. May I ask unanimous consent for two minutes to make some observations on the same subject?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

COAL SHORTAGE.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 11 I called to the attention of the House the fact that in spite of the extreme shortage of coal, and especially of anthracite, in the United States this winter we had been shipping to Canada largely increased quantities both of anthracite and bituminous coal. I pointed out that October, 1922, exports to Canada showed a 33 per cent increase over the exports of October, 1921, and that November, 1922, showed a similar increase. I also gave official figures to prove that total exports to Canada of bituminous coal had recently been greatly larger than in 1921, although the latter year was the largest coal-export year in the history of the United States.

I had hoped—and, frankly, I had believed—that the December figures, when announced by the Department of Commerce, would tell a very different story. The extremity of our consumers, the fact that we are now in midwinter, and the notorious extortion which is being practiced upon purchasers all over the country—all these things seemed to me to combine in an insistent demand that the sending out of anthracite coal to Canada should be greatly curtailed, if not completely stopped.

In this connection I noted the statement of our Fuel Distributor, Mr. Spens, just before he left office, in which he said, referring to the necessity of using substitutes for anthracite in this country, "We have no information that similar drastic steps have been adopted in Canada."

I had in mind the statement reported in press dispatches from Ottawa that Dr. Charles Camsell, Deputy Minister of Mines and member of the Federal Fuel Board of Canada, recently stated that in the course of a visit which he had made to Washington "he had been assured that Canada would be treated as though it were a State of the Union in the matter of fuel supplies." In a time of our own extreme stress I ask, parenthetically, Should Canada be treated like a forty-ninth State?

I had in mind that in certain portions of Canada at least it is authoritatively stated that there is more American anthracite in proportion than there is in almost any section of the United States, and that advertising has been utilized as a medium of effecting sales, and I had in mind the fact that all the evidence seems to point to a sale price of American coal in Canada very much less—from $2 to $7 a ton less—than at most points in the United States.

I had in mind a telegram which I have just received from my own city that Lowell "is destitute of hard coal." I had in mind the statement made by the president of the Lynn Chamber of Commerce—although Lynn is a city on tidewater—to the following effect:

In the small amount of anthracite coal that comes into Lynn only about 65 per cent of it is combustible fuel. The poor and humbler citizens of the community are paying anywhere from $18 to $22 a ton for coal that is so miserable in quality that it should never have been shipped from the mines in any event.

I had in mind a recent letter from Detroit, typical of many, which contains the following sentences:

I have personally visited many families of the tenement districts of Detroit and the condition is appalling. I met a family consisting of father, mother, and five children burning wood and obtaining poor heat out of that. The mother is expected to be confined shortly, and one of the children is sick in bed.

As I recalled these things they seemed to me to present a case for drastic and instant action. I could not believe that our coal-regulating authorities would have allowed the conditions of October and November to persist through December.

But the official figures just released by the Department of Commerce tell their own story. For December, 1921, we exported to Canada 800,000 tons of anthracite coal; 1921, as I have said, was the greatest coal export year in our history. Yet in December, 1922, we exported 375,000 tons, an increase of about 25 per cent. Did we skimp Canada on bituminous? In December, 1921, we exported 621,000 tons of bituminous to Canada. Last month we exported 1,376,000 tons, very much more than twice as much as a year ago. Evidently all this talk of a coal shortage in the United States is, in the minds of some of our officials, a figment of the imagination. Is there, after all, plenty of coal in the United States, if we can so largely increase our exports in midwinter?

Take the combined figures for the three months, October, November, December, 1921 and 1922. For the three months a year ago the anthracite export figure was 923,000 tons. For the three months just ended it was 1,209,000 tons, 30 per cent more than a year ago.

The bituminous figures are, respectively, 2,637,000 for 1921 and 4,586,000 for 1922, an increase of about 75 per cent.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman tell us whether those who may have official responsibility in this business give any satisfactory reason for the diversion of the coal to Canada?

Mr. ROGERS. I will refer the gentleman to the speech which I made in the House on January 11, in which I went into that question with a good deal of particularity. The only reason I have heard advanced by any responsible person, and I have talked with a good many, was that we must be neighborly. When Canada can purchase freely American anthracite for $2 to $7 a ton less than we must pay in America when we can get it at any price, I think neighborliness may be said to be carried to an extreme.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In view of the revelations I did not know but that they might have changed the form of their answers.

Mr. ROGERS. I thought that December would certainly show a change in the figures as well as in the answers.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. SNELL. I have just received a communication from St. Lawrence County, in my State, inclosing a clipping from the largest daily in Montreal, in which it says that they could furnish all the coal that was wanted if the people would pay the price, and he wanted to know why if the people of Montreal could get it the people in St. Lawrence County could not get it. Can the gentleman give us any information?

Mr. ROGERS. I have a telegram from my own city, Lowell, which says that it is destitute of hard coal. I have a statement from the Chamber of Commerce of Lynn, Mass., a city on tidewater, which says that when they can get coal at all they have to pay from $18 to $22 a ton for it. These are typical of conditions everywhere in the United States. Yet the control price of American anthracite in Canada is $15.50 to $16.50 per ton.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. GARNER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the American coal miner is willing to sell his coal at a less price to people in Canada than he does in the United States?

Mr. ROGERS. I did not say that. I will say what is the fact, that the Canadian consumers of American anthracite pay less than the average consumer in the United States.

Mr. GARNER. That would indicate that the miners are selling it over there for a less price than they are selling it here.

Mr. ROGERS. I think in a large measure the spread is due to the imperfect control of profiteering here. I have in my files an explicit statement from the Federal fuel administrator that profiteering is going on in the coal industry. After all this is simply a statement of what we all know to be the fact.

To me the situation is so incredible and so preposterous that I scarcely know how to make comment upon it. The American people—I say to the House again what I said two weeks ago—will not be indefinitely patient as they see themselves denuded of the coal which is essential to their comfort and prosperity—even to their very lives.

Pick up almost at random any newspaper in the northern and eastern sections of the United States and you will find that this subject is what I hope I shall be pardoned for calling a burning issue. The Boston Post of Wednesday, for example, has two articles upon coal. One is in the form of a dispatch from Augusta, Me., which states that Andrew P. Lane, State fuel director for Maine, declared to the legislative committee that coal dealers in Portland were exacting as high as $30 a ton for coal. Since last Thursday, Mr. Lane said, he had visited 285 families in the city of Portland who had been unable to secure coal. The same issue of the Boston Post reports that less coal came into Boston last week than in any week in over a month. Yesterday's Boston Herald has the following dispatch from the statehouse:

At the close of its first public hearing yesterday the house rules committee voted to admit an order filed by Representative James J. Mellon, of Charlestown, which would put the house on record in favor of the bill of Congressman JOHN JACOB ROGERS for the embargo on exportation of anthracite.

I again assure Members of the House that the people of the country are more concerned with this question than with any other domestic matter. The Congress of the United States will be held to a strict accounting. We go out of existence March 4 and in ordinary course the new Congress will not convene until December. We must deal with this coal matter now or it will be too late. I believe that the American people demand action and, what is more to the point, that they have an absolute right and duty to summon us to action.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. Has the gentleman the figures for 1921 when it is said that more coal was sent to Canada than in any other year? Why does not the gentleman give the figures for the whole year?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

[Mr. ROGERS had leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. ROGERS. As illustrative of the extremities to which our people are now being reduced, I desire to quote a brief article which was published in the Lowell Courier-Citizen day before yesterday:

A doctor's prescription calling for coal was made out several days ago by a local doctor, and through the efforts of Charles F. Richardson, of the Humane Society, the sick person to whom the prescription was made out is now more comfortable, although the supply of coal that was received was not alarmingly large.

This prescription is the first that has come into the hands of the Lowell Humane Society, but throughout the winter Mr. Richardson has had many pathetic pleas from almost destitute people who have been without fuel of any sort for many days. In some cases the stories of suffering have been almost unbelievable, and in each case the society has done its best to relieve the suffering.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a Representative in this House should be closer to the people than a representative at the other end of the Capitol. We have to go back to the people every two years to be passed upon and get a new commission in order to come back. Our distinguished brethren in the other end of the Capitol only have to go back for approval every six years. For that reason we are held responsible to the people and by the people more than are our brethren at the other end of the Capitol. It should make us a little more careful than they on expenditures of the public funds.

When this bill first came before the House for consideration and passage the Bureau of the Budget had estimated for this department a maximum of $69,031,613. But the committee, presided over by our distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], had pared down the estimates, had pared down the proposed expenditures, and brought the bill in below the estimate by exercise of proper economies. But the House in passing the bill inserted numerous amendments, so that when it left this body the House by amendment had increased the Budget estimate by $36,440.

Now what happened in the Senate? They have passed it with additional increases of $4,673,600. That is the way the bill comes back to us. What are some of these increases? Let me call attention to amendment No. 31 passed by the Senate. Under the present law of this land the scientific employees in the Agriculture Department have a basic salary fixed by law at $4,500. But the Senate is not content with providing an increase in this appropriation of $2,000 each for 15 employees for this year, but they make a permanent law by amendment No. 31, authorizing an increase of as much as $2,000 each thereafter to at least as many as 2,500 and possibly to as many as 3,700 scientific employees.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In one minute. They say:

Hereafter the maximum salary of any scientific investigator, or other employee engaged in scientific work and paid from the general appropriation of the Department of Agriculture, shall not exceed at the rate of $6,500 per annum: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year 1924 no salary shall be paid under this paragraph at a rate per annum in excess of $5,000 except the following: Not more than 12 in excess of $5,000 but not in excess of $5,500 each, and not more than 5 in excess of $5,500 each.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In one minute. The "hereafter" they put in this amendment makes it permanent law, and after 1924 the $2,000 raise may be given to at least 2,500 employees. My colleague knows that that makes it permanent law for all time until Congress shall change it. It may be that some of them ought to have their salary raised, but it should be by a proper legislative committee of the House, which should pass upon it and determine it.

Let me show you how some of these scientific experts earn their salaries. I am informed by reliable pecan experts in Texas that the State of Texas now produces about 90 per cent of all of the commercial pecans raised in the whole United States. There had been established four years ago in the State of Texas what was known as a pecan laboratory. Through the work and influence of that laboratory thousands of good citizens were induced to plant trees, to bud and graft the native pecan trees along the many streams of Texas. They have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars. Then one of the experts in charge of that laboratory, who happens to be a native of Georgia, with his interests mostly in Georgia, without any hearing at all issued an order to box up that pecan laboratory and move it to Georgia, move it from a State that now produces the great bulk of the commercial pecans of this country. He had the pecan laboratory boxed up and at the railroad depot and ready to go into the cars when the people found out about it and raised a protest.

That expert caused the pecan raisers of my State to go to the expense of sending their representatives across the State to attend hearings in respect to the matter, and they did so before they could induce the expert to keep the laboratory there. After the hearing he kept it there, and now we have raised his salary $2,000. Georgia is raising some very fine pecans, and if it needs a laboratory, Congress will give it one, but the one in Texas should not have been disturbed. I am not against a proper raise of salaries, where they may be passed upon properly, but a legislative committee ought to do that.

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

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I have only 10 minutes and I think the gentleman is going to get 15 minutes directly. I am with him on his proposition. I want to show you how easy it is to put things in appropriation bills. The Senate, for the schools of Washington, added an increase of over $1,000,000 above the House estimates. No legislative committee, nor any subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, considered that, but it was put on there on the recommendation of Superintendent Ballou. Let me show you another recommendation of Superintendent Ballou. Recently he issued an order that no teacher of the 2,500 in Washington shall teach more than five hours a day, four days in the week. He is establishing a 20-hour teaching week for the teachers, which will require one-fifth more teachers in the District of Columbia to be paid for by the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, 60 per cent, and by the general taxpayers of the United States, 40 per cent. Why should a teacher teach only five hours a day for only four days a week? Why should not a teacher teach five days a week? Why should a teacher teach only 20 hours a week? I am one of those who believe that every man, Congressman and everyone else, should give a good day's work and a good week's work.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I want first to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky. Then I will gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman said that a proper legislative committee ought to regulate these salaries. Last year the Committee on Agriculture spent days in hearings on this matter and reported a bill which has been on the calendar for a year. Yet there has been no request from the Agricultural Department for consideration of that bill, but they come in here now and endeavor to make this permanent law.

Mr. BLANTON. That is exactly what I have been trying to emphasize in my argument, that it is the duty of our legislative committees to make these substantial changes in our laws that are almost impossible to change thereafter in the annual supply bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I do not think such speeches as these ought to be made to empty benches. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment until I move the previous question on the conference report?

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: Page 36, after the word "forests," in line 17, insert "and the Secretary of Agriculture may hereafter, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment simply restores the language which has been carried in the House for many years with respect to this item and strikes out of the Senate amendment the word "hereafter," so that it becomes an annual instead of a permanent law.

Mr. DOWELL. What is meant by the word "exported"?

Mr. ANDERSON. That refers to exportation out of the State and also exportation out of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me two minutes in which to make a brief statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to upon the next item.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 31, page 81, after line 17, insert:

"MAXIMUM SALARIES.

"Hereafter the maximum salary of any scientific investigator, or other employee engaged in scientific work and paid from the general appropriation of the Department of Agriculture, shall not exceed at the rate of $6,500 per annum: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year 1924

no salary shall be paid under this paragraph at a rate per annum in excess of $5,000 except the following: Not more than 12 in excess of $5,000 but not in excess of $5,500 each, and not more than 5 in excess of $5,500 each."

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I think this matter is important enough to be considered by more people than are here now, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

Ackerman	Elliott	London	Schall
Ansorge	Free	Longworth	Scott, Mich.
Atkeson	Funk	Luhring	Shelton
Bankhead	Gahn	Lyon	Shreve
Barkley	Gallivan	McArthur	Siegel
Blakeney	Goldsborough	McClintic	Sisson
Bland, Ind.	Goodykoontz	McDuffie	Slemp
Boies	Gould	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, Mich.
Bond	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Sproul
Bowers	Griffin	Mead	Stedman
Brand	Henry	Merritt	Stiness
Brennan	Hickey	Michaelson	Stoll
Burke	Himes	Mills	Strong, Pa.
Burroughs	Huck	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Cantrill	Husted	Morgan	Tague
Carew	Ireland	Morin	Taylor, Ark.
Carter	James	Mott	Taylor, N. J.
Chandler, N. Y.	Jefferis, Nebr.	Mudd	Ten Eyck
Chandler, Okla.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newton, Minn.	Thompson
Clark, Fla.	Jones, Pa.	O'Brien	Thorpe
Classon	Kahn	Olpp	Underhill
Codd	Keller	Osborne	Vestal
Collins	Kelley, Mich.	Overstreet	Voigt
Colton	Kennedy	Park, Ga.	Volk
Connolly, Pa.	Kiess	Perlman	Walters
Copley	Kindred	Petersen	Ward, N. C.
Crago	King	Porter	Webster
Cullen	Kitchin	Rainey, Ala.	Wheeler
Darrow	Kleczka	Rainey, Ill.	White, Me.
Davis Minn.	Kline, N. Y.	Reber	Williams, Tex.
Dempsey	Knight	Reed, W. Va.	Winslow
Denison	Kreider	Riddick	Wood, Ind.
Drane	Kunz	Robsion	Woods, Va.
Drewry	Langley	Rodenberg	Woodyard
Dunbar	Layton	Rossdale	Wurzbach
Dyer	Lee, N. Y.	Ryan	Zihlman
Echols	Lehlbach	Sanders, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty-one Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, if I can have the attention of the House, probably I can hold it for a minute anyway; but I want to make a suggestion, if I may, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the House of Representatives, and the subcommittee acting for the Committee on Appropriations. I believe I stated once before, or a number of times, I was one of those who believed in creating a large committee and voted for the rule creating it, and I believed it would be beneficial to the country by reducing the appropriation from $100,000,000 to $3,000,000. I have not changed my views entirely about that yet. At the time this committee was created, as I understand it, it was with the distinct understanding that it would not report any legislation upon an appropriation bill. Now, if it was not the understanding, I want some gentleman to rise in his place and correct me. The history of the Committee on Appropriations does not bear out that assumption. Now we hear the Committee on Appropriations, through its chairman, Mr. MADDEN, and through the ranking Member on the Democratic side, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, say to the House of Representatives, "We will not report any legislation." But, if I understand it, in the Army bill, while the subcommittee recommended 15 amendments which carried legislation, the entire committee struck them all out; and I commend the entire committee for its wisdom. But here is what happened, and what happened in this instance. You go over to the Senate, and they put on some amendments. You meet in conference, and the conferees disagree to those amendments; and the subcommittee comes back to the House of Representatives and moves to concur in those amendments. So the result is that what you have refused in the House is accomplished through the Senate.

I want now to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], that if you mean what you say, if you do not intend to infringe upon the other committees by reporting legislation, when you go back to the Senate and get around the conference table, the first thing I would say to the Senators would be that "not one line of legislation would go in this bill with our permission. Whenever you get ready to recede from your legislation we are ready to go into conference and consider the other items, but as long as you insist upon your legislation we are going back to the House of Representatives and ask them to confirm us in our stand against the legislation." And I venture the suggestion that if you will do that the House of Representatives will back you up and the Senate will take off this legislation. [Applause.] But you have got to have a little courage yourself. I will tell you the reason they do not do it, and I am not impugning the motives of any man, but some of the conferees want some legislation themselves, and they are willing to agree to it, and the result is they do not want to change this policy. I say they are making a mistake. They are going to come back to the proposition of nine appropriating committees and have nobody to blame for it but themselves, because you are not carrying out the spirit of this House when it was enacted into a large committee. You have the power to do it, and I venture the assertion that this House would rise by 90 per cent and declare that to be the policy, that if you will not agree to any legislation on an appropriation bill put on by the Senate, we will back you up. But if you come back and undertake to discriminate yourself then we propose to discriminate ourselves. We have the right as well as you and——

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I will.

Mr. TILSON. I agree with the position of the gentleman, but is the gentleman sure that the House would do what he says with such unanimity as he predicts? Is it not a fact in the case of the Army bill that the subcommittee kept the legislation off of the bill, but we ourselves put on a considerable number of amendments carrying legislation?

Mr. GARNER. Yes; but if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairmen of the subcommittees will get up on the floor of the House and say, "Gentleman, it is the policy of your committee; are you willing to stand back of it?" do not you believe they will do it?

Mr. TILSON. We did not do it in the case referred to.

Mr. GARNER. I will ask the gentleman, as a general policy would not he do it?

Mr. TILSON. We ought to do it.

Mr. GARNER. Then I presume that the gentleman will do what he ought to do in supporting the policy of the committee.

Mr. TILSON. I have supported the position of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. But the trouble about it is this——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Take some more time.

Mr. GARNER. I do not care for more time. I merely desired to call attention to this.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I agree in the main with the views expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]. I think we should live up to the letter and the spirit of the policy we announced in creating a single appropriating committee. I think the committee should avoid, so far as it is humanly possible, reporting legislative provisions. I think the Senate should refrain, so far as it is possible under existing conditions, from attempting to place legislative items on an appropriation bill; but we can scarcely expect that the new order shall work perfectly immediately, or so soon after its adoption.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment; let me make my statement and then I will yield. I think that the legislative committees are themselves just a little to blame for the situation in which we find ourselves.

The Committee on Appropriations should not attempt to legislate or report legislation, but the legislative committees should legislate and should report legislation; and they should insist upon the consideration of their important legislation.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one question at that point?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman recalls, does he not, that upon this particular matter of a reclassification of salaries the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service did report a reclassification bill, and the House passed it, covering not only all the positions in this branch of the service but all the positions in all the other branches of the service?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. More than that, my understanding is—and the chairman of the subcommittee will correct me if I am not correct in my statement, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ANDERSON]—my recollection is that a bill was reported some time ago carrying practically the provisions that are contained in this item.

Mr. ANDERSON. A bill on the subject was reported which is similar to the provision carried in this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. And it was reported something over a year ago?

Mr. ANDERSON. It was reported, I think, about March 12, 1922.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that statement should go into the RECORD without explanation.

Mr. MONDELL. There was a bill reported on this subject.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understood the gentleman to state that the legislative committee was to blame.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no; the gentleman has not said that the legislative committees were to blame.

Mr. HAUGEN. I prefer to have the matter cleared up now.

Mr. MONDELL. It is a fact, is it not, that the Committee on Agriculture did report a bill on this subject more than a year ago?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is altogether a different bill.

Mr. MONDELL. It is a bill embracing the same subject, and it is a bill that would have enabled the House, if considered, to pass upon the matter just as we are now proposing to pass upon it.

Now I have not said and I shall not say that the Committee on Agriculture has been derelict in its duty in not calling that bill up. We have been crowded for time, and while the committee has occupied the time of the House on various occasions since that bill was reported, it has had other important legislation which has been considered. I am not complaining of the Committee on Agriculture, and yet I think it is true that if the committee had considered that measure of primary importance we could have arranged for its consideration.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just for information?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. But the matter not having been considered, a condition has arisen in the Department of Agriculture under which the Secretary of that department says it is absolutely essential that he shall have some relief.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I just want to ask a question for information. Could not this trouble have been cured by making legislation on an appropriation bill subject to a point of order at any time, just as an appropriation on a legislative bill is subject to a point of order at any time?

Mr. MONDELL. A lot of things could be done in the way of a modification of the rules. I think the rules are all right as they are touching these matters.

Mr. JONES of Texas. At the present time if an appropriation item is put on a legislative bill a point of order can be made at any time. Consequently, since the establishment of this rule there has never been an appropriation placed on a legislative bill. Now, if you would turn around and say that no legislation shall be carried on an appropriation bill, that would remedy the situation.

Mr. MONDELL. We have exactly that rule now. Legislation can not be placed on an appropriation bill unless it comes under the Holman rule without being subject to a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. But we require that a point of order must be made before the legislation is passed in the House, at the time it comes up in the House; and if the Senate puts on a legislative provision you can not knock it out; whereas you can knock out an appropriation on a legislative bill.

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

Mr. MONDELL. For a brief question.

Mr. GARNER. If a matter is of sufficient importance or emergency that legislation ought to go on an appropriation bill, do not you think that the rules of the committee ought to provide for that legislation and give the House a chance to consider it, rather than have the Committee on Appropriations take the responsibility?

Mr. MONDELL. It is not so easy a matter. In the first place, there is the question as to what constitutes legislation. A committee can not know in advance what the ruling will be under certain circumstances. There is no question about an appropriation. An appropriation is an appropriation, and there is no question of ruling in regard to it. We simply say that an appropriation shall not be made by a legislative committee. That is a comparatively simple matter.

But just one word more; it is a matter I have had in mind for some time. I do think that all the legislative committees—and I say this without intent to criticize—should very carefully consider their responsibilities under the changed conditions under which they do their work and have been doing their work since we have consolidated appropriations.

I think there has been rather too much of a disposition to take the position that, having lost the right to appropriate, there is nothing worth while left for the legislative committees to do. I think there is a wide and fruitful and useful field of work and effort for those committees. I think there are two things they should do. First, those committees that have not taken that action should report the legislation necessary to make in order those items that are the ordinary and necessary items on an appropriation bill. One of our difficulties lies in the fact that, as to some of the departments, we can not carry on an appropriation bill some of the essential items necessary to the carrying on of the regular work of the department because the legislative committees have failed to make those items in order. Without criticizing other committees, may I refer to the action taken by the Committee on Indian Affairs? That committee brought in a bill carefully prepared, which was carefully considered by the House, that clearly defined the authority of the Appropriations Committee, and in so doing clearly defined the authority of that committee in legislation. Following that this committee each session has taken up for consideration the legislation presented to it, the legislation suggested during the examinations before the Committee on Appropriations, and reports out an omnibus bill. In due time that bill is considered. I commend that practice to all of the legislative committees.

I think it would be very well, indeed, if following the consideration of the appropriation bills by the Committee on Appropriations the legislative committees would take up for consideration the legislative matters that have been presented to the Appropriations Committee and which that committee properly declined to consider. There were, as I understand it, 16 items——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more. I wish to ask him a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming two minutes more, and will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], and after that I shall yield only to gentlemen who want to talk about this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the extension of five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in this matter. I have been for the new rule, but I can see the harmful influence on the committees that have been deprived of much of their power. I wish to ask the floor leader if he has noticed any distinct result so far as this reform is concerned.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, I have not time in five minutes to discuss this matter in detail. I hope a little later to go into the question of the effect of the new method of appropriating. I have scarcely the time to answer that question in detail now. May I follow the line of my suggestion? There are several of the legislative committees that may very properly take up for consideration the propositions of legislation that have been presented to the Committee on Appropriations during its consideration of appropriation bills. Those legislative committees might well go further. They might very properly at some proper time enter upon the work which at one time it was contemplated the expenditures committees would perform, that of examining the expenditures of the departments.

During each examination there would come from the departments, and otherwise, suggestions and requests for legislation, and out of the suggestions that came from the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, out of the proposals presented during examinations and from time to time by members of the committee, there could very properly be made up an omnibus legislative bill covering the activities of government over which each committee has jurisdiction. I think it would be quite proper to amend the rules so as to make in order the consideration by the House of at least one such piece of legislation from each of the legislative committees during a session of Congress. I think that in order to balance the matter of privilege and leave the legislative committees in as favorable a situation as they were before they were deprived of authority to appropriate, they should under the rules have the right to bring in at the proper

time at least one omnibus legislative bill each session and have it privileged.

Mr. DOWELL. May I suggest to the gentleman that if he desires to stop legislation on appropriation bills, if he will amend the rules so as to prevent any legislation on appropriation bills it will force the legislative committees to act promptly.

Mr. MONDELL. We discussed that some time ago. The rules now prohibit legislation on our appropriation bill; but this is the thought I desire to emphasize, that the legislative committees of the House should, in good faith and with earnestness, apply themselves to their duties and responsibilities under the new conditions, and should present to the House at the proper time carefully considered legislative propositions, preferably in a single bill rather than divided up into numerous popgun measures, only one or two of which may, perhaps, be considered. And let me say again, I think it would be well to give such omnibus measures a privileged status in the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Is it not a fact that nearly all the legislative committees of the House do report out legislation and have legislation on the calendar, but that they can not get it up because Calendar Wednesday is usually dispensed with?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, we have dispensed with Calendar Wednesday in order to get rid of the appropriations program, practically by unanimous consent. We have now taken up Calendar Wednesday again. We will also have special rules. We will consider during this session much legislation coming from the legislative committees; but the legislation coming from those committees is divided into a multitude of small measures. If they could to a considerable extent be put together in one general legislative bill and given a privileged status, this whole matter of legislative authority being outrun by the needs of the public business would be largely cured, in my opinion.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment on the rule and also on the amendment. I am in entire accord with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] has said concerning the impropriety of carrying legislation upon appropriation bills. It is true, as I remember it, that when the present rule was adopted, there were statements made and assurances given that thereafter there would not be legislation upon appropriation bills unless it was authorized under the rules of the House, and that the legislative committees would report such legislation as should be adopted. I feel satisfied that all the members of the Appropriations Committee realize the force of that pledge or promise, whatever you care to call it, and that they seek to keep legislation out of appropriation bills. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], when it develops, as it develops frequently in the consideration of these appropriation bills, that certain legislation is important and would be very helpful economically and otherwise, has, without incorporating those provisions in the appropriation bills, reported them to the chairman of the proper legislative committee, with the suggestion that he take them up with his committee and that his committee take such action as it deems wise.

But the trouble, gentlemen, is that the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate differ. My own idea is that it would be entirely proper and very helpful if the concurrence of the Senate could be obtained for a joint committee to be appointed to take up the question of the rules governing the making of appropriations, so as to have some uniformity between the two Houses. The Senate acts under different rules, and the result is that when the House conferees go to the Senate and are confronted with matters of legislation upon an appropriation bill and call the attention to the Senate conferees to the rule of the House which prohibits the legislation, we are confronted with the fact that under the rules of the Senate it is entirely in order, but the Senators insist upon their amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] has said that there is a great deal of legislation upon appropriation bills. I lay down this proposition, that if you will investigate the record of appropriation bills since this new rule went into effect you will find far less legislation carried upon those appropriation bills than was enacted prior to the adoption of that rule. There can not be any question about that, and any gentleman who will take the time to investigate the appropriation bills passed prior to the adoption of that rule will find that that is a fact. I think that something ought to be done so as to bring about uniformity between the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate, because as long as nonuniformity exists we are going to be confronted by these propositions. It should be said that under the new rule adopted that the House now has full opportunity to pass upon the legislation, whereas under the old rule the House never had an opportunity to pass on the legislation carried in an appropriation bill, because the conferees would meet and agree on the legislation, report it back in the body of the report, and no Member had an opportunity to attack that piece of legislation, because in order to defeat it the House must vote down the whole report.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In just a moment. I do not know whether all these salaries are justified or not. They appear to me to be very large. I want to see the experts paid a reasonable salary, so that we can have the best experts obtainable.

I do not know whether all the salaries should be paid. They are much larger than they are in some other departments. When the amendment was put on the last appropriation bill it went on for that year alone, but now we are confronted with the fact that we are asked to vote for an amendment which makes it permanent law. I think the House should vote down the motion to concur in the amendment of the Senate and concur in the amendment with an amendment to apply to this fiscal year alone, and meanwhile let the Agricultural Committee report a bill and let the House take action upon that.

I agree with the gentleman from Wyoming that the trouble is that many of the legislative committees do not always consider legislation which should be reported and enacted, and in saying this I am offering no criticism, but calling attention to what we all know to be a fact.

The trouble is that many matters are called to the attention of the committees which are not taken up on the floor of the House. The Appropriations Committee is confronted with them; we are confronted with the absence of legislation for things necessary and imperative, and yet when we put them on appropriation bills we are met with criticism on the floor of the House that we are not following the rules of the House. I hope the legislative committees will take these matters up and report some of this legislation so that the House can pass upon it. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to address my remarks to members of legislative committees. I want to say to you that the principle involved in Senate amendment No. 31 vitally affects every legislative committee in this House. Now, the gentleman from Wyoming seems to leave the impression by inuendo, if not directly, that the Agricultural Committee has not done its duty. Under the system of this Republican House pertaining to legislative committees, before any of them can get consideration of any of the bills the chairman has to go, figuratively speaking, on his hands and knees to the Republican steering committee of the House, of which the gentleman from Wyoming is a prominent member, and get their consent before it can be considered.

Now, what is Senate amendment No. 31 that is proposed here? It proposes to make permanent law giving the Secretary of Agriculture the absolute power in his discretion to increase the salaries of every scientific employee in the Agricultural Department to $6,500 a year if he wants to, with the exception of the year 1924. How many employees are there doing scientific work in the Department of Agriculture? Let me show you what the hearings say. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] says:

> Can you give a general idea about how many scientific men you have at the Department of Agriculture?
>
> Mr. Ball, of the Agriculture Department, says approximately 2,500 technical scientists; about 3,700 scientific men.
>
> Mr. ANDERSON. Does the latter include the first group?
>
> Doctor BALL. Yes. But when you get down to men that are doing technical research work, there are about 2,500. That is more than there are in all the other Government bureaus put together.

Therefore if this amendment is adopted as it is written, which will make it permanent law, you put into the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture the power to increase the pay, if he wants to, to $6,500 of 2,500 men after the year 1924.

They talk about the diligence of the Agricultural Committee. Why, we conducted days' hearings last year on this matter, with the Secretary of Agriculture before us and all of his experts, and we carefully considered and reported the bill H. R. 10819 on the 9th day of March, 1922, to fix salaries of scientific men in this department. When the item came up in the Agricultural appropriation bill last year it went out on a point of order in the House. Then it was inserted in the Senate, and the members of the subcommittee of agriculture of the House said it ought to stay in the bill because the Committee on Agriculture had recently reported the bill but had not had time to consider it. This bill, H. R. 10819, has been on the calendar since March, 1922, and there has never been one request to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture from the Secretary of Agriculture to consider this legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman think that if the Committee on Agriculture reported the bill the Secretary of Agriculture should stand behind it with——

Mr. KINCHELOE. No; but I am opposed to the Secretary of Agriculture running to the Senate and asking for these increases, the same as last year, and the Senate giving him a bigger sum than he asks for, as I will show in a minute.

The only time the great steering committee gave the Committee on Agriculture any days for legislation was inspired by reason of the request for a rule, not for the consideration of public business like this, but for the consideration of private bills, sugar claims, to mulct the Government out of $4,000,000. [Applause.] If it had not been for that we never would have gotten a rule even to consume those two days. That is the diligence of the Committee on Agriculture, and that is the procedure of your steering committee, and the procedure of your majority members of the Committee on Rules. To take care of some fellows who have private bills, who gambled in sugar and lost $4,000,000, we got two days in which to consider important bills.

I say that in this amendment we are giving the Secretary of Agriculture more than the Secretary of Agriculture asked when he went to the Senate. In the hearings Senator Jones of Washington asked the question:

I understand, Mr. Secretary, that the provision which the House committee reported and which went out on a point of order is what we put in the last bill.

The Secretary said it was. Then the question was asked:

You would like to have that renewed—

That referred to the provisions of the last bill, and the Secretary said he would, "Very much, indeed."

What was the provision of the last bill? It provided for a maximum salary of $6,500 in scientific work, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, but for the fiscal year 1923 8 men should receive a salary in excess of $5,000 but not in excess of $5,500, and 3 men in excess of $5,500. That is what the Secretary asked for the other day before the Senate committee. Instead of having 8 men in excess of $5,000, they put in 12, and instead of 3 men in excess of $5,500 you have put in five. You have given the Secretary of Agriculture more than he asked for.

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

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman knows that the number is exactly in accordance with the recommendations which the Secretary of Agriculture made to the Budget and the Budget made to the Congress.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not know anything about the Budget, but you gave him more than he asked for.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have not given anything yet.

Mr. KINCHELOE. No; but you are making an assault with attempts to, and I hope that you will fail. [Applause.] What does the bill which the Committee on Agriculture reported after days of hearings, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and with the approval of all who appeared before that committee, provide for? We did not give carte blanc to the Secretary to increase to the amount of $6,500, 2,500 men engaged in scientific work in the Department of Agriculture. Here is what we gave: Not more than seven in excess of $4,500 and not to exceed $5,000; not more than five in excess of $5,000 and not in excess of $5,500; not more than three in excess of $5,500 but not in excess of $6,000; and in no case was the salary to exceed $6,000. We gave him the right to increase the salaries set out there of 15 men only that are engaged in scientific work. I have nothing against the Secretary of Agriculture. I have a high regard for him. I have said privately, and I say it now, I think he is the best man in the Cabinet, but I am against the idea of the legislative committees of this House losing their functions every day. I owe just as much responsibility to the people I represent as any member of the Committee on Appropriations does, and so does every other man in this House. [Applause.] Are we going to sit supinely and let these departments, whichever one it may be, ignore the committee appointed for the consideration of business applying to the particular department and run over to the other body, just because it is in order to get an amendment tacked on, where we can not make a point of order under our rules, because it is not against the Senate rules, and ignore the proper legislative committees of the House? Then, to add insult to injury, are we to sit supinely, as the chairman of the subcommittee has asked you to do to-day, and increase the appropriation, and not only that, but to make it permanent forever and a day after the year 1924?

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

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. What increase over the amount reported from the Committee on Agriculture is there; how many officers?

Mr. BLANTON. Over $4,000,000 increase in this bill over what the House passed.

Mr. BUTLER. And we have to consider that all in an hour?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will answer the gentleman. Under Senate amendment No. 31 we give to the Secretary of Agriculture carte blanche authority, if he wants to exercise it, to increase the compensation of every employee in the scientific work in the Department of Agriculture to the amount of $6,500 after 1924.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does the gentleman know how many scientific employees there are?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I just read that a short time ago.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think the gentleman is in error. The report from the Department of Agriculture states that a year ago—December, 1921—there were 3,778.

Mr. KINCHELOE. This says that there are 2,500 technical scientists, and so forth.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And this would permit an increase of $2,000 for every one of them, or a total increase of $7,500,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. As I say, that gives him the power to do that, but our bill limits it to 15; and, as I say, I have high regard for the Secretary of Agriculture. However, I serve notice upon him, and upon the Department of Agriculture, that so far as I am concerned individually, as a member of the Agricultural Committee, if they want cooperation they must come to the committee that is empowered to act for them.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations, nor have I any suggestions to make as to the present system. The only suggestion I have to offer is that the committee should observe the law and live up to the spirit of the law and the rule. The committees on legislation have been criticized for not reporting legislation. It has been suggested that the Committee on Agriculture reported a bill similar to the one that is under consideration. The committee did; it carried an increase of salary for nine people in the department, all that was asked for by the department. After conference with Doctor Ball we wrote into the bill exactly what was suggested and added one, Doctor Ball, to the list, giving everything that was requested. We expected that the representatives of the department would act in good faith and make their contract good with the committee. Instead of that evidently the agreement made was overlooked, and for some reason or other the numbers were increased. If all had acted in accordance with agreement made with the committee, there would have been no controversy about this matter.

Section 1 of the bill reported by the committee gave the Secretary authority to increase the salaries of 15 scientific investigators whose salaries are at present limited to $4,500, as follows: Not more than 7 in excess of $4,500, but not in excess of $5,000 each.

Not more than five in excess of $5,000, but not in excess of $5,500 each.

Not more than three in excess of $5,500, but not in excess of $6,000 each.

The increases in salaries authorized for the current year were 8 in excess of $5,000, but not in excess of $5,500, or an increase of 3 over the number agreed upon, and the number of increases suggested in the Senate amendments are 12, or 7 more than the number agreed upon. The number of increases ranging from $5,500 to $6,000 were increased to 5 for the current year, at a salary from $5,500 to $6,500, and the same number are provided for in the proposed Senate amendments.

Section 2 of the bill reported authorizes the increase of salary of nine officers of the Department of Agriculture who were on the statutory roll of the department, were seven chiefs and the librarian and, as before stated, Doctor Ball, director of scientific work, was added to the list submitted. Salaries were fixed as suggested and as follows:

Title.	Present salary.	Salary proposed.
Director of Scientific Work	$5,000	$6,000
Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry	5,000	6,000
Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry	5,000	6,000
Chief of the Bureau of Forestry	5,000	6,000
Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry	5,000	6,000
Chief of the Bureau of Markets	5,000	6,000
Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey	4,000	4,500
Chief of the Division of Accounts and Disbursements	4,000	4,000
Librarian	2,000	2,500

What is the suggestion at this time? The representative of the department asked for increases, and indicated, as has been stated, the proposed amendment would make it possible to increase the salary of 3,778 employees of the department $2,000 each, or more than $7,500,000. We have heard a good deal about economy. I believe some of you probably discussed it in the last campaign. I doubt, my friends, you can satisfy your constitutents by decreasing the appropriation for the control and eradication of hog cholera more than $100,000; no increase in appropriation for the control and eradication for tuberculin testing of animals, or for the payment of indemnities; and only $25,000 increase to exterminate the corn borer, thus giving the corn borer, now invading the Corn Belt, the right of way; and, on the other hand, authorizing the increase of salary of 3,778 employees, or $7,500,000 increase in salary. I believe that is all I care to say. I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I regret to find myself in an emphatic disagreement with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and my Democratic colleagues who have spoken. If there ever was a time when agriculture should not be handled lightly, it is now. Everybody is talking about helping the farmer, and I doubt exceedingly the wisdom of doing this injustice to the Department of Agriculture because we are not pleased with the proceedings of the Senate and the House. There has been a great deal said here in criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture for going to the Senate. But, gentlemen, the Secretary of Agriculture came to the Committee on Agriculture and that committee had exhaustive hearings and reported a bill, unanimously favorable, covering the general purpose of this amendment under consideration. The facts are, and I am not criticizing anybody, but the facts are the bill has been on the Calendar of the House nearly a year, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has not gotten it up for the consideration of the House.

And I am not here to criticize the chairman or the Secretary of Agriculture. But after the Secretary had waited nearly a year and gotten no action in the House, then why should he not go to the Senate and try to get some recognition?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman knows the chairman is not at liberty to call up a bill. The chairman has acted on orders made by the committee to call up bills as directed by that committee.

Mr. ASWELL. The committee reported the bill favorably and it has been on the calendar nearly a year. I thought that action was an order.

Mr. HAUGEN. The committee reported about 20 other bills which have not been considered on calls of committees.

Mr. ASWELL. I merely state the facts, that this bill has not received consideration by the House. The gentleman from Iowa has not gotten it up.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ASWELL. In just a moment. There has been criticism for putting legislation upon an appropriation bill. My own opinion, my own judgment, is clear; the way out of this dilemma, the way out of all this mass of confusion, is to abolish the Committee on Appropriations of 35 and put the authority back to the nine committees, where it belongs. [Applause.] And I for one in the new Congress will do my part to bring that to pass. Now, gentlemen, I want to call attention to this fact: The Secretary of Agriculture asks for some additional salaries at $6,500 a year. This very Congress has authorized salaries in one of the departments of this Government of $25,000 a year, and others at $20,000 in that department, and here, because the Secretary of Agriculture appeals to the Congress for a salary of $6,500 a year, you criticize the Secretary and make it appear he has committed some crime. I for one, under the conditions of agriculture in this country to-day, would be willing to vote for the Secretary of Agriculture to get 10, 12, or 20 people at $6,500 a year in order that he may transact the business and help agriculture in this country. [Applause.] Again, you will observe that there is no provision in this amendment that authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to increase a number of people to $3,500, as some have stated, because he can not increase any salary until he comes back to Congress and gets authority.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. ASWELL. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman contend that the first part of this amendment did not give him the right in his discretion to increase every scientific employee he wants to up to $6,500?

Mr. ASWELL. Provided he can get the money from Congress.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman say he is in favor of this increase? Does the gentleman undertake to say to the House he is in favor of making this permanent without giving any hearings at all?

Mr. ASWELL. I made no such statement, and intimated no such thing. I said the word "hereafter" should be stricken from this amendment, and I said that if the Secretary of Agriculture believes he can bring some additional body of men into the department at this great crisis in agriculture to assist in promoting the agricultural welfare of this country, I am willing to give him a chance to do it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will say to the gentleman that the parliamentary situation developed so that I wanted to give the gentleman an opportunity to vote what he is advocating.

Mr. ASWELL. I will vote to cut out the word "hereafter" and as far as criticizing the Secretary in regard to the number of five men for $6,500 each, I am for it, and if the Secretary wants 10 he may have them, and if the Secretary of Agriculture comes to Congress and says he wants 20 I will be for that.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think that we will agree that if you strike out the word "hereafter" making it permanent law, I am in favor of giving the Secretary all the assistance he thinks is necessary. But the gentleman is aware of the fact that the Congress in making up the appropriations has adopted a suggestion that makes it possible for the Secretary to increase every one of them up to $6,500 if the appropriations are made.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman would not make that statement seriously if he understood the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the amendment to provide higher salaries for scientific men. It is now at $4,500, altogether too low. That situation has existed for many years. It has been impossible under it for the department to engage, or to keep very long, competent men. The Secretary is constantly embarrassed by not being able to pay salaries high enough.

With that in mind, the officials of the department asked the Committee on Agriculture to prepare a bill. The committee did prepare a bill, and, as has been stated on the floor, that bill has been on the calendar for 9 or 10 months, but no action has been taken on it. As prepared by the committee it was satisfactory to the department, as I remember their testimony, although by it the limit would be raised to only $5,500, an increase of only $1,000, whereas my amendment would raise it to $6,500. The department was also satisfied with the further limitation which the bill carries—that is, only so many at the $5,500 rate, and only so many at $5,000; the remainder, I presume, to stay at $4,500, or less.

Now the Senate amendment provides a limit of $6,500, $1,000 more than the department itself wished, as I remember it, a year ago. But I approve the Senate amendment. Six thousand five hundred dollars is not too large. I approve of the use of the word "hereafter," to make the law permanent. But my opinion is that some limitation ought to be placed upon it, so that the condition that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. HAUGEN] says may arise can not be permitted, by opening the door wide, allowing the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion of placing a very large number of men on the roll at the limit of $6,500.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I can not; there are certain things I wish to say, and my time is limited.

Now, as to the limit of $6,500, I would amend the Senate amendment. If one has the bill before him, he can see what I wish. If he has the Senate amendment before him in print, he can see what I mean. I will state it differently. In the bill I would strike out the words "for the fiscal year 1924," and, on the next page, I would strike out "$5,500," so that if the Senate amendment is adopted, amended as I suggest, it would read:

That the limit shall be $6,500: *Provided*, That no salary shall be paid under this paragraph at a rate per annum in excess of $5,000 except the following: Not more than 12 in excess of $5,000 but not in excess of $6,500 each, and not more than 5 in excess of $5,500 each.

It would make the limit of $6,500 permanent, but I would make $6,500 available for the next fiscal year, whereas the Senate amendment, favored by the gentleman from Minnesota

[Mr. ANDERSON] will not make it available until 1925. It would make the qualification as to the number permanent and permit the paying of salaries of 12 up to $6,500 and the salaries of 5 at $5,500. Those 12 and 5 are 17, which is 6 more than the Secretary of Agriculture himself asked for only a short time ago; several more—I do not have in mind the exact number—than the Secretary of Agriculture approved at the time the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. At the proper time I shall offer that amendment and ask its adoption. If adopted it will provide the higher salaries to more men than does any other proposal now before the House, and these higher salaries may be paid one year earlier than is possible under any other proposal.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, the only opposition I have to this Senate amendment No. 31 is to the language that makes it permanent law, and I understand that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] is going to ask for a division of the question, and if the House votes to recede, then he will move to recede and concur with an amendment making these salary changes apply only to the fiscal year 1924.

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

Mr. BLACK. In a moment I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Now, the reason why this amendment should be adopted as permanent law is the fact that it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the broad and inclusive power to classify all scientific employees in any classification that he sees fit, provided that the salaries are under $6,500.

The House has already passed the bill known as the Lehlbach reclassification bill, which provides the machinery for reclassifying all of the Government employees, and one of the classifications is the scientific class. Now, some Members—a good many Members—voted against that bill because they thought the salaries provided were too high. And yet if the House passes this pending amendment you are giving the Secretary of Agriculture much broader authority than was given to any head of a department in the reclassification bill. I have the reclassification bill here as it passed the House, and it provides for six different grades of professional men, and there is but one grade that would draw up to $6,500, and that grade is grade 6, which would include a very limited number of employees. Let me read it to you. The only class that would draw that amount is grade 6, in the professional class, which may be referred to as the chief professional grade. I read:

> It shall include all classes of positions in this service the duties of which are to act as the scientific and administrative head of a major professional or scientific bureau.

There are but few employees in the Government service that could go as high as $6,600, and those would be such as the Chief of the Bureau of Standards and, perhaps, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, in the Department of Agriculture, and administrative positions of that kind.

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

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will say to the gentleman that if this bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture shall become a law everyone in excess of $6,000 comes within the purview of that.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; and if my friend from Kentucky will permit, the pending amendment would give to the Secretary of Agriculture complete authority to make a reclassification of all the scientific employees in his department. I am not saying the Secretary of Agriculture would abuse the authority. What I say is that it is not the policy of Congress to grant such powers. What Congress needs to do is to enact the reclassification bill which the House has already passed and then have a thorough, comprehensive reclassification of all Government employees.

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

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. This amendment is for one year only. Does the gentleman fear there would be any difficulty in adding to the number, inasmuch as it ended this year?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; but after one fiscal year——

Mr. ASWELL. You would not favor cutting out the word "hereafter"?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I so stated.

Mr. ASWELL. Then you are in favor of one year only?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I explained that.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman believe that the Secretary of Agriculture could find a scientist of any value unless he gave him some permanent position? Does the gentleman think he could get a scientist to go there who would amount to anything?

Mr. BLACK. The point I am making is not against the particular salary schedule provided for the one fiscal year of 1924, but the bill goes further and provides for the Secretary of Agriculture to make a permanent classification limited only by a maximum of $6,500 salary. If Congress is going to provide a system of classification, it should be done in accordance with some such bill as the Committee on Agriculture brought before the House, or it should be done by such a bill as the Lehlbach reclassification bill. I am sure there are some very high class scientific men in the Department of Agriculture, but there are others equally as worthy in other departments and it does not seem to me the proper thing to merely favor one department. It is just that kind of piecemeal legislation which has occasioned so much complaint. I therefore hope that Senate amendment No. 31 to this bill, making permanent law, will not be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASWELL. One more question.

Mr. BLACK. My time has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this appropriation bill carries the appropriations to care for 15 scientists at above the $4,500.

Mr. KINCHELOE. For the year 1924.

Mr. TINCHER. For the year 1924. Now, there is some objection to the language authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to pay out that appropriation. There can be no question but that the Congress should legislate upon these salaries. The Committee on Agriculture reported out a bill which at any rate can not be said to be out of accord with what the appropriating committee has done this year, but the House has not passed that bill. The Committee on Agriculture, as I recall, was unanimous in reporting that bill, so no one is trampling on our toes. We have announced for the policy of paying these men. There may be something in the language of the appropriation bill calculated to make it permanent law; but the Agricultural Committee will still function, and if there is something wrong with that we will pass a law to cover it. We will not lose our jurisdiction. It will not be permanent unless the Committee on Agriculture is abolished.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. TINCHER. In just a moment. What I do not understand is why every time when we try to appropriate a few thousand dollars here for a department in which everyone concedes there is efficiency, for a department at the head of which there is a man of whom even our friends on that side boast, we spend more time on it and there is more quibbling about it than there is over the expending of hundreds of millions of dollars in some other department.

I believe it would be all right to give the present head of the Agricultural Department $50,000,000 to use in the interests of agriculture. I believe we would be perfectly safe in making that appropriation. Finally, I do not want to go on record or be classified as one who is always finding some little work that is wrong and spending so much time in appropriating a little money for the Department of Agriculture. This bill does not carry an appropriation for 3,700 scientists at above $4,500. It only carries an appropriation for 15. The Committee on Agriculture has declared in favor of that. We did not give them all that they asked for when we reported out that bill, but we did report it out unanimously. What is the difference if we do forget that we had a bill? We appropriated for these men last year. The bill stays here on the calendar. This Congress has been busy. The Committee on Agriculture has had a great deal to do. Of course it did not call up this bill because there were others pressing. The committee has declared for this principle. What does the country care about which committee reported it out here? The committee has not been ignored. There is too much talk about this every time. And why is it that we always jump on poor old agriculture when we want to economize a little? [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. I just want to suggest on the question of the diligence of the Committee on Agriculture that the chairman of the committee tried to get this bill up on unanimous-consent day.

Mr. TINCHER. Probably some town boy objected to it, and the same fellow who objected will probably come in here to-day in holy horror and vote against appropriating this money for

these men, while for some river and harbor project or some other expenditure he will vote $100,000,000 and never bat an eye. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman states that the Committee on Agriculture reported a bill declaring for this very proposition.

Mr. TINCHER. Declaring for the principle of it, when we reported out the same 15. This appropriation carries only 15.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman states further that it was the unanimous action of the committee.

Mr. TINCHER. Yes; I so understand it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I take it there were Democrats there?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. They were for the bill?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes. I am not accusing the Democrats of making this fight. This is not a party fight. There is always a fight when this bill comes up to give something to agriculture, and it does not come from any particular party. My friend from Texas knows it comes from all parties. The gentleman from Texas is with us in this matter.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And I will be with you in the future, too.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I know the gentleman does not mean to leave the impression that he did leave. The Agricultural Committee followed the principle in the proviso of the amendment, but this proviso applies only to 1924, and after that it is permanent law.

Mr. TINCHER. It ought to be until we act on it. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, let us see how far we are in agreement. There has been no dissenting voice on the proposition that there should be power given to the Secretary of Agriculture to increase, as this amendment does increase, to $6,500 the amount of salaries to a certain number of men who are occupying scientific positions in the Department of Agriculture. What is the fear expressed in giving that authority to the Secretary? In the first place, objection is made because the provision makes it permanent law. It does make it permanent law, unless in any year the House of Representatives concludes that it would be unwise to continue it. At any time this can be changed by anyone who offers an amendment to reduce the amount of the appropriation if the House agrees to the amendment. It is within our power to change it if we see fit, or if it is shown at any time that an unnecessary number at the maximum rate are appointed.

Now, gentlemen, let us be sensible about this proposition. We ought to recognize this fact: The Department of Agriculture has been losing every year some of its most valuable men because of insufficient salary. It can not go to the scientific schools and ask them to send their best men here, because those men, on an average, get more than $6,000 a year.

They can not secure the men that they want and ought to have in the matter of scientific attainments because of the fact of insufficient salary. For that reason the Department of Agriculture is handicapped in the very place where it needs men of this character most and the country needs men of this character most. These men can not come or will not come at the present salaries unless you make this permanent legislation, because of the fact that they say, "It is true you will give me $6,500 next year, but I am sure of an increase and a permanent place at a larger salary where I am."

Now, gentlemen, can you trust the Secretary of Agriculture? That is the proposition. Let us see whether we can or not. During the last seven or eight years Secretaries of Agriculture have had the power to raise salaries to $4,500. Have they done that in many cases? There was a far greater temptation to do that than there would be to raise to $6,500, and a far greater necessity. And what is the fact? No man can say that during the seven or eight years, under different administrations, under three or four Secretaries of Agriculture, there has been a single man advanced even to that salary who was not entitled to it and approved; and the total number, I understand, is very small indeed.

So why do we hesitate? Why do you want to handicap the Secretary of Agriculture? You all say that you can trust him, and in your next breath you say you will not trust him. The great interests of this country demand that this department, which creates more wealth and which looks after the health of the people more carefully than all the other departments of the Government combined, shall have the benefit of this amendment, and yet you say to them, with the record of the Secretaries of the department during past years, you will not trust them. If at any time you think it is unnecessary or excessive or that wrong appointments have been made in the exercise of this power you can cut it off.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does not the gentleman think that Congress should retain the power and not transfer it to the Secretary of Agriculture? As the gentleman knows, in transferring it to the Secretary of Agriculture you put it out of the hands of Congress, and the gentleman knows that it is not the Secretary of Agriculture that we are transferring it to but some one in the department. Is it not safe to leave it in the hands of Congress?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not agree with my colleague in that regard. I think the Secretary's judgment in that regard far more valuable than that of Congressmen. It is absolutely important and necessary that this Congress should not handicap the Secretary in regard to this matter, because Congress has the right at any time, if he does the wrong thing or pursues a wrong policy, to stop it, and you can not tell what the circumstances may be as they arise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the issue on this amendment is pretty clearly defined. I should like to make a few observations in reference to the amendment. The Agricultural Department, in the employment of its scientific force, comes in competition with all of the State universities and agricultural colleges throughout the United States. The general scale of salaries in universities for scientific men and in agricultural colleges is not only far above the $4,500 limitation, but far in excess of the $6,500 limitation proposed in this amendment. In addition, the Department of Agriculture, in getting scientific men, comes into competition with the great commercial institutions of the country. I am not contending that the department should pay salaries equal to commercial salaries, but I do think it should be put in a position to compete with the universities and the agricultural colleges in obtaining scientific men.

For example, the University of Pennsylvania pays a maximum salary of $7,000 or $8,000 for professors. The University of Wisconsin pays $7,500; Michigan, $7,500; Illinois, $7,000; California, $6,000; Ohio, $7,500; Cornell, $6,250. The Ohio State University pays $15,000 for its dean.

Now, let us get down to brass tacks on this proposition. Under existing law the salary of scientific men in the Department of Agriculture is limited to $4,500. That limitation was imposed in 1915, and it has been in effect about seven years. Has the department abused that limitation? Has it advanced a large portion of its scientific force to $4,500? As a matter of fact, in the seven years that provision has been applicable to the Department of Agriculture only 74 men, approximately 2 per cent of the total scientific force of the Department of Agriculture, have been advanced to a salary of $4,500. Now, this provision of $6,500 has been in effect for two years. Up to this time no one—not one man—in the Department of Agriculture has been appointed at a salary of $6,500. Under the limitation 20 men have been appointed at salaries of $5,000 and 6 of $5,500. In two years 35 men out of a total force of about 3,800, less than 1 per cent, have been advanced in salary, and none have been advanced to the maximum. The provision will cost the Government just $20,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I agree with my colleague heartily that the salaries ought to be increased, but——

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman wants to limit the salaries so that it would absolutely tie up the Department of Agriculture to a fixed and limited schedule of salaries for all time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. My amendment would put more men on a higher salary than the Secretary of Agriculture ever asked for and more than does the gentleman's bill. I will say this——

Mr. ANDERSON. I decline to yield further. I have only 10 minutes and I want to use them. Why do gentlemen want to impose a limit on the Department of Agriculture which they do not impose on any other department? There are 7,700 men in other departments who are getting more than $5,000. Yet the Committee on Agriculture, which is supposed to have the interests of the agriculture of this country at heart, proposes to limit salaries in the Department of Agriculture above $5,000 to 15 for all time. It is so absurd that I am surprised that anybody should suggest it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The Secretary of Agriculture's suggestion to our committee would not give as much liberality as my amendment would give it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know what the Secretary of Agriculture proposed to the gentleman's committee. I do not think that he ever proposed to hamstring the department. I have no criticism of the Committee on Agriculture; it is charged with legislation in the interest of agriculture and it ought to have the substantial interests of agriculture at heart. I want it to have a chance to give some new consideration to this question. I would like to see if the Committee on Agriculture really wants to deal fairly with the matter. I would like to find out whether it is willing to give the Department of Agriculture the same opportunity, the same power, with respect to salaries as is given to other heads of departments.

Mr. Speaker, because I want to give them that opportunity, because I would really like to see them demonstrate whether they are in favor of a policy of reasonable liberality with respect to salaries of scientific men in the Department of Agriculture, I am going to move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will limit the application of these salaries to one year, and I hope the Agricultural Committee will get together and consider this question from a reasonable point of view and bring out a piece of legislation here that will adequately deal with the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"MAXIMUM SALARIES.

"During the fiscal year 1924 the maximum salary of any scientific investigator or other employee engaged in scientific work and paid from the general appropriations of the Department of Agriculture shall not exceed at the rate of $6,500 per annum: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year 1924 no salary shall be paid under this paragraph at a rate per annum in excess of $5,000, except the following: Not more than 12 in excess of $5,000 but not in excess of $5,500 each, and not more than 5 in excess of $5,500 each."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Would it be in order at this time to congratulate the gentleman upon offering this amendment now?

The SPEAKER. It would not. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask for a division of the main question when it is put.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, and the gentleman from Texas demands a division. The first question is on the motion to recede.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 128, noes 1.

So the motion to recede was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, can we have the amendment again reported?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: Page 83, beginning with line 11, strike out the remainder of the page and lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 83 and insert: "Forest roads and trails: For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, and as authorized by paragraph 2 of section 4 of the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1923, approved June 19, 1922, to be available until expended, $6,500,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS.

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, $3,000,000, to be available until expended, being part of the sum of $6,500,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, by paragraph 2 of section 4 of the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1923, approved June 19, 1922: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, immediately upon the approval of this act, also to apportion and prorate among the several States, Alaska, and Porto Rico, as provided in section 23 of said Federal highway act, the sum of $3,500,000, constituting the remainder of the said authorization of $6,500,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may incur obligations, approve projects, or enter into contracts under his apportionment and prorating of this authorization, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations heretofore, herein, and hereafter made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 8 of the act of July 11, 1916, and of section 23 of the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House carried a provision for forest roads, which made an appropriation of $3,000,000, on account of the authorization of $6,500,000 for the next fiscal year. It carried with that provision a proviso which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to apportion and prorate among the States the balance of the authorization, amounting to $3,500,000. The Senate made a straight appropriation of $6,500,000 on the item. When we came to examine the proposition we found that the language which the House carries was not sufficient to accomplish the purpose we had in mind. Under existing law the appropriations are apportioned and prorated to the States, on the basis specified in the law, for the construction of highways which complete the State highway system and for forest roads and trails for purposes of fire protection. The consequence of this situation was that we had tied up in the proposition a considerable amount of money which was not needed for payment upon contracts which were coming due within the fiscal year. The object of this amendment is to make the total sums already appropriated available interchangeably in any State or upon any contract. The program is now going forward at the rate of $10,000,000 a year. This will give the department something over $11,000,000 to apply on those contracts during the next fiscal year.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. In what respect does this amendment change the bill from the way it passed the House?

Mr. ANDERSON. It does not change it at all. It simply conforms to some suggestions made by the Forest Service, in order to comply with the methods they are operating under down there.

Mr. DOWELL. The substance of this amendment is the same as was contained in the original bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. And this will not deprive the fund in any way of the full amount of authorization of last June?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it will not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, was submitting some observations early in the day on the provision in this bill relative to the pecan industry of the United States. I am advised, however, that he stated that Texas produced 90 per cent of the pecans produced in the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Commercial pecans.

Mr. CRISP. There is no way of differentiating between the commercial and the other pecans, so far as statistics are concerned. Texas is a great State and I rejoice in any good that befalls it. Of course, I think Georgia is a greater State. I have just phoned to the Census Office and to the Agricultural Department to get the statistics as to the production of pecans, simply for the purpose of keeping the record straight. The last available statistics were for the year 1919. Both the Census Office and the Agricultural Department advise me that in 1919 there were produced in the United States 31,808,508 pounds of pecans; that the great State of Texas produced 16,757,421 pounds, which is a fraction over 50 per cent. Of the rest, Georgia produced 2,544,377 pounds; Oklahoma, 4,296,647 pounds; Louisiana, 2,242,859 pounds; Florida, 1,025,673 pounds; and Mississippi, 155,245 pounds.

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

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will get the hearings that were passed at the meeting called by Doctor Quintance, who is at the head of this department, with reference to the removal of the pecan laboratory from Texas, he will see that the evidence there, just a month ago, was that Texas produces about 90 per cent of the commercial pecans of the United States.

Mr. CRISP. Well, I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and urged this appropriation. I did not read or know of any such evidence, but I know that the statistician of the Department of Agriculture has just advised me as to these figures, and told me he had no later figures. Now, I wanted, for the purpose of keeping the record straight, to put these figures in. The pecan industry in my State is a new one, comparatively new, and only for the last four or five years has it been enlarging. It is now growing very rapidly. I have no doubt Georgia raised twice as many pecans last year as she did in 1919. In my section there are a number of pecan orchards containing 2,000 acres. One of them is partially owned by one of our colleagues in this House [Mr. MCFADDEN, of Pennsylnia], and no State and no country is producing larger, finer, or more delicious pecans than the State of Georgia. [Applause.]

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. LOWREY. Will not the gentleman at least agree that his colleague, the gentleman from Texas, comes from the nuttiest State in the Union? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Except Mississippi.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman from Minnesota permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It may have been asked this morning, and therefore——

Mr. ANDERSON. I never object to answering questions twice if I can answer them the same way each time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to know if the appropriation of $700,000 as proposed by the Senate for market news service is sufficient to extend the service into my State and in some of the Southeastern States?

Mr. ANDERSON. The amount appropriated is sufficient to extend to all parts of the United States the existing telegraphic service on fruits, vegetables, and live stock.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So I am justified in the conclusion that the purpose of the legislation at least is to give this extension in the service?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but the gentleman must realize that it only extends the existing service and does not involve any new service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps it would not apply to Virginia and some of these other points.

Mr. ANDERSON. It would depend somewhat upon the character of the production.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think that service is provided for in these various State colleges. Is that right?

Mr. ANDERSON. All I can say about it is that the purpose of the Senate amendment was to extend the existing service to the sections of the country which do not now have it, which includes the southeastern, the intermountain section, the west coast, and the southwest.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I desire unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from my State college about this matter we are talking about.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

STATE COOPERATION IN MARKETING WORK IN NORTH CAROLINA.
DIVISION OF MARKETS AND RURAL ORGANIZATION,
Raleigh, N. C., January 22, 1923.

[North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering and bureau of markets and State department of agriculture cooperating.]

Hon. C. L. ABERNETHY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: For several years we have been attempting to supply the growers of this State with market information on a few of the leading crops during the shipping season. Because of the very great expense of the ordinary telegraph service we have had to limit this work to strawberries, white potatoes, and peaches, giving about a three weeks' service on each. Our growers have constantly clamored for a more continued service and have asked us to include daily market information on all the farm crops, but this will be impracticable without we are able to secure an extension of the Federal leased-wire service into this State.

For some time the leased-wire service of the United States Department of Agriculture has been available to the New England, North Atlantic, East North Central, and West North Central States. Then during the war it was extended to the Pacific coast and recently a special appropriation has been made to take it into the State of Texas. Mr. J. H. Meek, of the Virginia Division of Markets, states that for this service the Federal Government has expended as follows:

1918	$893,130
1919	1,171,920
1920	322,920
1921	403,920
1922	390,000

It is anticipated that $405,000 plus $20,000 for the extension of the service into the State of Texas will be expended in 1923, and $401,400 in 1924, as per estimates placed before Congress.

Mr. Meek recently made a trip to Washington to determine if it would be possible to add a provision on the present appropriation for extending this leased wire into North Carolina, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Tennessee, Florida, and Mississippi. It was estimated at least $150,000 would be required for this purpose.

Do you not feel that the truck growers of the southeastern section are being discriminated against somewhat by not having this service?

At the present time we are very well equipped for broadcasting radio news inasmuch as the State college station here is one of the best in America. We are unable to use it, however, except very slightly, because of the enormous cost of collecting market information. The State of North Carolina might be financially able to pay for an extension of the leased wire into Raleigh, but we feel that all of the States in this section need the same service and that it will be much cheaper to provide for all at the same time.

We trust that you will see fit to inquire into this matter and assure you that if this service can be extended into Raleigh, the division of markets will abundantly care for the dissemination of market prices to the growers throughout the State.

Very truly yours,
GORRELL SHUMAKER,
Acting Chief, Division of Markets.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 34: On page 84 of the bill after line 10 insert:

"Purchase of seeds for drought-stricken areas: That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1923, to make advances or loans to farmers in the drought-stricken areas of the State of Washington and of the State of New Mexico, where he shall find that special need for such assistance exists, for the purchase of wheat for seed purposes in the State of Washington and the purchase of pinto beans for seed purposes in the State of New Mexico, and, when necessary, to procure such seed and sell same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each farmer to use the seed thus obtained by him for the production of crops. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. All such advances or loans shall be made through such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture shall designate. For carrying out the purposes of this paragraph, to be immediately available (not more than $100,000 of which shall be available to procure pinto bean seeds), $550,000.

"That any persons who shall knowingly make any false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale under the preceding paragraph shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months or both."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves further to insist on its disagreement, and the gentleman from Washington makes a preferential motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, as to whether this policy of Federal aid to drought-stricken farmers is a sound policy or not I need not now discuss, because we have already established that policy during the two preceding years. This Congress in 1921 appropriated for the drought-stricken wheat farmers of Montana and the Dakotas and Idaho $2,000,000. In 1922 we appropriated for the same purpose $1,500,000. During 1922 there were loans to 6,554 farmers in the State of Montana, $756,000. In South Dakota to 4,977 wheat farmers, $661,000, and North Dakota to 431 farmers, $37,600.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Are drought conditions in the State of Washington as severe as in the State of New Mexico?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am not familiar with conditions in New Mexico.

Mr. HUDSPETH. There was 1 inch of rain in that State in the last 15 months, and I will state to my friend that if the conditions are as bad in his State as in the State of New Mexico, the people need this help and I am for it.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I thank the gentleman. I want to state the conditions a little further. The loans which were made to drought-stricken farmers in the States just referred to have been productive of splendid results. I drove through all of those States last summer. I found a good wheat crop growing, which later matured, and they harvested millions of bushels of wheat, the best crop they have had in many years.

And I learned further—in fact, I was told by a Member of this House only two days ago—that hundreds and hundreds of those farmers have been enabled to remain on their farms instead of having to go into bankruptcy, lose their stock, lose their machinery, lose their farms, and the farms have not remained idle.

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

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to go a little further first.

The situation in the State of Washington is this: In most of the wheat-growing portions of the State of Washington we have the very best and most productive wheat lands to be found anywhere in the United States. Statistics bear me out in this statement. But there is an area including some five or six counties which has been suffering for the past six years. For five years in succession they had a shortage of moisture. In 1922 the rainfall was so limited that they had almost a complete failure and produced only from 1 to 4 bushels per acre over a part of this area.

The banks took care of those farmers during all of these years.

The merchants carried them. The millers carried them. But they have all gone down together. Now, if that condition were going to continue, certainly the Federal Government would not be justified, nor would anyone else be justified, in helping them to seed a crop at this time.

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

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The situation at this time is this: After putting forth every effort to purchase seed wheat, they succeeded in seeding last fall all but about 400,000 acres. It has cost them to plow, harrow, cultivate that land and prepare it for seeding, according to the farming methods out there, not less than $1,500,000. But I am informed they will not be able to seed this spring unless they secure outside help.

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

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. A little later, if you please.

I asked for and have received numerous affidavits from wheat growers of many years' standing in that section of the State, and I appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and laid the information before the committee. The Secretary of Agriculture has asked for this relief, and the Senate has written this amendment into this appropriation bill.

The weather conditions are the all-important matter there. The soil is all right. After these six years the drought is now broken. They have already been having unusual rains, and they had a very heavy snowfall at a time when the ground was not frozen, so that when the snow melted the moisture went into the ground, and there is every prospect of a good crop this summer, if we are willing to do for these farmers exactly what we have done for their neighbors across the State line during the past two years.

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

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. The question I wanted to ask was whether these loans, made to these farmers in other States, are being paid back?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I understand they are being paid back at the rate of many thousands of dollars every day.

I provided in the bill which I introduced that the loans should bear 5 per cent interest and should be repayable by November 1. This amendment, which was inserted in the bill by the Senate, provides, of course, for a first mortgage on the growing crop, or the Secretary may require any other security that he thinks is necessary to secure the Government.

Now, gentlemen, this is the situation: These farmers are in exactly the same condition as were the farmers across the line. By our action the farmers in the other States were able to grow a good crop and are reestablished in their farming operations. These men—hundreds and hundreds of them—are absolutely down and out unless they can get a little outside aid. Their condition is not a consequence of any fault of theirs. They have done the best they could. They have made every effort possible, and the community has done the best it could for them. But they have come to the point where they are not able to go out and purchase the necessary seed wheat so that they can seed these 400,000 acres and grow a crop this year.

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

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LOWREY. Have these lands produced good crops before this period of drought? Have they been proven to be good wheat lands?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The figures submitted show crops of 15 to 20 bushels per acre and as high as 35 or 40 bushels an acre previous to this drought. It is not that these lands are unproductive—they are productive—but there has been a shortage of moisture during these years.

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

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. This amendment may not be looked upon as a privileged one to the farmers alone; but is it not for the benefit of the American people?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; it is for the benefit of the American people. I trust my motion will be sustained. [Applause.]

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the position in which my friend from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] finds himself. But this is not a Federal proposition, and it is not one that justifies a Federal appropriation. There are four or five counties in the State of Washington where, as I understand it, they have not had a crop for five years, where the banks had made loans, and the situation is rather badly tied up. But, if we make these loans, we would do substantially as we did before and help the banks rather than the farmers, for, after all, these loans will mean that the banker has better security, and in some cases the farmer will pay his note at the bank and borrow money for seed from the Government.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Does not the gentleman think that if we enable the farmer who has been putting forth his best efforts to put in a crop and to remain on his farm rather than to lose everything, when there is every prospect that this can be repaid, and will be repaid this fall, we shall do about the right thing? It seems to me the fact that it is a smaller area should not militate against the passage of this. Two years ago we appropriated $2,000,000 and last year we appropriated $1,500,000, and now we are asking for $450,000 for that same class of farmers.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, when we made the prior appropriation for seed loans the proposition was one covering hundreds of thousands of acres, in which several States were interested, and some of those States practically admitted their bankruptcy and inability to deal with the situation. Now, I do not suppose that the State of Washington, with its legislature in session, is admitting its inability to deal with these farmers in four or five counties in the eastern part of the State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think, on the contrary, that the State legislature in the State of Washington is at this time endeavoring to memorialize Congress in reference to this situation.

Mr. MADDEN. Why do they not memorialize the State?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They have. If the gentleman will give me one minute, I will say that the drought-stricken counties in the State of Washington are, perhaps, 200 miles from where I live. When I got home to the State of Washington last fall, after being here and away from it for two years, I was very much surprised to find the extent of the drought and distress in eastern Washington. I found that five or six counties had gone to the mat in the effort to carry themselves through those bad years. I found only four bank failures. There had been the most tremendous financial effort to hold up those counties. Of course, the other banks helped and to the limit in the effort to enable them to hold their own and not make necessary an appeal to the Nation. Now we come with a modest request, which has been agreed to in the Senate, and we come with an almost certain pledge—agreeing to pay interest—that this money can be returned this winter. We base this appeal on the precedent of the help for other States. We make it because we know that this Congress has been desirous of helping the farmers. We can not do any more than present the merits of the case. We make the appeal to the membership to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, remembering that at the same time there is an item here on behalf of New Mexico, whose Representative in Congress died only a few days ago and can not

speak for himself. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] will prevail.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, of course everyone in this House sympathizes with the situation, but there must be an end somewhere to the Federal Government being the Santa Claus of everybody who happens to be in distress. There are people in distress in my district. There are people in distress in every district in the United States. Why pick out four counties in Washington and a little piece of New Mexico and deal with them? If we are going to loan to people who are in distress, why not pass legislation which will deal with all the States and all of the people who are in distress and who need loans?

And let me just say to my good friends on the Committee on Agriculture that here is a place where they can very properly assert their jurisdiction. If the salary item was legislation, this is more legislation. This is a matter which ought to receive the consideration of the Committee on Agriculture if it ought to receive the consideration of any committee.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. It has been before the Committee on Agriculture, but it has never got out of that committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that answers the question. There is nothing more to be said about it.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The answer is in exactly the same way that the preceding question was answered. The committee failed to take action. I was assured that there would have been a favorable report at the time this was presented to the committee, but there was no quorum present.

Mr. MADDEN. My understanding is that there was a distinct understanding when the last loan was made that no other applications would come to the House, and there ought not to be any consideration of this one now.

Mr. SNELL. What proportion of the previous loans have been paid?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. That is what I want to know, too.

Mr. ANDERSON. In November, 1922, 42 per cent of the 1921 loan had been paid and 30 per cent of the 1922 loan had been paid.

Mr. SNYDER. What was the term of the loan when it was made?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it went to the crop year, approximately six months.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. In 1921 their drought continued. In 1922 they made a crop, and before their marketing time had half passed they had repaid almost half of the loans for the two years. In November the wheat is not all marketed by any manner of means, not half of it marketed, and everybody knows who is familiar with conditions that they did not make a crop in 1921 and could not pay, but in 1922 they did.

Mr. SNYDER. If that is so, there was no idea of paying the loan when it was supposed to come due.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. When they made a crop they paid the loan. Surely no bad faith can be charged against them for not paying in 1921 when they had nothing with which to pay.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, I want to suggest that under the previous appropriations made, chiefly in Montana, when it came to repaying the loan the Government was obliged to spend considerable money to make collections, and in many cases encountered obstacles put in its way by the banks who were so largely the beneficiaries of this kind of legislation. Instead of coming to the aid of the Federal Government and cooperating in getting the money repaid they were far from cooperating, as the hearings held before the Committee on Appropriations will demonstrate.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is unquestionably true, Mr. Speaker. This is clearly not a Federal proposition.

I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. A preferential motion was made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] on which the vote will come first, that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question being taken, the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 85, line 13, strike out the figures "$69,068,053" and insert "$73,741,653."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON moves to recede and concur with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert $69,536,653.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its secretaries, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 11939) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, 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. MCLEAN, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. FLETCHER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13660) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13926) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4114) for the relief of Bertha N. Rich, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 13926, the legislative appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference, a bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 13926, making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman a question. The Senate has placed numerous, not a few, but numerous, legislative items on this bill, going up to an enormous sum of money.

Mr. MADDEN. The amount put on by the Senate is about $100,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, more than that.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is a relatively small amount, about $100,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I have been misinformed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. CANNON, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims:

S. 4114. An act for the relief of Bertha N. Rich.

PRIVATE PENSION BILLS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that private pension bills in order to-day may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that private pension bills in order to-day may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That request applies to H. R. 12887?

Mr. FULLER. Yes; this is a private pension bill to correct a mistake made in a former bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And it does not apply to a legislative bill?

Mr. FULLER. It applies to this bill and an omnibus bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JACOB F. ROSENBERGER.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 12887, granting a pension to Jacob F. Rosenberger.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jacob F. Rosenberger, helpless and dependent son of Frederick Rosenberger, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the reason for this bill is that there was a clerical mistake in the same case which was included in an omnibus bill passed in the second session of the Congress and which became a law on the 18th day of September last. In that bill the name was given as Joseph F. Rosenberger when it should have been Jacob. The bill is to correct that mistake, and I offer an amendment at the end of the section striking out the period, inserting a comma, and adding "from the 18th of September, 1922."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "month" strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the words "from the 18th day of September, 1922."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. FULLER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. N. Owen, editor of Farm, Stock and Home, Minneapolis, delivered a very thoughtful and convincing address in favor of a controlled production at the Tri-State Grain Growers' Convention, held this month at Fargo, N. Dak.:

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE TRISTATE GRAIN GROWERS' CONVENTION, FARGO, N. DAK., THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1923.

In a short story by Ambrose Bierce he develops a situation in which the leading character battles with an unseen enemy. He is constantly aware of its presence; it thwarts all his efforts to shake it loose, and all of the plans that he tries out to kill and eliminate this unseen enemy are futile.

Now, it seems to me that agriculture is in a good deal the same situation as the man in this story. It is battling an unseen enemy. We have a situation in this country that should give us prosperous agriculture. We have, next to Russia, the largest area of possible farming land in the world. We have a large consuming population. We have means of rapid transportation. We have an intelligent class of farmers, I believe the most intelligent class of farmers of any country in the world, and yet the returns to farmers are less than the returns that come to any other line of productive enterprise.

I believe that before I get through I will bring this unseen enemy that now apparently has such a hold on the throat of agriculture out in plain view. I will go further than merely showing it to you. I will suggest a remedy. I will suggest a means of killing and doing away with this enemy.

First, however, I want to pay some attention to the various remedies proposed to help out farmers at this time. Let us examine, first of all, for a few minutes, the credit situation. Congress is busy working on credit legislation, hoping that by giving farmers access to more money at lower interest rates, they can tide themselves over the present crisis. Now, I believe nearly everyone in this room know my sentiments on credit and the necessity of cheap money for farmers, but unless there is a chance of making money on borrowed money, ability to borrow is not going to solve the problem. Borrowing money to lose simply prolongs the struggles of the borrower, and he keeps working and hoping that in some mysterious way the tide will turn and enable him to pay his debts. When the deflation started in the fall of 1920, I fully believed that greater credit facilities to enable farmers to tide over the deflation period was necessary and desirable. I believed at that time that agriculture was being deflated first and that all other lines of industry would follow in due course. Unfortunately, however, that has not been the case. In manufacturing there was some decline in prices of manufactured goods, but for the last six months there is every indication that manufacturing has stood all the deflation that we can expect to see. Prices of many articles have started up. There has been in some lines a slight revival of business in the last quarter of 1922, and this revival may extend into the first half of the present year, but agriculture has not as yet shown a proportional rise from its deflation, so that instead of the price of what the farmer buys getting closer to what he has to sell, the last few months have seen the tendency the other way. Under these circumstances it is difficult to see how a farmer is going to make enough profit to take care of his indebtedness or even to take care of the interest on his indebtedness.

Now, let us suppose, for an illustration, that a man owes $5,000, on which he is paying 9 per cent. Then let us assume that, by reason of legislative action, it is possible for that man to get money at 6 per cent. He saves then $150 a year. Of course, this is some saving, but, after all, how much will it really help him if his farming operations are still showing a loss? Every $150 that can be saved on the outgo, of course, lightens the burden just that much, but if money is still being lost, the eventual finish will be just the same whether the man is paying 9 per cent or 6 per cent. It will take a little longer to go broke. People can not borrow themselves into prosperity. We have got to look further for our remedy than more credit.

I refer here to the chart of the increase in mortgaged farms. I am not going to use these figures, as you probably think I am going to. I am not going to use them, as they are so frequently used by sensational speakers, to indicate the downhill course of agriculture. A mortgage does not necessarily mean that it has been entered into because of monetary losses. Mortgages may be used for raising money to make it possible to make more money; so, for the sake of argument, I am going to assume that this increase in mortgage indebtedness does not necessarily mean, taken by itself, that agriculture is going downhill.

But putting the best meaning possible on it, what conclusion do we reach? Let us take Minnesota, for instance, with its increase of 10 per cent in the number of farms mortgaged between 1910 and 1920. Now, this decade includes the period of the war and only includes a few months of the deflation period. It includes the period when it is popularly supposed agriculture reached its greatest height of prosperity. We find in the same decade North Dakota increased the number of mortgaged farms 25 per cent, with South Dakota making practically the same increase. These three States we might classify roughly as grain States. In the older States of Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin we do not find as great an increase in mortgages, but there was a much larger percentage mortgaged in 1890 in Iowa than in Minnesota, and even in 1920 we find that Iowa had a larger percentage of mortgaged farms than Minnesota. Illinois makes the best showing of the six States under consideration. Wisconsin shows a large percentage of increase in the prosperous decade of 1910–1920. Now, it does not make any difference whether these mortgages were made to raise money to pay losses or to build better buildings, till, buy more stock, or what not. The indebtedness is there just the same. It was created on a high-price level and must be paid on a lower-price level. If that price level remains say 25 per cent below the level that the debt was contracted on, it means that for every dollar borrowed, $1.25 will have to be paid back, this entirely aside from interest, so that, looking at the matter from this standpoint, credit, instead of helping, has been a detriment.

Let us turn for a moment to the matter of cooperative marketing. Just now cooperative marketing is being hailed as the great cure all for all our agricultural troubles; if we can only get all the farmers in the country organized to market all their products cooperatively, there would no longer be an agricultural problem. Now, what I am going to say may be construed by some of my friends as going back on some of my previous ideas—that I have always been a cooperator, that I have always been strong for cooperation. Well, now, I want to say that I am just as strong for cooperative marketing to-day as I ever was, but I do not believe that cooperative marketing to-day is going to solve the matter of greater profits on the farm. Cooperative marketing developed to its fullest extent may cut out some of the spread between what the ultimate consumer pays and the farmer receives for his product; it may raise the price of what the farmer gets, at the same time lowering to a certain extent the price the consumer pays. That, at all events, is the ideal that the true cooperator has in mind. But cooperative marketing can not of itself be much of a price maker unless it can reach a point where the flow from the farm to the market can be regulated to meet demand. In that way something can be done in raising the price; but even that has its limitations. The citrus-fruit growers of California have probably the most successful cooperative enterprise we have in the United States, and have actually increased the price the growers receive through their methods of marketing, but in doing so they have opened the great danger that threatens cooperative marketing.

It is estimated by the citrus people themselves that the better profits they have secured for their members have caused a doubling of the fruit-producing area in California, which will begin to come into bearing in about five years. Now then, what is going to happen when this new acreage comes into bearing and when the additional acreage that will be put into trees during the next five years begins to come into bearing? Can the Citrus Fruit Growers' Association expand their market as rapidly as they expand their product? Another example is what has happened as a result of cooperative potato marketing:

The seven northern States, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Nebraska, produce 62 per cent of the potato crop grown in the United States.

In the last three or four years a number of these States have organized more or less efficient cooperative marketing associations, Michigan being a particular example of efficiency, and yet, in the last three years production in these seven States has increased 33 per cent and while there still are factors in the marketing end that can be improved all the States agree that the crop produced is larger than can be marketed profitably. Here are the figures:

ACREAGE—3 YEARS.

State.	1920	1921	1922
Michigan	345,000	340,000	357,000
Wisconsin	308,000	315,000	328,000
Minnesota	319,000	430,000	486,000
North Dakota	83,000	124,000	198,000
South Dakota	75,000	90,000	110,000
Nebraska	85,000	102,000	139,000
Montana	40,000	41,000	46,000
Total (7 States)	1,255,000	1,442,000	1,664,000

YIELDS—3 YEARS.

State.	1920	1921	1922
Michigan	36,225,000	27,200,000	37,800,000
Wisconsin	33,200,000	21,400,000	40,600,000
Minnesota	31,500,000	32,200,000	43,700,000
North Dakota	6,500,000	11,900,000	17,800,000
South Dakota	7,900,000	5,400,000	8,500,000
Nebraska	8,400,000	8,100,000	11,600,000
Montana	4,400,000	4,700,000	5,700,000
Total (7 States)	128,000,000	111,000,000	165,000,000

To just the extent that cooperative marketing increases the profit to the producer it will lead the producer to greater production, and in time to overproduction. Then, what can cooperative marketing do, if it has more to handle than there is demand for? Therefore, I do not think that cooperative marketing of itself can save the situation.

Then we are told by certain people that all that ails farming is high railroad rates, that if the railroad rates were reduced there would be no further difficulty. Well, I will admit that high railroad rates are a great handicap to farmers. They catch him coming and going. He has to pay the freight on what he sells, and he also has to pay the freight on what he buys. In a way, high freight rates are restricting and localizing his markets. Under the present freight rate structure the farmers in the Eastern States are enjoying the greatest prosperity they have had for a great many years, because they can compete for the markets in the large cities on the eastern coast. Notwithstanding the higher cost of production of farm products in the East, the freight rate structure acts pretty much as a tariff wall. But suppose we got our freight rates down to where they were prior to the war. What would it amount to to the individual farmer? I do not believe it would amount to $200 a year on the average. Now, are you so nearly prosperous that a $150-a-year saving on a $5,000 indebtedness and a $200-a-year saving on freight rates will make you prosperous? I do not think so. I do not believe that the line is as fine as that, or can be closed as easily.

Then there was the matter of tariff. It has been felt that if we had an adequate tariff on farm products it would go a long ways toward solving our problems. Well, we have a high tariff on farm products, the highest tariff on farm products we have ever had in this country. Unfortunately, we also have the highest tariff on everything the farmer must buy that we have ever had in this country, so I am rather inclined to think that, as the tariff situation stands, the farmer really is not very much better off than he was before, except possibly as to wheat. I know it is argued that there is no protection to the American farmer as long as the United States and Canada are both exporters. As an economic proposition that is probably correct, that inasmuch as both the United States and Canada must compete in the world's market, the fact that Canadian wheat and flour can not come into this country does not make any particular difference. Now, I said as an "economic proposition," which I mean to qualify by saying that in this sense I use economic and theoretical in about the same way. There are a great many economic propositions that can be demonstrated theoretically to be correct, but in actual practice do not work out that way. I do not believe the competition of Canadian wheat can by any possibility be as great to the North Dakota farmer in Liverpool as it would be on the sample tables of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce; therefore I believe a tariff on wheat is necessary, and as I develop my theme I think I will convince you that a tariff on agricultural products is necessary to carrying out and applying the remedy for our situation that I have in mind.

For the last two years we have been told that the trouble with our farmers is due to the fact that our exports of foodstuffs have been too light, on account of the inability of Europe to buy. This has been repeated on platforms, in the daily press, and in the trade press until it has become ingrained in the thinking of the people. It is accepted as readily as the statement that two and two make four. As far as I know, outside of myself there has been no effort made whatever to put the facts before the people of the United States. There seems to be a propaganda at work that sees fit to ignore the facts, that sees fit to refuse to refer to them. I am not going to take time here and now to impute motives to the spreaders of this propaganda. It isn't as though the facts were inaccessible; it isn't as though they were mysteries; they have all been published; they have been collated by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture, and yet no reference is made to exact figures. The statement is simply made that farmers are going broke because Europe can not buy our food.

Now, let us have these figures sink in a little bit, because, in view of the way they have been persistently suppressed, they are of the utmost importance:

Exports to Europe.

WHEAT—INCLUDING FLOUR.

	Bushels.
5 years, 1909–1913	503,575,000
5 years, 1914–1918	1,090,712,930
4 years, 1919–1922	1,134,288,284

CORN.

5 years, 1909–1913	216,739,000
5 years, 1914–1918	200,509,000
4 years, 1919–1922	319,032,468

RYE.

5 years, 1909–1913	40,978,000
5 years, 1914–1918	57,207,805
4 years, 1919–1922	158,504,377

TOTALS OF WHEAT, CORN, AND RYE.

5 years, 1909–1913	771,292,000
5 years, 1914–1918	1,348,429,735
4 years, 1919–1922	1,611,825,129

This refusal to recognize facts is one of the finest examples of controlled news I ever saw. Somebody has passed the word that people must be told that Europe is not buying our foodstuffs, and the well-trained chorus sings the song.

I have taken the five-year period prior to the war, the five years covered by the war, and the four-year period since the war. Now, these exports are by calendar years. The 1922 exports in all cases contain estimates for the December exports; but, even so, the figures will not be far enough out of the way to have any bearing on the argument.

Now, what do we find? We find that in the five pre-war years we exported in round numbers 503,000,000 bushels of wheat, 216,000,000 bushels of corn, and 40,000,000 bushels of rye. During the war, when it was not a question of price, when it was entirely a question of getting food, our wheat exports aggregated for these five years a little over a billion bushels. Our corn exports were about 200,000,000 bushels, and our rye exports were about 57,000,000 bushels. The great increase in wheat was due, of course, to the fact that the war was on, that Russia was out of the wheat-exporting business, and the people of Europe required food, and food was raised and sent them. Then we come to the four years since the war, and what do we find? Simply that in these four years, when Europe has been bankrupt, when Europe has been "unable to buy food," we have shipped them 1,134,288,284 bushels of wheat, 319,032,468 bushels of corn, and 158,504,377 bushels of rye.

Let us put it another way. In five years previous to the war the total exports of the three food grains—wheat, corn, and rye—amounted in round numbers to 771,000,000 bushels. During the war, when food was the paramount issue, when food had to be got at any cost, the United States' exports of these three grains was 1,348,000,000 bushels. Then we come to the four years that have followed the war—four years of a bankrupt, starving Europe, a Continent that can not buy food, a Continent that must be helped to buy food—and what do we find? Simply that in these four years we have shipped 1,611,000,000 bushels of these food grains, more than double in four years what we shipped in the five years prior to the war, and almost 300,000,000 bushels more in four years than we shipped in the five years of the war, when every muscle was being strained to produce food.

Now, in the light of these figures, do you blame me for saying that there is some ulterior motive back of this propaganda that American agriculture is depressed because Europe is not buying food?

Senator NORRIS has a bill now pending to form a corporation to finance the exporting of food to Europe. I have no criticism to make of Senator NORRIS. I believe he is one of the most valuable men that agriculture has in Congress to-day, but I believe that the Senator has been misled by taking the word of the propagandists as to our exports of food to Europe. I have no quarrel with Senator NORRIS's proposition if it will enable our farmers to ship more to Europe, but in the light of the figures I do not believe it will. Food is something that will be bought by the people of Europe irrespective of their financial condition, and I doubt very much whether financing exports will enable the individuals in Europe to buy any more than they require to sustain life; or, even if it would enable them to do so, I question very much whether they would do so under present conditions.

Now I have given you my reasons for thinking that all of the proposed recommendations will fall short of accomplishing their purpose, and that while they are all good and all necessary, no one of them will do the work, nor will all of them do the work unless this unseen thing in agriculture is brought into view and grappled with. Just what is this unseen thing I have been talking about and referring to? Well, in brief, it is this: About five years ago I began to compare the returns of agriculture as a whole with other lines of productive effort, and I found that agriculture lagged far behind manufacturing; therefore it seemed logical to suppose that there must be some law that manufacturers were observing that farmers were not. Arguing from that basis, I began to compare the methods of production of manufacturers and farmers. I found that a manufacturer is very careful to gauge his probable sales before contracting for his raw materials. The manufacturer—it doesn't make any difference what line it may be—sends out his traveling men to take orders for delivery from six months to one year in advance, and he bases his purchases of raw materials and the amount of goods that he expects to produce by the amount of sales booked by his traveling men.

The jobber who buys from the manufacturer sends his traveling men out to the retailers, and so does not place his orders with the manufacturer until he has a pretty good line on how much he is going to be able to sell the retailers. On the other hand, the retailer gauges his purchases from the jobber by the crop outlook and the population of his trading area. If he is in a manufacturing district, he takes into consideration the probability of continuous employment or the probability of strikes. He weights carefully the question of whether labor is satisfied or not. If he is in a farming community, he keeps pretty close tab on crop conditions, so he places his orders accordingly.

Well, now, what does the farmer do? He puts in every acre that he can put in with himself and boys and as many hired men as he can get hold of, and he does it without any idea of how much is being produced in the world or what the demand for his products is going to be when he gets them ready for market. He simply hopes that they will be taken at a satisfactory price when he gets ready to sell them. We have a fundamental difference in procedure here, and we also have a fundamental difference in returns received, as this chart shows. Now, then, what is the answer? It is simply this: The manufacturer, the jobber, and the retailer have been conducting their business along sound economic principles, while farmers have not been doing so. The farmer has always felt that the size of the crop determined his prosperity. It is only within a few years that they have begun to realize that something besides size of crops determines their well-being. The farmers have not been alone in this. Nearly everyone has felt that whenever we had a big crop, irrespective of price, the country was all right; but 1922, with its good crop, has not brought the business revival that everyone expected would come, so it is beginning to dawn on business and financial interests that something besides the number of bushels determines the general condition of business in the United States.

This is the unseen thing that has been throttling agriculture, this working in defiance of sound economic law. Of course, the first thing that will come to the minds of a great many in this audience is that I am wrong when I talk about there being an overproduction of food, and will say that there can not be any overproduction of food as long as there is anybody starving in the world. Well, that is one of those statements that are true but while being true have very little weight in the question that we are now discussing. And yet there is a great deal of confusion in the minds of almost everybody on this subject. I want to see if I can get this distinction clear. If I can, it is going to be pretty easy to get what I want to say across. If I can't, I am not going to get anywhere at all. The question of there being people in the world who haven't enough to eat, who haven't sufficient clothing, or who haven't decent places in which to live is entirely distinct from the question of controlling agricultural production so as to make a profit for the farmer. The question of the distribution of

opportunity, the distribution of work so that the physical well-being of every person in the world can be 100 per cent, is something that must be worked out and will be worked out as the years go by. But it can not be worked out by farmers and manufacturers producing goods that can not be purchased at a profit to them. We have two demands recognized by economists. One is known as the potential demand; that is, the demand that would exist if everybody could have all of every sort of production that they wanted. Then there is the effective demand, which means the demand that will take and pay a profitable price for the products. The effective demand is the only demand that the manufacturer considers; it is the only demand he can afford to consider, no matter how much he might desire to take into account the potential demand and attempt to fill it. Let me illustrate this point a little further. I think as a general proposition it is true that nearly every owner of a Ford, a Dodge, a Chevrolet, or any of the lower priced automobiles way down deep in their hearts have a desire for a Packard, a Pierce-Arrow, or even a Rolls-Royce. In other words, there is a potential demand in this country for these high-priced cars, just about equal to the number of the cheap cars now owned. But do you see the Rolls-Royce, the Packard, or Pierce-Arrow manufacturers bending their energies and adding to their plants for the purpose of making cars enough to supply this potential demand? Are they wasting any tears because several million people in this country are driving Fords who would like to have Packards? Not so anybody could notice it.

Every clothing manufacturer might produce clothing so that every man, woman, and child in the world could have two suits of clothes at a time; yet if there was no means of getting these clothes to these people he would simply have piled up a useless surplus and would go broke. The same thing applies exactly to the production of food, with a fundamental difference. There is a natural limitation to the consumption of food that does not apply to the consumption of goods. The consumption of goods is governed by the financial ability of the individual to purchase. It seems to be a law of human nature that as one's financial condition improves he buys more things; but it doesn't make any particular difference how rich a man may be he will only eat just about so much. He will eat what satisfies him, so the limit of food production is naturally reached some time before the limit of the production of goods.

Now, the farmers of the United States could undoubtedly produce double the amount of wheat and rye and corn that they are now producing. They could feed everyone who is now hungry; but if there was no means of getting that food to these people who are hungry, the farmers would be in exactly the same position as the manufacturer who ran his factory to take care of the potential rather than the effective demand. This may seem like a cold-blooded way of looking at this problem, but, in point of fact, it is not. If it were possible to feed these hungry people by producing irrespective of profit, then there might be some justification in asking farmers to make the sacrifice. But overproduction beyond the effective demand for farm products would simply break the farmers and not do the starving people of the world any good. There is a great deal of misunderstanding, I find, when I begin to talk this controlled-production idea. A great many farmers say, "Well, what good will higher prices do us when we have not anything to sell?" Controlled production simply means having something to sell at a profit. I have a letter on my desk from a farmer who says, "I am heavily in debt. The only chance I will ever have to pay my debts is to produce to the limit." Well, I might use this illustration: Suppose a shoe manufacturer was heavily in debt, and he was making shoes that cost him $2 a pair to make, but he could only sell those shoes for $1.50 a pair, and he would say to himself, "Now, here I am in the hole, and the only way I have of getting out of the hole is to produce all the shoes I can by working my factory 24 hours a day." I leave it to anybody here how far he would get in getting out of debt. How far is the farmer going to go toward getting out of debt if he produces 1,000 bushels of wheat that cost him $1.25 to produce and he only gets $1.10 a bushel for it? Is he going to get out of debt? Maybe he is, but I doubt it.

Now, I want to refer to the chart showing the curve of acreage and price of wheat from 1912 to 1922, inclusive. I want you to notice that price does now control production, but as the thing stands now, the farmer is getting the short end of it. He is about a season too late. Of course, in a way these are abnormal years. In 1914 the breaking out of the war caused a jump in price which induced a large acreage for the 1914–15 crop. In the fall of 1915, about the time the winter wheat people were putting in their 1916 acreage, there was a drop in the price of wheat and you will see a corresponding drop in the acreage for 1916. In the fall of 1916 there was a fairly good bulge in wheat, which was reflected to some extent in the increased acreage, and would probably have been increased more had not the season of 1917 in the spring-wheat district been rather backward. Then, of course, under the war stimulus, we shot our acreage up in 1919 to its highest point, because the armistice was not signed until after the winter-wheat seeding. There was a slight dip in price in the fall of 1919, and this dip in consideration of the war being over, caused a sharp break in the acreage for the 1920 crop, which, in view of developments in the fall of 1920, was exceedingly fortunate. The acreage of 1921 held about even with 1920, but the acreage for the crop year 1922 showed a considerable decrease, owing to the falling price during the year 1921.

Now, this shows that production is controlled by the rise and fall of prices. This chart shows substantially the same curves on many of the grain crops, therefore a great many economists say that the present situation, if let alone, will eventually adjust itself, that production will naturally continue to decline until there will be a scarcity, which will cause prices to go up again, and they will continue to go up until production increases to a point that begins to build up a surplus. Of course this is true, but it is a hard road to travel. It is a road that is strewn with the wrecks of farm homes, of blasted hopes, suicide, and premature old age. But this natural control of production gives us the cue that, if we will but follow it, will lead to the control of production intentionally, which will hold prices at a more stable level, preventing these great swings from year to year, with their consequent losses and profits to the farmer.

There is a bill before Congress, known as the Christopherson bill, for the stabilization of nonperishable farm-products prices, the idea being to have the Government agree at the beginning of a crop year to purchase any surplus at a guaranteed price and sell this surplus on the world's market for what they will bring. The prices for the following year are to be determined by the amount of surplus that had to be disposed of the previous year, so if a surplus was produced one year the guaranteed price would be made so low as to make it unattractive for the growers to put in that particular crop the following year. That is the theory of the Christopherson bill. It recognizes the necessity of coupling stabilization up with some sort of controlled production. Unless this is done in some way, any guaranteed-price plan would eventually fall of its own weight. If there was no limit to the production in any way, there would be so much produced that the taxpayers of the country would rise in revolt against carrying out the promise to purchase. The United States Government would then be in exactly the same position as the Governments of Europe are now in with their printing-press money. They would simply be swamped with farm products, so that if farmers expect any help from the Government in the way of price fixing or price stabilization, they must make up their minds to do something themselves.

We hear a good deal yet about the danger of the United States becoming an importer of foodstuffs. I believe that this is absolutely impossible, because long before the United States would get to a point where it would begin to import foodstuffs prices would reach a point where it would be profitable to grow them. But I believe the greatest profit to agriculture, and incidentally to the entire United States, lies in producing just as closely as possible enough for our home consumption, letting Canada, the Argentine, Australia, India, and Russia, with their cheap lands, feed the world. I believe that it is about time for the American farmer to realize that he has gone broke trying to feed the world. We must remember that, while it may take several years, eventually Russia is going to come back as an exporting country of foodstuffs. We must not overlook Canada. One of the recent ministers of agriculture of Canada made the statement that Canada has 252,000,000 acres of potential wheat land. Personally I think this minister was a little bit overoptimistic. When you consider that 252,000,000 acres of wheat land is practically the entire wheat acreage of the world at this time, it is hardly probable that Canada will ever have as much land as that under wheat, for the simple reason that if they ever did it would be so cheap they would all go broke.

But to get down to the realm of reasonable probability, I believe the time is comparatively near—by comparatively I mean within, say, a quarter of a century—that Canada will be producing as much wheat as the United States. That will mean that they will be just that much stronger competitors of ours in the markets of the world. Of course, if that time ever comes, the United States will be forced out of the wheat-producing game for export. Now, would it not be a great deal better to get out of the exporting business and make a profit on every crop of wheat for the next 25 years than it would be to buck the growing Canadian surpluses and lose money on every crop of wheat? It seems to me that here is a plain business proposition.

Referring again to the figures I gave in the matter of exports, I would like to ask what do you think is going to happen to the American farmers when the time comes, as it will, when our exports of the three leading food grains drop to the basis of 1909–1913? We surely will eventually get back to that basis of exports. Russia is not going to be out of agricultural production forever, although I am willing to grant it will probably be from 5 to 10 years before Russia can become much of a factor in the world's export of foodstuffs, but without Russia there is no question but what Canada is going to progressively increase her output. There is little doubt but what we will see an increase from Argentina and probably from Australia. There is no way possible to prevent the time coming when our aggregate exports of the three leading food grains will be back to a basis of around 700,000,000 bushels for a five-year period. We certainly are not going to continue to produce on the basis of an export of 1,611,000,000 bushels for four years. If, as the propagandists I referred to claim, the trouble with American agriculture is that we are not sending food to Europe, in the light of our exports in the last four years, what is going to happen to us when we really drop to a 700,000,000 or 800,000,000 bushels aggregate for five years? Following out the natural economic law, as our exports decline, if we continue to produce on the same basis we are now producing, prices will also decline, and the decline in these prices will cause an eventual falling off in production to meet the demand.

I want to emphasize again that production does adapt itself to demand, so in advocating intentional adaptation of production to demand, I am simply advocating a course that is absolutely in accordance with economic law, with this difference—controlled or adapted production means this: It means more intensive farming of fewer acres, which will cut down the overhead cost and naturally the cost of production. There is a vast difference between a short crop caused by climatic conditions when the yield of wheat, for instance, may not average more than 9 bushels to the acre, and the production of an equal amount of this short crop with an acre yield of 14 bushels to the acre. Farmers have often said when I have been talking to them on the controlled production idea: "Well, what good would it do us when we have a higher price if we haven't anything to sell?" Of course, if a man can't see the difference between controlled production and having nothing to sell, that chap is about hopeless and there isn't very much use trying to waste any more time or words on him. A surprisingly large number of farmers seem to think that what is meant by controlled or adapted production is no production at all. I don't know where they get that idea, except that they choose to believe the opponents of the idea rather than the statements of the advocates of the idea. It certainly shouldn't take very much eloquence to prove to a man that he would be better off with, say 750 bushels of $1.50 wheat raised on 60 acres than he would be with 1,200 bushels of 75-cent wheat raised on 120 acres, particularly as the 750 bushels would have cost him less money to produce than the 1,200 bushels.

I also think that farmers have been paying too much attention to commercial production and not enough attention to production for living. By that I mean that there is too much of foodstuffs bought from the grocery store that might just as well be produced on the farm in a great many cases. I believe a farm family would be much better off if instead of growing 100 per cent of their stuff for sale they grew, let us say, 90 per cent for sale and 10 per cent for their own use. Farmers would then be doing two things. By this method of procedure they would be cutting down the amount available to sell and they would also be cutting down the outgo for the family food. Of course, it might be argued in this that by proceeding along this line they would be cutting down the market for the producers of the food they were raising themselves.

While this might be true to a certain extent, it would probably bring up the amount of food produced for market by causing the people who were producing what the farm was now buying to go into other lines, so that the actual decrease of production of products for sale would not amount to the whole 10 per cent. But even so, it would improve the economic condition of the farmer.

Now, I am coming to a very important consideration; in fact, I am coming to the biggest rock, the biggest obstacle, that we will have to remove if it is ever possible to put the idea of controlled or adapted

production across. Will the farmers themselves realize the necessity of working together? Unless some outside pressure can be brought to bear, I am frank to confess that I believe the chances of getting farmers to work together with sufficient unanimity to put a program of controlled production over are rather remote. But, on the other hand, unless farmers are willing to get together and are willing, as I will show a little later on, to join in a plan sponsored by the Government to control production, then I say that farmers might just as well quit running to legislatures and to Congress for relief. They might just as well quit asking their farm papers to help them. It all comes down to a question of whether or not the farmers are going to get together and help themselves put over the only thing that will give agriculture the same standing and the same profits of other productive enterprises. We are getting pretty close to the parting of the ways in this country. We are getting almost to a point where we have got to make a great decision. When I say "we" I mean the farmers. Farmers have got to decide pretty soon whether or not farming is going to grow into a business where the returns will be somewhere near the returns received in other lines of productive industry, or they have got to take the other road, where farming will be merely a question of shelter, food, and a few clothes, where it will be merely a board and keep proposition, where it will be practically on the same level as existed in Europe prior to the war and probably will exist in Europe for many years to come. Are we to have business men or peasants on American farms?

The decision rests entirely with the farmers. They have got to work out their own salvation on this to a great extent. In order to do it they have got to give up some of that individuality and individualism which is such a marked characteristic of the American farmer.

For good or ill, we will not discuss which, organized labor has become a great power in this country, and it became a great power because every member of a labor union is loyal to every other member of that union. The solidarity of union labor is what has given it its power. If union labor had never grown beyond the mere loose organization that we now have even in the best of our farmer organizations, it would not have got anywhere.

Now, then, the great question is to take our material as we find it and try and determine whether or not the material we have on hand can be made into such a structure as we desire. Five years ago, when I first began to talk controlled or adapted production, I did not have any concrete idea of how it was going to be done. I saw the obstacles; I saw the difficulty of getting farmers to work together, but I put up the general proposition that controlled production must come. Then last year, after the agricultural conference at Washington, Mr. Roger Babson, the statistician, made the statement that he regretted no one told the conference at Washington just what was the matter with agriculture. He said there were about 10 per cent too many farmers. He said 10 per cent of the farmers of to-day should be plasterers, carpenters, masons, or what not. In a speech at St. Paul last December, Mr. Babson raised his percentage and said there were 25 per cent too many farmers. Now that is simply putting in another way the statement that we are producing more agricultural products than can be handled profitably, and 25 per cent of our farmers should be off the farm and in some other business where they would be consumers. Babson suggests they ought to be carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers, plasterers, and so forth. That is very fine, if it were possible to make a bricklayer, carpenter, or plumber of a farmer overnight if all he had to do was to get the tools. But unfortunately a farmer in any one of these crafts would not be any better and would not be any more skillful than would a carpenter, bricklayer, or plumber if he were dropped on a farm and told to farm it.

If it is a fact, and I do not dispute the general conclusion, that under the present methods of hit-and-miss, haphazard production we have 25 per cent too many farmers, it means that eventually 1 farmer out of every 4 has got to quit. But, when he does quit, he won't be a bricklayer, carpenter, plumber, or any kind of a skilled laborer, because the fourth that quit will, in the following out of the inexorable economic law, be the least efficient and the only thing that he can put his hand to will be unskilled labor, the lowest-paid labor we have. He would become a competitor in the labor market. He would tend to reduce wages, the reduction of wages would naturally be reflected in lower prices for farm products, and lower prices for farm products would be reflected in a lessening demand for goods—so we have a vicious circle established here that must be broken in some way. I believe the way to do it is to make it profitable for all the farmers we now have on the land to stay on the land and become a market for the products of the skilled laborers in industry. Of course the consumers of food are against any idea of controlling production, because they feel it will raise prices. I am willing to admit it will raise prices; that is the intention, but I believe that the lesson of the last two years has been pretty well learned. I believe the laboring man realizes as never before that cheap food is not to his interest.

Now, this brings us back to the proposition of the consumption of food and the consumption of manufactured goods, because there is no question that, measured by our ability to produce manufactured goods, there is an overproduction that is now measured by the potential demand I referred to in the opening. As I see it, we must first of all get the farmers of the country in such shape that a large part of this potential demand now existing on the farms must be made an effective demand for manufactured goods; make it much nearer the potential demand—that is, we must have such farm prices and profits that will enable the great mass of farmers in this country to buy more goods. In that way the spread between the potential demand for food and effective demand for food will be narrowed through the full employment and higher wages of the laborers in the cities. Then production can be increased just to the extent that the effective demand increases. Everyone admits that the prosperity of the farmers is the groundwork of the prosperity for everybody else, so I feel that a plan of adapted or controlled production, worked out scientifically, will go further in bringing about that ideal that we want for our country—when there will be no poverty, no one short of food, no one short of clothes—than any other plan that has ever been thought of. But we still come back to the old question: How are we going to do it?

Congressman YOUNG of North Dakota has this suggestion: He says let the Government sponsor an organization of farmers who will come into this organization under an agreement to obey orders as to the amount of acreage they will put in of any given crop. Then let the Government agree to buy the crop at a certain specified price that will yield a profit to the producers. The people who do not see fit to come into this organization, who want to go their own way, let them go their own way, but the Government will be under no obligation whatever and will not buy anything that the nonmembers of that organization have for sale. Congressman YOUNG will do two things with this plan, two very essential things. He will fix a price that will be profitable and at the same time will prevent the production of an unwieldly surplus. Of course, this idea isn't worked out in full detail. It can't be until some ideas can be had of how the farmers will regard it; whether or not they will be willing to take it up. In view of the fact that our winter-wheat acreage just put in is the third largest on record, a great many people are saying that farmers are being misrepresented by those who are trying to help them. They are saying that farmers must have been satisfied with last year's price of wheat, else they would not have put in such an enormous acreage of winter wheat. Now, this is a hard argument to meet. It is rather difficult to tell anyone who brings up this argument that farmers are a lot of dubs and are perfectly willing to keep on producing at a loss. Well, we have either got to tell them that, or else admit that all the figures and claims we have been making that farm prices are less than cost of production aren't so. Really, it puts us in a very embarrassing position, and if the spring-wheat farmers next spring go to work and put in as large an acreage of wheat as they did last year. I don't see where I am going to have a leg to stand on when I am told that the farmers must be perfectly satisfied with prices as they are.

When I was presenting the idea of controlled production through an organization of this sort before the House Agricultural Committee last month, I was asked if I thought the American farmers would go into a plan of this kind. Well, the only answer I could make was that I didn't know, but that I did have enough confidence in the common sense of the American farmer to think he would go in if he could be persuaded that he could make money by doing so.

Now, gentlemen, we have come up to this point. I don't know whether you agree with all I have said here or not, but if you do I don't want you to go away from this convention and say: "Yes, that is a good thing; that ought to be done." What I want to know is whether you are going to do it or not. I want to know whether you are merely going to sit around and say: "Yes, that is a good thing and should be done," or whether you are going to do it. I want to know whether you are for or against such an organization as your Congressman YOUNG proposes. I don't know of a better place for a show of hands on this proposition than right up here in the great bread basket of the Northwest; and I would like to see before this meeting adjourns some evidence that the farmers of this part of the country, at least, are willing to go ahead on a controlled-production program that will lead them out of their present situation into one where they can pay off their debts and make a profit.

We want cooperative marketing. We need it under this plan of controlled production. We need lower freight rates. We need lower taxes. We need a tariff on agricultural products. We need stabilized prices. All these things will be required even under a program of adapted production, because they will all save money; but I want to tell you right now that if you get your farming on a profitable basis ability to borrow money and the interest rates won't be much of a factor. You will have people coming around trying to loan you money at practically your own rates. If you are making money, the freight rates won't be so oppressive, the taxes won't be so oppressive, but the cornerstone of the whole structure has got to be profits, and that cornerstone has got to be high, broad, and firmly laid or else the whole structure of American agriculture is going to fall. The very cornerstone of profitable agriculture is controlled production; and if this generation doesn't see it, if we go on to a point where we get a peasantry on the land, we can't have that American standard of living that we hear so much about in the cities. A peasantry on the land will mean a condition and a plane of living in this country just about equivalent to that in the pre-war days in Europe. Better farming to the end that we get more to the acre, fewer acres under cultivation, to prevent getting a burdensome surplus, is the way out of our whole difficulty.

Now, I may have been talking to no purpose here. I may not have convinced you; but, whether I have or not, I feel that sometimes the logic of events will convince you that I am right. Sometime you will have to come to what I am now advocating, but I want to see it done now.

Following my remarks in the House and before the House Committee on Agriculture in favor of a controlled production, editorials appeared in a number of newspapers. Here are two from Farm, Stock, and Home:

STABILIZATION AND PRODUCTION.

At the recent hearings on price stabilization, before the Senate and House Agricultural Committees, the writer took the position that any governmental price-fixing, or price stabilization of farm products policy, unless joined with a plan to keep down production to the limit of demand, would result in failure, because of the inevitable increase in production that guaranteeing a high price would bring about. Rich as the United States is, it could not carry out its promises, because of the protests of taxpayers. There would be the same economic waste in overproduction, even though the producer got a higher price, that there is with an overproduction and low prices, the only difference being the loss would not fall so directly on the producer in the former case as it does in the latter.

Congressman YOUNG, of North Dakota, has suggested a plan to control production. He hasn't it worked out in detail, so its final form may be very different from the first draft. In brief, he proposes to have the Government say to the farmers that if they will come into an organization to be formed and supervised by the Government, and agree to reduce their acreage on the various grain crops whatever per cent ordered, the Government will buy at a guaranteed price the crops of those who join the organization and live up to its terms. Those who preferred to keep out and go their way, putting in as much of the various grains as they pleased, could not sell their crops to the Government, but would have to take their chances on the world market just as the Government would have to do on whatever surplus grains there might be.

This is simply applying the tariff principle to agriculture. It is considered perfectly legitimate for American manufacturers to get as much as they can for all they sell at home and dispose of their surplus to foreign buyers for what they can get. We think Congressman YOUNG has supplied the missing link in the Johnson-Peek plan, which is the same as outlined in the foregoing, lacking the vital matter of controlled production. It is also an improvement on the Lyon plan, which contemplates the purchase of the surplus at a price set before seeding. An adjustment the following year is to be

made in the price to discourage the production of the crop having the burdensome surplus.

This is the groundwork of the Christopherson bill. In actual practice, we believe the first year under this plan would produce so much of everything that next year's prices would have to be far too low, and the loss sustained by the Government would be very high on the first crop. With Congressman YOUNG'S plan, the reduction of the surplus would start at seeding time of the first harvest to be handled under a price-fixing plan, so that the surplus, if any, would be small, and the loss to the Government would not be great.

Take the United States out of the exporting column and the world price for wheat would rise to very nearly the price the Government might guarantee. If Canada could be induced to adopt a similar system, the world price would go to the guaranteed price in the United States and Canada, for there is no question that North America holds the key to the wheat price if her peoples will but realize it. We will discuss other phases of Congressman YOUNG'S plan in future issues.

It may be, as suggested by a member of the House Agricultural Committee, that farmers would not take kindly to the plan because of its hampering the exercise of their own judgment as to how much of a certain crop they will grow. Our answer was that we had enough confidence in the ability of the majority of American farmers to realize the possibility of greater profits to bring them into such a working agreement. We will hold to that view until farmers themselves prove they prefer to continue in the old rut of hard labor and scant return.

[From Farm, Stock, and Home, Minneapolis, Minn., January 15.]

WILL YOU HELP YOURSELVES?

It is now generally admitted that growing more than can be sold at a profitable price is the fundamental cause of agricultural depression. Nevertheless we hear farmers say, "What good will high prices do us if we haven't anything to sell?" Do you know, folks, when that is sprung on us by presumably intelligent men we feel like throwing up our hands and saying it's no use.

Controlled production does not mean growing nothing at all; yet an appalling large number of people seem to have that idea. Controlled production does not mean deliberately bringing about famine, as President Harding and others seem to think. It simply means trying to match supply to demand by having every farmer reduce his acreage of crops a certain per cent.

The big question is how to do it. As stated in last issue, we believe Congressman YOUNG has the idea. Let the Government sponsor an organization of farmers who will pledge themselves to obey orders and reduce their acreage as requested. Then let the Government agree to pay a fixed minimum price for the crops, this price to be high enough to insure a fair profit.

Now, the question is, Will the farmers come into such a scheme if organized? We do not know, but we are going to test the matter out right now as far as this part of the country is concerned by making it easy for every reader of Farm, Stock, and Home to say whether or not they would go into such a deal with Uncle Sam. Fill out coupon in signboard. If you will, say so; if you won't, say so The point is we want a showdown in this, and want it quickly.

The Courier-News, Fargo, said:

GOVERNMENT CONTROL.

The railroads of the country are under Government control. Their rates are fixed by the Government and the amount of profit they may make is supposed to be regulated, although this feature is not yet perfected. The railroads accept this as the lesser of two evils. The other evil, which they fear more than control, is Government ownership.

Yet the evil came upon them through their own sinning. The day of rebates, of making the public pay "all the traffic would bear," and of outrageous wrong and discrimination, brought upon the railroads the natural fruits, and rigid control by the Government was that fruit. Bitter as it is, the railroads, while they make wry faces over it, accept it rather than the final result which impends—Government ownership.

But railroads are not alone in Government control. Our street-car lines, our public-service companies, supplying gas, light, and heat, our public warehouses, all are under the hand of some government—State, county, or city—that their rapacity and natural greed may be curbed and the public protected.

If Government control is necessary in these instances, and there are few who will deny it, why should not Government control be extended to cover the farmer and agriculture?

That seems to be the gist of the question asked by Congressman GEORGE M. YOUNG, who surprises the Courier-News with the advanced position he takes and the lengths to which he is willing to go to redeem agriculture.

You will read Mr. YOUNG'S statement elsewhere in this issue. It was prepared for publication in a farm weekly, but as it talks mighty plain doctrine to the farmer, it has its place in our columns.

What, in brief, Congressman YOUNG proposes is that the Government take over the marketing of farm products. He wants to see a corporation which he would call a Federal Marketing Corporation, which will have for its duties the handling of the matter of farm production much as the manufacturer now handles and controls his product!

In other words, the Government would control farming as it does the railroads. It would not own the farm lands or the machinery of production, any more than it owns the rails or coaches or engines of the railroads. But it would put a period to overproduction and would set the rate at which the various farm products might be sold. It would serve as a governing body, eliminating waste and overproduction and assuring the man who went into farming a just return for his labor and on his investment.

We can hear some people remark: "That's socialism, thinly disguised," and expect the consequent denunciation. Others will smile and say: "That is nonpartisan doctrine, lacking only the label."

To both the answer of Congressman YOUNG is commended. It is either that, or "we shall have, as they have in Europe, classes of society well defined, say, the peasant class, the middle class, the upper class. What an end for America!"

It is well worth while to consider what George N. Peek, a hard-headed business man says upon the subject of a controlled production. Mr. Peek is president of the Moline Plow Co. In an address before the Ohio Implement Dealers' Association, he said:

The implement industry is at its lowest ebb. Why?

First. The buying power of its customer, the farmer, is paralyzed.

Second. It was organized to give American farms their original equipment during our development period. That day is done. We shall now have a replacement business only. We have an excess of manufacturing and sales capacity. The fittest will survive. This elimination contest is here, intensified many times by the desperate condition of agriculture.

What must you and I do to survive and flourish? Know the situation and chart our course by knowledge.

Let us look to our customer. The weighted net average of wholesale prices is called the general price index. The net average of terminal prices for farm products is called the farm price index. The former is a measure of the price the farmer pays for what he buys; the latter, of what he gets for what he sells. Comparison of the two shows the exchange value of his product. That comparison is shocking. It shows exchange value about 65 per cent of pre-war. But even this is above the mark, because:

(a) Retail prices have gone up more than wholesale, and the farmer pays retail prices.

(b) The farmer does not get terminal prices. He pays an enormously increased freight both ways.

(c) The figures do not adequately reflect increases in rent, interest, and taxes since the war.

Considering these other elements it is probably safe to say that the farmer's buying power has been cut squarely in two.

This is a desperate situation. There are two ways to cure it—

(1) Raise the price of what the farmer sells.

(2) Lower the price of what he buys.

Can we raise the price of what he sells?

Never forget this. American price of every crop we export is not fixed here by American conditions. It is fixed by world conditions. Why? We must sell our surplus abroad in world competition, at a price fixed by world supply and demand and regulated by world conditions. Since it is economic law that the price of the surplus is the price of the crop, world price fixes domestic price. A tariff of $10 per bushel on wheat would not make one cent's difference. Chicago price is now, and always has been, Liverpool price less cost of transportation.

The farmer buys in a tariff-protected market regulated by American conditions; he sells in a free-trade market regulated by world conditions. For this reason you can raise the price of what he sells in only two ways:

1. Fix world conditions.

2. Find a way to let the farmer's home price be regulated as are industrial domestic prices—by American conditions in a protected market.

I am not here to talk of fixing the world. Let Lloyd-George do it. But I know we must fix the American farmer. All we could do to lower the price of what he buys would not restore his buying power. His buying power is, say, 40 per cent of total buying power. Ninety-two per cent of our commerce is domestic. When he is 50 per cent out of the market nearly one-fifth of our domestic commerce is gone. This is enough to destroy our economic structure. Therefore you, I, everybody in America have one prime job, and that is to give the farmer an American price for his product. It is not an insurmountable problem. Industry solved it long ago. How?

Industry regulates production and supply to demand. If it produces a surplus that would depress price below cost, it either holds and checks production or dumps it abroad at less than the American price, and by equalizing supply with demand at home maintains price at cost plus a profit. It can dump abroad because the tariff protects it, and because it is organized and financed to do so, but above all, because it controls its own marketing mechanism.

If agriculture suggests regulating production a hypocritical howl goes up from every blind leader of the blind in America. If the manager of a great industry did not regulate production he would be sent to an insane asylum.

The steps necessary to restore agriculture to an American price are:

(1) Organize and finance it to a point where unified sales policy is possible, where it can hold or sell surplus abroad at world price, regulating supply to demand at cost plus profit on the domestic market.

(2) Protect it by tariff.

(3) Give it control of its own marketing mechanism.

Exactly this has been done with industry. Therefore it can be done for agriculture. Until it is done, and as long as we have a depressed world fixing farm price and a high tariff and highly organized industry fixing all others (which may be forever), there will be a spread so wide between the price the farmer pays and the price he gets that farm buying power will be dead and domestic commerce disarranged and paralyzed. For industry and commerce to permit this would be slow suicide for them and for the Nation, politically as well as economically; therefore, they will not permit it when they understand. The only question is one of the time and effort necessary to impregnate the opinion of 110,000,000 people with an economic truth.

Such is the outlook on restoring the farmer's dollar by raising the price he gets. Before considering the other method—lowering price he pays—let me warn you that while you can help in the latter way you can not cure. You can only cure by permitting him to sell, not in a free-trade market regulated by world conditions but, like every other American citizen, in an American market regulated by American conditions.

NESTOR MONTOYA, JR.—FRANCES MONTOYA.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I call up House Resolution 494.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 494.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Nestor Montoya, jr., the sum of $186.66 and to Frances Montoya $120, being the amount received by them per month as clerks to the late Hon. Nestor Montoya at the time of his death, January 13, 1923.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual and customary resolution following the decease of a Member. I do not think that I ought to take up the time of the House to say

anything more than that it has had the consideration of the Committee on Accounts and was unanimously recommended for adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. A. P. NELSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

SUBSTITUTE TELEPHONE OPERATOR.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 493.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, for the employment of a substitute telephone operator, compensation at the rate of $2.50 per diem, from February 1 to March 3, 1923, inclusive.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is necessary to provide for a telephone substitute operator to take care of the business, and comes recommended by the Clerk of the House, Mr. Page. It will involve an expenditure of only $77.50. Mr. Page wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts as follows in respect to this matter:

JANUARY 19, 1923.

Hon. CLIFFORD IRELAND,
Chairman Committee on Accounts,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. IRELAND: Inclosed is a draft of a resolution for the employment of a substitute telephone operator from February 1 to March 3, 1923, inclusive.

This will involve an expenditure of $77.50, made necessary by reason of the exhaustion of the appropriation for a substitute telephone operator for the current fiscal year through sickness and the continuous operation of our exchange. For the same purpose from March 3 until the end of the fiscal year I shall submit a deficiency estimate to the Committee on Appropriations.

Very truly yours, WM. TYLER PAGE.

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

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the necessity for a substitute telephone operator during the month of February to March 4?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. As the gentleman knows, there has been considerable sickness. The regular operators have been unable to perform their duties. We have had to have substitute telephone operators in order to take care of the business.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, it is to provide a substitute for some one who is sick?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise, if I may be permitted to do so, to inquire about the plan for business to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that to-morrow the program is to consider claims unobjected to on the Private Calendar.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And if any of the pension bills, which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] desires to call up to-day, are not concluded to-day, will they also be continued to-morrow? In other words, will to-morrow be a Private Calendar day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then I understand it is the purpose of the gentleman from Wyoming to ask that the business in order to-day shall be in order to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. And I make that request now, and ask that at the conclusion of business before the House we may take up the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, unobjected to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the pension bills, bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to may be taken up to-day and to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So that there will be no misunderstanding about it, I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] has but one bill, and that the gentleman from Minnesota has another bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have two omnibus bills.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then I understand that the request is that at the conclusion of the pension bills we take up private bills unobjected to, and that the business in order to-day be in order to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. That is it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, would it not be well to state in the request that the Private Calendar would not be taken up until to-morrow because there are a number of gentlemen who are interested in that Calendar who would probably have to remain all the afternoon here waiting the conclusion of the pension bills?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, gentlemen surely can remain here for an hour; it will not take longer than that.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object.

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

AMPLIFIERS IN THE HOUSE CHAMBER.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has a resolution which he desires to call up that I did not have in mind at the time I made the request a moment ago. I ask unanimous consent to modify the order just made so that this resolution from the Committee on Rules may be presented, following the consideration of the pension bills.

Mr. GARNER. Let us have the resolution reported; let us know what it is.

Mr CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], providing for final disposition of the amplifiers here in the House, as to whether they shall be retained, or what disposition shall be made of them. The resolution provides that the Committee on Rules shall make an investigation of the matter and report their conclusions to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to modifying the order just made, so that the resolution referred to may be considered at the conclusion of the pension bills? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none.

BUSINESS IN ORDER ON MONDAY NEXT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, Monday next is a maverick Monday. I ask unanimous consent that District of Columbia business shall be in order on Monday next, January 29, 1923.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that business of the District of Columbia be in order on Monday next? Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. That will not interfere with the regular District day that follows?

Mr. MONDELL. No; that will be an additional day.

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

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 13980, an omnibus pension bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up an omnibus pension bill and asks unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13980) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Nancy J. Crum, widow of Peter Crum, late of Company H, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Kate M. King, widow of Mordecai S. H. King, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Burns, widow of William H. Burns, late of Company A, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cynthia Luttrell, widow of Newell Burr, late of Company H, Eighty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Ella Brodrick, helpless and dependent daughter of William P. Brodrick, late of Company F, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Marion D. Sweet, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of William H. Linnabarry, helpless and dependent son of Andrew Linnabarry, late of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Rosamond C. Dailey, widow of Orrin V. Dailey, late of Company E, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josephine Walker, widow of George Walker, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jane N. Ashley, widow of Edward M. Ashley, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Barnett, widow of Morris Barnett, late of Company F, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda Fuller, widow of David Fuller, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Drusilla Luce, widow of James M. Luce, late of Company H, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martin L. Stokesberry, helpless and dependent son of Richard R. Stokesberry, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Tennie Helm, widow of Felix G. Garner, alias William Helm, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rosie Lambert, widow of Moses Lambert, late of Company F, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Reeves, former widow of William M. Reeves, late of Companies F and C, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Robert Wiley, helpless and dependent son of William Wiley, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Anna B. Hurd, widow of Charles W. Hurd, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Kate L. Littlepage, widow of Lewis D. Littlepage, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Christopher C. Pratt, helpless and dependent son of Henry Pratt, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Jeannette Goslin, widow of Alexander Goslin, late of Company C, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alwilda E. Williamson, widow of John Williamson, late of Companies B and H, One hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Stites, widow of George W. Stites, late of Company F, Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy S. Faser, widow of Ziba M. Faser, late of Company I, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Militia Infantry, and Company F, Forty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Emergency Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy A. Felton, widow of Daniel Felton, late of Company I, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel C. Shattler, helpless and dependent son of Frederick Shattler, late of Seventeenth Ohio Independent Battery Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Roland, widow of Samuel Roland, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month.

The name of Mathew H. Udell, alias William H. Clark, late of Companies K and D, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Josefa Martinez, helpless and dependent daughter of Narciso Martinez, late of Company B, First Regiment New Mexico Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Orilla S. Spicer, former widow of Porter B. Earl, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Company L, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna E. Hughes, widow of John Hughes, late of Company H, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catharine Strauser, widow of Daniel Strauser, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Lillian Strauser, helpless and dependent daughter of said Catharine and Daniel Strauser, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Strauser, the name of said Lillian Strauser shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine Strauser, paid through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Elizabeth House, widow of John House, late of Company G, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nellie A. Hope, widow of Michael B. Hope, late quartermaster Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, aid-de-camp to Brigadier General Fry, and Company B, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bessie B. Celley, widow of Charles N. Celley, late of Company H, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna R. N. Beach, widow of William Beach, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan A. Wilsey, former widow of William H. Gesford, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry; Captain Breditt's company, Black Hawk Cavalry; and Company C, Black Hawk Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Merico E. Fox, widow of Daniel S. Fox, late of Company B, First Rigiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rosalia M. Burroughs, widow of Augustus C. Burroughs, late of Company B, First Battalion New York Volunteer National Guard Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jacob Staley, late unassigned, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Annie Brewer, widow of Thomas Brewer, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amelia Mathena, widow of John M. Mathena, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna P. McCrosky, widow of Charles McCrosky, late of Company H, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary M. Lewis, widow of John M. Lewis, late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Gregory Bird, alias William Galer, late of Battery M, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Theresa A. Hunter, widow of William M. Hunter, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Effie Edwards, helpless and dependent daughter of Leander Edwards, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Clara A. McCarty, widow of Thomas G. McCarty, late of Company C, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie Ackerman, widow of Harlow P. Ackerman, late of Company B, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Sizemore, former widow of Wilburn Sizemore, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane Dyer, widow of Gideon A. Dyer, late of Twenty-third Independent Battery New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company H, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Syntha Black, widow of Samuel Black, late of Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Lake, widow of Israel Lake, late of Company K, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bridget Stapleton, widow of Michael Stapleton, alias Michael Mahar, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, One hundred and thirteenth and One hundred and twentieth Regiments Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Genoa H. Scholz, widow of Henry C. Scholz, late ordinary seaman, U. S. S. *Hartford*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Robert M. Mann, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Anna M. Billet, widow of George Billet, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ocie E. Billet, helpless and dependent daughter of said Anna M. and George Billet, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Anna M. Billet the name of said Ocie E. Billet shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Anna M. Billet.

The name of Polly Nelson, helpless and dependent daughter of Gabriel Nelson, late of Company D, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Minnie Hosier, widow of George W. Hosier, late of Company L, Third Regiment, and Company B, Eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma J. Philhower, widow of Isaac N. Philhower, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Doll, widow of Lewis Doll, late of Company G, Eighty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Harriett E. Kilgore, widow of John Kilgore, late of Company A, Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Woodward, widow of Wells R. Woodward, late of United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Addington, former widow of William J. Addington, late of Company B, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catharine Hand, widow of Daniel Hand, late of Company K, Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of William H. Turnbull, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Amelia M. Hetherington, widow of Joseph S. Hetherington, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elsie M. Pool, widow of Hiram R. Pool, late of Company L, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Holmes, widow of Marion Holmes, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Almira L. Boutelle, widow of William Boutelle, late of Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elmira Pariseaux, former widow of Frederick Minnie, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frances Conner, widow of James L. Conner, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Narsisus Butler, widow of John T. Butler, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Kirkpatrick, widow of Anibel D. Kirkpatrick, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Anderson, widow of Solomon Anderson, late of Company E, Thirty-first Regiment, and Company E, Thirty-second Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Harriet Boyer, former widow of Robert Forrester, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and First Regiment Mississippi Marine Brigade of Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie A. Robinson, widow of Albert B. Robinson, late of Company C, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha R. Potts, helpless and dependent daughter of Israel B. Potts, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Susan A. Sims, widow of John Sims, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Griffith, widow of William E. Griffith, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Olive A. Bosworth, widow of Benjamin I. Bosworth, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sophia Wilson, widow of John H. Wilson, late of Company G, Ninety-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura Morris, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Morris, late of Company K, Ninety-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Harriet E. Waterman, widow of Lucius A. Waterman, late of United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Davis, widow of Randall M. Davis, late of Companies A and I, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of James S. Davis, helpless and dependent son of said Randall M. Davis, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Davis, the name of said James S. Davis shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Davis.

The name of Elizabeth Sterling, widow of Wilbur E. Sterling, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura C. Wible, widow of Francis M. Wible, late of Company D, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Chlora Wible, helpless and dependent daughter of said Laura C. and Francis M. Wible, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Laura C. Wible, the name of said Chlora Wible shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Laura C. Wible, paid through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Ezra Pokett, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer State Militia Cavalry, and Fourth Battery Iowa Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Reese Tunks, late of Company F, Eighteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteers, Company B, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri State Militia, and Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Emma C. Weinhold, widow of William S. Weinhold, late of Company G, Ninetieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma W. Mitchell, widow of George J. Mitchell, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Enrolled Militia, and United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. O'Reilly, widow of Thomas O'Reilly, late of Company C, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josephine Campbell, widow of John Campbell, late of Company C, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Artillery, and Battery E, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret F. Roach, helpless and dependant daughter of Edward Roach, late of United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Mary A. Mallory, widow of Daniel H. Mallory, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maria C. Faloon, widow of Joseph Faloon, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Reserve Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Gill, former widow of John A. Klein, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice A. Mangum, widow of Andrew J. Mangum, late of Company D, Thirty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Catherine E. Mangum, helpless and dependent daughter of said Alice A. and Andrew J. Mangum, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Alice A. Mangum, the name of said Catherine E. Mangum shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Alice A. Mangum through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Luraney R. Standley, widow of James C. Standley, late of Company A, National Guards, East Tennessee, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie J. Dickey, widow of William N. Dickey, late scout, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Richard M. Johnson, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ella Day, former widow of Alpheus B. Day, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josephine C. Long, widow of Levi R. Long, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Morgan, late of Company G, Seventy-eighth Regiment, and Company C, Twenty-fifth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Annie H. Sines, widow of Charles D. Sines, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Sutton, widow of Henry H. Sutton, late of Company H, Thirty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Stepson Sutton, helpless and dependent son of said Elizabeth and Henry H. Sutton, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth Sutton the name of said Stepson Sutton shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Elizabeth Sutton.

The name of Parthine Curtis, widow of Felix Curtis, late of Company B, Third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elmira Bauer, widow of Abraham Bauer, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie Rheb, helpless and dependent daughter of Louis Rheb, late of Company D, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Angie Scanks, widow of Jacob Scanks, late of Company H, and Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. McGill, widow of William H. H. McGill, late of Company B, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan S. Boyd, widow of James P. Boyd, late lieutenant colonel One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Fenner, widow of James W. Fenner, late of Company B, one hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie E. Thompson, widow of Samuel S. Thompson, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David Housel, late of Company E, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, Company G, Eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Henry C. Williams, late of Company G, Ninety-third Regiment, and Company B, Fifty-fourth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Sylvester Haus, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Henry C. Bagley, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Frances Laport, widow of William Laport, late of Company B, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Bryant, widow of Walter B. Bryant, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment, and Company C, Twentieth Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of M. Lovina Porter, widow of John W. Porter, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Azubath Srofe, widow of John V. Srofe, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Veatch, widow of James D. Veatch, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer

Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah B. Jewett, widow of Orin Jewett, late of Company G, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza J. Creighton, widow of Frederick Creighton, alias Gillenk, late of United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Warren, widow of James Warren, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Heilman, helpless and dependent daughter of Elias Heilman, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary E. Hart, widow of Robert D. Hart, late of Company G, Third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice Hadsell, widow of Homer Hadsell, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Francis M. Meadows, late of Company K, Sixty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Clara S. Shuler, widow of John B. Shuler, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ann Starkey, widow of Almon J. Starkey, late of Company D, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Miller, widow of Joseph Miller, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sallie Laswell, helpless and dependent daughter of John D. Laswell, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Louis Van Dyke Rousseau, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $35 per month.

The name of Nancy E. Adams, widow of Thomas Adams, late of Company K, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucretia Coffman, widow of Charles Coffman, late of Company G, Two hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary P. Davis, widow of George E. Davis, late of Company A, First Battalion Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Davis, widow of Thomas L. Davis, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Della Loveless, widow of Silas Loveless, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of John Usner, helpless and dependent son of Adam Usner, late of Company E, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Anna R. Jackson, widow of Henry F. Jackson, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Sowers, widow of Erastus Sowers, late of Company I, Fifty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza C. Maher, widow of George W. Maher, late of Company I, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Huldah E. Hall, widow of Benjamin F. Hall, late first-class pilot, U. S. S. *Victory*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Permelia McDonald, widow of David McDonald, late of Company C, Seventy-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda W. Jordan, widow of Thomas T. Jordan, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice Loree, widow of Charles M. Loree, late of Company L, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Sutton, widow of Azariah K. Sutton, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances Jackson, widow of Philip Jackson, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza J. Hall, widow of Alfred L. Hall, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eugene Kee, helpless and dependent son of John R. Kee, late of Company H, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of George W. Briggs, late of Company B, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Mary L. Cornell, widow of Albert H. Cornell, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Robert King, late of Company H, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Rachel A. Kendall, widow of Bladen A. Kendall, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine M. Painter, widow of George W. Painter, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie M. France, helpless and dependent daughter of William France, late of Company F, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Dolly P. Beckner, widow of David R Beckner, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Barbara E. Rhea, widow of Patterson Rhea, late of Company I, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Lawson, widow of William H. Lawson, late of Companies K and F, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Veteran Battalion, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Regiments Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Martin, widow of Robert B. Martin, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy F. Ralston, widow of Andrew D. Ralston, late of Company K, Eighty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Benjamin F. Ralston, helpless and dependent son of said Nancy F. and Andrew D. Ralston, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Nancy F. Ralston the name of said Benjamin F. Ralston shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Nancy F. Ralston, paid through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Susan Kiley, helpless and dependent daughter of Michael Kiley, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Martha E. Leach, widow of John W. Leach, late of Companies C and G, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan R. Vititoe, widow of William Vititoe, late of Company K, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah E. Cahey, widow of Bernard Cahey, late of United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Tabitha E. Isbell, widow of Thomas R. Isbell, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine Crow, widow of George W. Crow, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice L. Byers, widow of Seth W. Byers, late of Company G, One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah Harris, widow of John M. Harris, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella H. Candy, widow of Charles Candy, late colonel Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura M. A. Jones, widow of Charles H. Jones, alias Charles H. Clark, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Third Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Caroline W. Kinsloe, widow of Albert S. Kinsloe, late of Company D, Fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sylvester Condon, late of Company H, Eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Joseph D. Thompson, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Second Regiment United States Veteran Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Lucy A. Parker, helpless and dependent daughter of Abram Parker, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment, and Company A, Eighth Regiment, Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Pettit, widow of Stephen M. Pettit, late of Company A, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Nellie Pettit, helpless and dependent daughter of said Sarah J. and Stephen M. Pettit, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah J. Pettit the name of said Nellie Pettit shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah J. Pettit.

The name of Hannah Seward, widow of William F. Seward, alias William Ward, late of Company K, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay here a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Jones, widow of Alonzo C. Jones, late of Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Celesta Lamme, widow of Ferdinand Lamme, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Dill, widow of Ira W. Dill, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Penina A. Wright, widow of George H. Wright, late of Company B, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William B. McElhaney, alias McElharney, late of Company D, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Orilla J. Hainline, widow of Andrew J. Hainline, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of James N. Parker, alias Charles Thompson, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Mary E. Todd, widow of Grandison Todd, late of Company B, Second Regiment, and Company D, First Regiment, North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charlie Todd, helpless and dependent son of said Mary E. and Grandison Todd, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Todd the name of said Charlie Todd shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Todd.

The name of Mary A. Powell, widow of Amasa C. Powell, late of Company H, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Newell, widow of Henry W. Newell, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. McCabe, widow of Felix McCabe, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Candus Criswell, helpless and dependent daughter of William Criswell, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Emma A. Carl, widow of Ira Carl, late of Company M, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frances S. Gooding, widow of James W. Gooding, late of John Berins's company, Arkansas Rangers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha Kailey, widow of George W. Kailey, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elsie V. Reinhart, widow of Ferdinand Reinhart, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Adelaide Thacker, widow of Martin Thacker, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of S. Harriet Morris, widow of Caleb M. Morris, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Malvina Cost, former widow of Asher T. Coleman, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lavinia A. Griswold, widow of Adrian M. Griswold, late of Company F, Seventy-sixth Regiment, and Company F, Ninety-first Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rosamond Barker, widow of Edward Barker, late of Company B, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia I. Stuart, former widow of Isaac L. Foster, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ardella M. Farnsworth, widow of Horace Farnsworth, late of Company A, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry (Mounted Rangers), and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. S. Campbell, widow of John H. Campbell, late of Companies B and G, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Stinson, widow of James Stinson, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret D. Wise, widow of Jacob Wise, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melissa D. Ellis, widow of Thomas Ellis, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Radell, widow of Bernard Radell, late of Company C, First Battalion Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Surrell, alias Syrrell, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Mary E. Logan, widow of Francis M. Logan, late of Company F, Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Letha J. Logan, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary E. and Francis M. Logan, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Logan the name of said Letha J. Logan shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Logan.

The name of Elizabeth J. Thorn, widow of Levi Thorn, alias John Sumney, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Abigail J. Gardner, widow of Samuel Gardner, late of Company C, Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Jewett, widow of Henry Jewett, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan L. Shew, widow of Lewis S. Shew, late of Company K, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John M. Shew, helpless and dependent son of said Susan L. and Lewis S. Shew, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Susan L. Shew the name of said John M. Shew shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Susan L. Shew.

The name of Casper Runz, late of Eighth Battalion, District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Emily J. Thompson, widow of Jonathan Thompson, late of Company G, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice J. Stoddard, widow of Nelson Stoddard, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie M. Flandreau, widow of Daniel A. Flandreau, late of Company A, Eighty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria A. King, widow of James R. King, late of Company I, Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Augusta Seubert, widow of John Seubert, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Marshall, former widow of Andrew J. Marshall, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy J. Lance, widow of Charles H. Lance, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company M, Eighth Regiment, Missouri Volunteer State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Pricy Eveline Cook, widow of Timothy Cook, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Shirley, widow of John T. Shirley, late of Company H, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Shoemaker, widow of Adam S. Shoemaker, late of Company G, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Veith, widow of Frank Veith, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, synonymous with Empire Light Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine McQuade, widow of James McQuade, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Fannie M. McQuade, helpless and dependent daughter of said Catharine and James McQuade, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine McQuade the name of said Fannie M. McQuade shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine McQuade.

The name of Ella S. Robison, widow of Henry Robison, late of Company K, Sixty-first Regiment, and Company I, Eighty-second Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frances A. Harris, widow of John P. Harris, late of First Independent Battery, Kansas Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emeline Rader, widow of John Rader, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Candace A. Kain, widow of Silas D. Kain, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-second Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary R. Pinkley, widow of John Pinkley, late of Company H, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Ogden, helpless and dependent son of Levi H. Ogden, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Geneva Beha, helpless and dependent daughter of Gerhard Beha, late of Companies A and H, Fifth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mahala E. Broadbent, widow of Samuel S. Broadbent, late of Company A, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, First Battalion Massachusetts Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, Company F, Fifty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twenty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Mason, widow of Judson A. Mason, late of Company G, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Harriet A. Bishop, widow of Harvey W. Bishop, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Addie J. Green, widow of Samuel H. Green, late of Company E, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rebecca J. Dunn, widow of Harvey T. Dunn, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment, and Company F,

Sixty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Angie O. Allen, widow of George H. Allen, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment, and Company B, Seventh Regiment, Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Minerva J. Gardner, widow of Robert Gardner, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adaline Walker, widow of Henry Walker, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fannie F. Kennedy, widow of Daniel E. Kennedy, alias Samuel Cooper, late of Company D, Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Powell, widow of John H. Powell, late of Companies I and G, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora Campbell, widow of Edward Campbell, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel M. Baxter, widow of John W. Baxter, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Ervin, widow of John F. Ervin, late of Company C, Fiftieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary I. Hidy, widow of William Hidy, late of Company C, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie B. Shriner, widow of George W. Shriner, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Melvina Glidden, widow of Sylvester S. Glidden, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Young, widow of John H. Young, late of Company G, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cynthia Earnest, widow of Joseph Earnest, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hannah M. Earhart, widow of Joseph D. Earhart, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Logan, widow of John Logan, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Edward Barr, helpless and dependent son of Edward Barr, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Etta Vanzant, widow of George W. Vanzant, late of Company G, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Amanda Baird, widow of William K. Baird, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Unity P. Spencer, widow of Moses C. Spencer, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. White, widow of William W. White, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Minnie E. White, helpless and dependent daughter of said Sarah J. and William W. White, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah J. White the name of Minnie E. White shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah J. White.

The name of Mary E. Clifford, widow of Joseph C. Clifford, late of Ordnance Department, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Alfred Clifford, helpless and dependent son of said Mary E. and Joseph C. Clifford, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Clifford the name of said Alfred Clifford shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Clifford.

The name of Dora Coffman, helpless and dependent daughter of William Coffman, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month

The name of John Wait, late of Company A, Third Regiment, and Company A, Eleventh Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Mary M. Kelly, widow of Henry A. Kelly, late first lieutenant and quartermaster Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mina Riley, widow of George W. Riley, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Florence C. Clark, widow of Frank Clark, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Libbie M. Ryan, widow of James W. Ryan, alias James Conklin, late of Company D, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Taylor, former widow of John Lewis Scholl, late of Company I, Third Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucinda M. Fuller, widow of Henry A. Fuller, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ada G. Sherwood, former widow of Thomas W. S. Hale, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julia Adams, widow of James A. Adams, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza Hill, widow of Alexander Hill, alias Alexander Chandler, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Margaret A. Medley, widow of James H. Medley, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Militia Cavalry, and Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia B. Cole, widow of George H. Cole, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Eighty-ninth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Volunteer Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Huldah A. E. Dutton, widow of John M. Dutton, late of Company M, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary B. Elliott, widow of Oliver Elliott, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment, and Company D, Eighty-eighth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Morris, helpless and dependent daughter of Aaron Morris, late of Company K, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Sarah F. Champlin, widow of Orrison Champlin, late of Company B, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy M. Raymond, helpless and dependent daughter of Leonard Raymond, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Elizabeth J. Wright, widow of Ethan B. Wright, late of Company E, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clarice Fly, widow of Joseph Fly, late of Company G, Fifty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francis S. Haynes, alias Francis S. Reedy, late of Company H, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and Companies I and F, Forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Nineteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Mary Underwood, widow of William O. Underwood, late of Company C, Seventy-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy E. Alward, widow of Smith M. Alward, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily French, widow of William French, late of Company F, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Ramsey, widow of Samuel Ramsey, late of Company D, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Samuel Ramsey, helpless and dependent son of said Mary A. and Samuel Ramsey, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. Ramsey, the name of said Samuel Ramsey shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary A. Ramsey.

The name of Emma V. Wilkerson, widow of Benjamin F. Wilkerson, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Blevins, widow of Reuben Blevins, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret E. Myers, widow of William B. Myers, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Reilley, widow of John A. Reilley, late of Company B, First Battalion Fremont Rangers, Missouri Volunteer Home Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Leavitt, widow of Seth E. A. Leavitt, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Higley, widow of Lyman A. Higley, late of Company D, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Atherton, widow of Edwin R. Atherton, alias Edwin R. Gross, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and unassigned Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna R. McAdams, widow of George L. McAdams, late leader of band, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza A. Salomon, widow of Jacob Salomon, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company M, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lina J. Harcourt, widow of Thomas J. Harcourt, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Eighty-ninth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cynthia M. Bowles, widow of Justus C. Bowles, late of Company K, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Gilmore, now Louisa Smith, former widow of Robert B. Gilmore, late of Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. Henry, widow of Charles V. Henry, late first lieutenant and quartermaster, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice Darr, widow of William N. Darr, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophronia O. Hubble, widow of Levi J. Hubble, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine Foster, helpless and dependent daughter of William Foster, late of Fourth Battery New Jersey Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Kate E. Clear, widow of Samuel A. Clear, late of Company K, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lavenia A. Collett, widow of Henry Collett, late of Company I, Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Arminda Russell, widow of Carlos M. Russell, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgia A. Scarbrough, widow of Gilbert Scarbrough, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hester E. Aldrich, widow of Garner Aldrich, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Florence S. Bradbury, former widow of Rufus D. Bradbury, late of Company M, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Charity I. Haskell, widow of Andrew J. Haskell, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie E. Nelson, widow of Edward Nelson, late of Company D, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ida Nelson, helpless and dependent daughter of said Jennie E. and Edward Nelson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Jennie E. Nelson the name of said Ida Nelson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Jennie E. Nelson.

The name of Sarah Dobner, widow of Isadore Dobner, late of Company I, Two hundred and fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara E. Brass, widow of Albert N. Brass, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Keller, helpless and dependent son of Jacob Keller, late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Susan Clark, widow of Alfred E. Clark, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of L. Ethel Bolton, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles W. Bolton, late of Company I, Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Helen Calvert, helpless and dependent daughter of Washington Calvert, late of Company F, Sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mark Gilliam, late unassigned, One hundred and ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Caroline Hazen, widow of Horace D. Hazen, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Belt, widow of John C. Belt, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda L. Hill, widow of James M. Hill, late of Company K, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Esther A. Deyo, former widow of Charles G. Deyo, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Jessie Parsons, widow of David Parsons, late of Fourteenth Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma A. Kline, widow of Martin Kline, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Theodore S. Steffy, late of Company B, Permanent Party, Tod Barracks, Ohio, and unassigned, Thirty-second Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Tice, widow of Myron C. Tice, late of Company M, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Addie Peck, widow of John H. Peck, late of Company D, One hundred and fifth Regiment, and Company H, Ninety-fourth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Georgianna M. Burroughs, widow of Joseph F. M. Burroughs, late of Company H, One hundred and sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melissa S. Omans, widow of George Omans, late unassigned recruit, United States Army, and Companies B and D, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Isabella L. Williamson, widow of Joseph Williamson, late of Company E, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Wilson, widow of Robert C. Wilson, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment, and Company K, Twelfth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josinah Brinson, widow of Anthony Brinson, late of Captain Bassett's independent company, and unassigned, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John F. Brinson, helpless and dependent son of said Josinah and Anthony Brinson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Josinah Brinson the name of said John F. Brinson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Josinah Brinson.

The name of Asa Daniel, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Martha L. Harris, former widow of Charles S. Harris, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel E. Kerby, widow of Samuel D. Kerby, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Cornelius, helpless and dependent son of George W. Cornelius, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Lindia Bentley, widow of Jacob C. Bentley, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriett L. Sheets, widow of Benjamin F. Sheets, late of Company K, First Regiment Northeast Cavalry, Missouri Home Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle Torrence, widow of Finton G. Torrence, late of Company A, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Fields, widow of Henry Fields, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment, and Company A, Seventh Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elenor J. Valen, widow of Joseph A. Valen, late of Company D, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rosy J. Barnes, helpless and dependent daughter of Calvin Barnes, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pey her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Brown, widow of Peter Brown, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Senea Beamon, widow of Austin C. Beamon, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Canan, widow of William H. Canan, late of Company G, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Virginia V. Deyo, widow of Nelson J. Deyo, late of Company C, One hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mattie A. Tansil, widow of Zebeland G. Tansil, late of Company K, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Steele, widow of John H. Steele, late of Company G, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary S. Bisco, widow of Hiram R. Bisco, late of Company F, Sixtieth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah F. Murdock, widow of William H. Murdock, late of Twelfth Independent Battery, Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Buckley, widow of William W. Buckley, late of Company D, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Pierson, widow of Frank W. Pierson, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edith Bonter, helpless and dependent daughter of Cornelius Bonter, late of Company B, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Louis Weiss, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Ella Clark Shoecraft, widow of Ross P. Shoecraft, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah Lighthart, widow of Lewis Lighthart, late of Fourth Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Garno, widow of George Garno, late of Company D, Second Battalion, Sixteenth (subsequently Twenty-fifth) Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Flener, helpless and dependent daughter of Napoleon Flener, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ava Pinkerton, widow of Nicholas J. Pinkerton, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hannah M. Atha, widow of William P. Atha, late of Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Esther E. Green, widow of Oliver H. Green, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Koch, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Koch, late of Company A, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Veteran Volunteer Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Carrie S. Pierce, widow of Henry H. Pierce, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Robbins, widow of Alexander Robbins, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha A. Worden, widow of Arnold J. Worden, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of James W. Beckwith, late of Company I, Seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Carrie Wolbert, widow of William R. Wolbert, late of First Battery, Minnesota Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie M. Hartzell, widow of Jonas M. Hartzell, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment, and Company D, Sixty-third Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel Hagan, widow of Lawrence Hagan, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ada L. Kinsey, widow of William B. Kinsey, late lieutenant colonel One hundred and sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie G. Bourne, helpless and dependent daughter of Benjamin Tolman, late of Twentieth Company, unattached, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Eliza J. Terry, widow of Oliver C. Terry, late of Company H, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth T. Cousens, widow of William G. Cousens, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isabel Sandlin, widow of Huriah Sandlin, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and Company I, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elenore C. Akers, former widow of Wilbur F. Goheen, late of Company C, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Brown, widow of William Brown, late of Company M, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Della E. Hudson, widow of Richard W. Hudson, late of Company K, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Provisional Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $42 per month: *Provided*, That upon the attainment of the age of 16 years by, or in the event of the death prior to the attainment of the age of 16 years of, Roy G. Hudson, minor child of the said Della E. and Richard W. Hudson, $12 per month of the pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Della E. Hudson, before the attainment of the age of 16 years by Roy G. Hudson, the name of said Roy G. Hudson shall be placed on the pension roll at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Della E. Hudson until he attains the age of 16 years. And to drop from the pension roll, from the date of the signature of this act by the President, the name of Roy G. Hudson, now pensioned at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mabel Ortz, helpless and dependent daughter of David Ortz, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Emily Stewart, former widow of William Stewart, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adelia Chill, widow of Zebulon Chill, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Virginia J. Sawrey, widow of John E. Sawrey, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna C. Walquist, helpless and dependent daughter of John S., alias Jonas, Walquist, late of Company K, Ninety-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia Metzger, widow of William D. Metzger, late of Company E, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel E. Diehl, widow of Milton Diehl, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Thirty-second Regiment, and Company H, Twenty-first Regiment, United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel Slaten, widow of Henry L. Slaten, late of Company C, Sixty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Angeline Lacey, widow of Thomas J. Lacey, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza F. Andrews, widow of William O. Andrews, late first-class boy, United States ship, Stars and Stripes, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Starr, widow of William Starr, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy A. King, widow of William King, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Angie H. Skinner, widow of Andrew A. Skinner, late unassigned, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Hiatt, widow of Jesse M. Hiatt, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Priscilla Metcalf, widow of William M. Metcalf, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna C. White, widow of Thornton F. White, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Gertrude A. Robinson, former widow of Carl Rantzau, known as Charles H. Grantson, late of Companies E and B, Thirty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maria L. Westgate, widow of William Westgate, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Abram Jones, late of Companies A and C, Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of William Karch, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment, and Company K, Tenth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Jesse Wilcox, helpless and dependent son of Josiah Wilcox, late of Comapny K, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Freeman A. Burris, helpless and dependent son of Rufus Burris, late of Company F, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Shaw, widow of William Shaw, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ruben Riley, helpless and dependent son of Smith Riley, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Margaret J. Essex, widow of Martin Essex, late of Company K, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie C. Masters, helpless and dependent daughter of Isaac W. Masters, late of Company K, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Hulda J. Gilmore, widow of Charles W. Gilmore, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company F, One hundredth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Cynthia R. Hess, widow of John C. Hess, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Agnes Hess, helpless and dependent daughter of said Cynthia R. and John C. Hess, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Cynthia R. Hess the name of said Agnes Hess shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Cynthia R. Hess.

The name of Charlottie E. Rockhold, widow of Edward G. Rockhold, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ann K. Kindred, widow of Thomas J. Kindred, late of Company K, Ninety-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cora E. LaPage, widow of Joseph LaPage, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sophia Hubbard, widow of William McK. Hubbard, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella E. Johnson, widow of Matthew Johnson, late of Company G, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Grayson, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas M. Grayson, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Belle Bair, widow of William T. Bair, late of Company B, One hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Smith, widow of William D. Smith, late of Company I, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rachel M. Goin, former widow of William B. McDaniel, late of Battery C, First Battalion Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Allie Powell, helpless and dependent daughter of William Powell, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of George M. Howe, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Nettie M. Howe, widow of Charles M. Howe, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Alice Howe, helpless and dependent daughter of said Nettie M. and Charles M. Howe, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Nettie M. Howe the name of said Alice Howe shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Nettie M. Howe, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Laura I. Brown, widow of Edward Brown, late of Company I, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emila Rueppel, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles C. Reuppel, late of Company D Fourth Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Zippora B. Sowards, widow of Archibald Sowards, late of Company I, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lottie Frailey, widow of William Frailey, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment, and Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John W. Frailey, helpless and dependent son of said Lottie and William Frailey, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Lottie Frailey the name of said John W. Frailey shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Lottie Frailey.

The name of Sarah Palmer, widow of Erastus Palmer late of Company L, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura Birkhimer, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles Birkhimer, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 month.

The name of Maude Monrean, helpless and dependent daughter of Michael Monrean, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jane L. Wagner, widow of James H. Wagner, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary Wagner, helpless and dependent daughter of said Jane L. and James H. Wagner, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Jane L. Wagner the name of said Mary Wagner shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Jane L. Wagner, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Mary A. Huffman, widow of Tyler Huffman, late of Company C, Twenty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Sims, widow of Alemuel Sims, late of Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret E. Zeek, widow of John Zeek, late of Company E, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Amanda Kline, widow of William Kline, late of Company A, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Hogan, widow of Patrick Hogan, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and Companies L and E, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Casey, alias Thomas Clancy, late of Company C, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, First Regiment Vermant Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Malissa A. Bostwick, widow of Joseph L. Bostwick, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company M, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jessie Johnson, helpless and dependent son of Albert J. Johnson, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment, and Company B, Sixth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James McCullough, alias James Smith, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Lottie Kyle, widow of Irvin M. Kyle, late of Company C, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Corr, helpless and dependent daughter of Philip Corr, late unassigned, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah Burch, former widow of Francis M. Crouch, late of Company K, Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Edna M. Johnson, helpless and dependent daughter of John B. Johnson, late of Company E, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah W. Manning, widow of Cornelius E. Manning, late quartermaster, United States ship *Acacia*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Marley, helpless and dependent daughter of John Marley, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edith M. Ball, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles E. Ball, late of Company G, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Emma Page, widow of Alonzo J. Page, late of Company E, One hundred and sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Hayden, widow of James B. Hayden, late of Company I, Eighty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Hoyt Hayden, helpless and dependent son of said Catharine and James B. Hayden, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Hayden the name of said Hoyt Hayden shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine Hayden.

The name of Etta E. Divine, helpless and dependent daughter of Joshua Divine, late of Company C, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Lucretia Bernard, widow of Lemuel Bernard, late third assistant engineer, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Herman E. F. Schroer, helpless and dependent son of Stephen H., alias Henry, Schroer, late of Company E, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Julia E. Hammond, helpless and dependent daughter of Israel B. Hammond, late of Company I, Twenty-eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Elizabeth Palmer, helpless and dependent daughter of John Palmer, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment, and Company H, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Arthur R. Blakeslee, helpless and dependent son of Henry M. Blakeslee, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lucy Stevens Wilson, former widow of William Stevens, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Barbara Beaver, widow of John Beaver, late of Company E, Forty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Burdick, widow of Lewis B. Burdick, late of Company K, One hundredth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy J. O'Connor, widow of John O'Connor, late of Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of James H. Arnold, helpless and dependent son of Alexander Arnold, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Lilly Hudson, helpless and dependent daughter of John Hudson, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of Luther L. Sloan, helpless and dependent son of William H. Sloan, late of Company E, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Shook, widow of Lytle J. Shook, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margarett E. Dotson, widow of William Dotson, late of Companies B and K, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Salina A. Julius, widow of Aaron Julius, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nellie L. Atkins, helpless and dependent daughter of John A. Atkins, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Anna D. Arrowsmith, widow of Albert Arrowsmith, late of Company H, Eighty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nellie A. Farley, helpless and dependent daughter of John Farley, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Fry, helpless and dependent daughter of John Fry, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Thomas C. Jones, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Adaline Donaldson, widow of Thomas Donaldson, late of Company B, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of David Graff, helpless and dependent son of Oliver Graff, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month, through duly appointed guardian.

The name of William B. Williams, helpless and dependent son of Cincinatus B. Williams, late of Company D, Seventy-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Elida G. Cusick, helpless and dependent daughter of Hiram A. Cusick, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Wellman, widow of Elisha F. Wellman, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Kate Bantz, widow of William A. Bantz, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Devlin, widow of William Devlin, late of Company D, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Leona M. Ferguson, helpless and dependent daughter of Robert Ferguson, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Lucus, helpless and dependent son of Reason Lucus, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Laura A. Hurd, widow of Elias Hurd, late of Company B, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lewvina Hoffer, widow of John Hoffer, late of Company C, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Augusta A. Fiske, former widow of Calvin D. Johnson, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Adams, widow of Edwin H. Adams, alias Francis P. Wyse, late seaman, United States ship *Minnesota*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah M. Hopkins, widow of Thomas J. Hopkins, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Augusta Lambert, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew Lambert, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Irene Brown, former widow of John McClelland, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Tomilson, former widow of Peter Cummings, late of Battery A, Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company D, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice F. Parrigin, widow of Joseph Parrigin, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia Bedortha, widow of Burrett S. Bedortha, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary L. Cory, widow of Uzal E. Cory, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda D. Bell, widow of Mordecai Bell, late of One hundred and fifty-sixth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 1839. Nancy J. Crum.
H. R. 2032. Kate M. King.
H. R. 3354. Eliza Burns.
H. R. 4439. Cynthia Luttrell.
H. R. 4724. Ella Brodrick.
H. R. 5454. Marion D. Sweet.
H. R. 5611. William H. Linnabarry.
H. R. 5664. Rosamond C. Dailey.
H. R. 5861. Josephine Walker.
H. R. 5863. Jane N. Ashley.
H. R. 5920. Mary Barnett.
H. R. 6096. Amanda Fuller.
H. R. 6137. Drusilla Luce.
H. R. 6631. Martin L. Stokesberry.
H. R. 7042. Tennie Helm.
H. R. 7117. Rosie Lambert.
H. R. 7291. Mary C. Reeves.
H. R. 7321. Robert Wiley.
H. R. 7960. Anna B. Hurd.
H. R. 8224. Kate L. Littlepage.
H. R. 8234. Christopher C. Pratt.
H. R. 8635. Jeannette Goslin.
H. R. 8686. Alwilda E. Williamson.
H. R. 8754. Emma Stites.
H. R. 8800. Lucy S. Faser.
H. R. 8866. Nancy A. Felton.
H. R. 9040. Samuel C. Shattler.
H. R. 9116. Mary Roland.
H. R. 9151. Mathew H. Udell, alias William H. Clark.
H. R. 9166. Josefa Martinez.
H. R. 9176. Orilla S. Spicer.
H. R. 9178. Anna E. Hughes.
H. R. 9225. Catherine Strauser.
H. R. 9377. Elizabeth House.
H. R. 9484. Nellie A. Hope.
H. R. 9532. Bessie B. Celley.
H. R. 9564. Anna R. N. Beach.
H. R. 9917. Susan A. Wilsey.
H. R. 9926. Merico E. Fox.
H. R. 9948. Rosalia M. Burroughs.
H. R. 10035. Jacob Staley.
H. R. 10048. Annie Brewer.
H. R. 10128. Amelia Mathena.
H. R. 10191. Anna P. McCrosky.
H. R. 10233. Mary M. Lewis.
H. R. 10317. Gregory Bird.
H. R. 10362. Theresa A. Hunter.
H. R. 10484. Effie Edwards.
H. R. 10510. Clara A. McCarty.
H. R. 10680. Annie Ackerman.
H. R. 10686. Elizabeth Sizemore.
H. R. 10709. Jane Dyer.
H. R. 10793. Syntha Black.
H. R. 10810. Mary J. Lake.
H. R. 10832. Bridget Stapleton.
H. R. 10855. Genoa H. Scholz.
H. R. 10856. Robert M. Mann.
H. R. 10884. Anna M. Billet.
H. R. 10922. Polly Nelson.
H. R. 10930. Minnie Hosier.
H. R. 10935. Emma J. Philhower.
H. R. 10959. Sarah J. Doll.
H. R. 10963. Harriett E. Kilgore.
H. R. 10991. Mary C. Woodward.
H. R. 11092. Margaret A. Addington.
H. R. 11096. Catharine Hand.
H. R. 11148. William H. Turnbull.
H. R. 11157. Amelia M. Huntington.
H. R. 11261. Elsie M. Pool.
H. R. 11266. Mary Holmes.
H. R. 11290. Almira L. Boutelle.
H. R. 11293. Elmira Pariseaux.
H. R. 11316. Frances Conner.
H. R. 11318. Narsisus Butler.
H. R. 11325. Margaret Kirkpatrick.
H. R. 11334. Sarah Anderson.
H. R. 11377. Harriet Boyer.
H. R. 11383. Jennie A. Robinson.
H. R. 11386. Martha R. Potts.
H. R. 11425. Susan A. Sims.
H. R. 11426. Mary E. Griffith.
H. R. 11437. Olive A. Bosworth.
H. R. 11442. Sophia Wilson.
H. R. 11457. Laura Morris.
H. R. 11482. Harriet E. Waterman.
H. R. 11483. Mary E. Davis.
H. R. 11484. Elizabeth Sterling.
H. R. 11495. Laura C. Wible.
H. R. 11496. Ezra Pokett.
H. R. 11501. Reese Tunks.
H. R. 11502. Emma C. Weinhold.
H. R. 11525. Emma W. Mitchell.
H. R. 11535. Mary E. O'Reilly.
H. R. 11541. Josephine Campbell.
H. R. 11542. Margaret F. Roach.
H. R. 11551. Mary A. Mallory.
H. R. 11556. Maria C. Faloon.
H. R. 11557. Sarah A. Gill.
H. R. 11558. Alice A. Mangum.
H. R. 11575. Luraney R. Standley.
H. R. 11576. Jennie J. Dickey.
H. R. 11582. Richard M. Johnson.
H. R. 11585. Ella Day.
H. R. 11587. Josephine C. Long.
H. R. 11594. George W. Morgan.
H. R. 11597. Annie H. Sines.
H. R. 11601. Elizabeth Sutton.
H. R. 11602. Parthine Curtis.
H. R. 11611. Elmira Bauer.
H. R. 11614. Annie Rheb.
H. R. 11632. Angie Scanks.
H. R. 11641. Mary E. McGill.
H. R. 11642. Susan S. Boyd.
H. R. 11643. Elizabeth Fenner.
H. R. 11651. Annie E. Thompson.
H. R. 11662. David Housel.
H. R. 11663. Henry C. Williams.
H. R. 11664. Sylvester Haus.
H. R. 11666. Henry C. Bagley.
H. R. 11670. Frances Laport.
H. R. 11671. Margaret A. Bryant.
H. R. 11679. M. Lovina Porter.
H. R. 11680. Azubath Srofe.
H. R. 11683. Nancy Veatch.
H. R. 11689. Sarah B. Jewett.
H. R. 11690. Eliza J. Creighton.
H. R. 11700. Sarah J. Warren.
H. R. 11709. Sarah J. Hellman.
H. R. 11711. Mary E. Hart.
H. R. 11713. Alice Hadsell.
H. R. 11714. Francis M. Meadows.
H. R. 11718. Clara S. Shuler.
H. R. 11719. Ann Starkey.
H. R. 11720. Anna M. Miller.
H. R. 11725. Sallie Laswell.
H. R. 11726. Louis VanDyke Rousseau.
H. R. 11727. Nancy E. Adams.
H. R. 11736. Lucretia Coffman.
H. R. 11737. Mary P. Davis.
H. R. 11741. Margaret Davis.
H. R. 11742. Delia Loveless.
H. R. 11743. John Usner.
H. R. 11745. Anna R. Jackson.
H. R. 11749. Elizabeth Sowers.
H. R. 11752. Eliza C. Maher.
H. R. 11753. Huldah E. Hall.
H. R. 11754. Permelia McDonald.
H. R. 11755. Amanda W. Jordan.
H. R. 11757. Alice Loree.
H. R. 11761. Mary E. Sutton.
H. R. 11770. Frances Jackson.
H. R. 11777. Eliza J. Hall.
H. R. 11784. Eugene Kee.
H. R. 11786. George W. Briggs.
H. R. 11796. Mary L. Cornell.
H. R. 11805. Robert King.
H. R. 11813. Rachel A. Kendall.
H. R. 11819. Catharine M. Painter.
H. R. 11820. Annie M. France.
H. R. 11821. Dolly P. Beckner.
H. R. 11837. Mary J. Lawson.
H. R. 11838. Barbara E. Rhea.
H. R. 11841. Mary J. Martin.
H. R. 11845. Nancy F. Ralston.
H. R. 11849. Susan Kiley.
H. R. 11851. Martha E. Leach.
H. R. 11852. Susan R. Vititoe.
H. R. 11854. Hannah E. Cahey.
H. R. 11860. Tabitha E. Isbell.
H. R. 11861. Catherine Crow.
H. R. 11875. Alice L. Byers.
H. R. 11882. Sarah Harris.
H. R. 11891. Ella H. Candy.
H. R. 11892. Laura M. A. Jones.
H. R. 11898. Caroline W. Kinsloe.
H. R. 11899. Sylvester Condon.
H. R. 11910. Joseph D. Thompson.
H. R. 11913. Lucy A. Parker.
H. R. 11914. Sarah J. Pettit.
H. R. 11916. Hannah Seward.
H. R. 11917. Elizabeth Jones.
H. R. 11918. Celesta Lamme.
H. R. 11925. Mary L. Dill.
H. R. 11935. Penina A. Wright.
H. R. 11937. William G. McElhaney.
H. R. 11945. Orilla J. Hainline.
H. R. 11948. James N. Parker.
H. R. 11949. Mary E. Todd.
H. R. 11953. Mary A. Powell.
H. R. 11960. Margaret Newell.
H. R. 11961. Mary C. McCabe.
H. R. 11973. Caroline Candus Criswell.
H. R. 11974. Emma A. Carl.
H. R. 11977. Frances S. Gooding.
H. R. 11978. Martha Kailey.
H. R. 11979. Elsie V. Reinhart.
H. R. 11981. Adelaide Thacker.
H. R. 11982. S. Harriet Morris.
H. R. 11994. Malvira Cost.
H. R. 11995. Lavinia A. Griswold.
H. R. 11997. Rosamond Barker.
H. R. 11998. Julia I. Stuart.
H. R. 11999. Ardella M. Farnsworth.
H. R. 12001. Mary A. S. Campbell.
H. R. 12002. Elizabeth Stinson.
H. R. 12004. Margaret D. Wise.
H. R. 12005. Melissa D. Ellis.
H. R. 12010. Sarah A. Radell.
H. R. 12026. Alexander Surrell.
H. R. 12027. Mary E. Logan.
H. R. 12028. Elizabeth J. Thorn.
H. R. 12038. Abigail J. Gardner.
H. R. 12043. Mary Jewett.
H. R. 12049. Susan L. Shew.
H. R. 12056. Casper Runz.
H. R. 12057. Emily J. Thompson.
H. R. 12058. Alice J. Stoddard.
H. R. 12064. Carrie M. Flandreau.
H. R. 12076. Maria A. King.
H. R. 12078. Augusta Seubert.
H. R. 12079. Mary J. Marshall.
H. R. 12080. Nancy J. Lance.
H. R. 12085. Pricy Eveline Cook.
H. R. 12089. Martha A. Shirley.
H. R. 12095. Mary A. Shoemaker.
H. R. 12096. Mary E. Veith.
H. R. 12102. Catharine McQuade.
H. R. 12108. Ella S. Robison.
H. R. 12109. Frances A. Harris.
H. R. 12111. Emeline Rader.
H. R. 12112. Candace A. Kain.
H. R. 12113. Mary E. Pinkley.
H. R. 12114. Charles F. Ogden.
H. R. 12116. Geneva Beha.
H. R. 12118. Mahala E. Broadbent.
H. R. 12128. Mary Mason.
H. R. 12130. Harriet A Bishop.
H. R. 12131. Addie J. Green.
H. R. 12133. Rebecca J. Dunn.
H. R. 12135. Angie O. Allen.
H. R. 12136. Minerva J. Gardner.
H. R. 12139. Adaline Walker.
H. R. 12147. Fannie F. Kennedy.
H. R. 12150. Mary Powell.
H. R. 12164. Cora Campbell.
H. R. 12168. Rachel M. Baxter.
H. R. 12178. Sarah Ervin.
H. R. 12179. Mary I. Hidy.
H. R. 12180. Lizzie B. Shriner.
H. R. 12183. Melvina Glidden.
H. R. 12184. Sarah E. Young.
H. R. 12185. Cynthia Earnest.
H. R. 12194. Hannah M. Earhart.
H. R. 12198. Louisa Logan.
H. R. 12201. Edward Barr.
H. R. 12203. Etta Vanzant.
H. R. 12204. Amanda Baird.
H. R. 12215. Unity P. Spencer.
H. R. 12217. Sarah J. White.
H. R. 12219. Mary E. Clifford.
H. R. 12245. Dora Coffman.
H. R. 12251. John Wait.
H. R. 12256. Mary M. Kelly.
H. R. 12258. Mina Riley.
H. R. 12260. Florence C. Clark.
H. R. 12262. Libbie M. Ryan.
H. R. 12273. Emma Taylor.
H. R. 12280. Lucinda M. Fuller.
H. R. 12282. Ada G. Sherwood.
H. R. 12283. Julia Adams.
H. R. 12285. Eliza Hill.
H. R. 12286. Margaret A. Medley.
H. R. 12287. Jula B. Cole.
H. R. 12289. Hulda A. E. Dutton.
H. R. 12290. Mary B. Elliott.
H. R. 12295. Mary A. Morris.
H. R. 12296. Sarah F. Champlin.

H. R. 12297. Lucy M. Raymond.
H. R. 12298. Elizabeth J. Wright.
H. R. 12299. Clarence Fly.
H. R. 12300. Francis S. Haynes.
H. R. 12301. Mary Underwood.
H. R. 12302. Nancy E. Alward.
H. R. 12303. Emily French.
H. R. 12304. Mary A. Ramsey.
H. R. 12305. Emma V. Wilkerson.
H. R. 12307. Sarah A. Blevins.
H. R. 12308. Margaret E. Myers.
H. R. 12309. Mary Reilley.
H. R. 12310. Sarah E. Leavitt.
H. R. 12312. Mary E. Higley.
H. R. 12314. Sarah A. Atherton.
H. R. 12322. Anna R. McAdams.
H. R. 12326. Eliza A. Salomon.
H. R. 12327. Lina J. Harcourt.
H. R. 12328. Cynthia M. Bowles.
H. R. 12333. Louisa Gilmore, now Louisa Smith.
H. R. 12335. Kate M. Henry.
H. R. 12336. Alice Darr.
H. R. 12338. Sophronia O. Hubble.
H. R. 12339. Catherine Foster.
H. R. 12342. Kate E. Clear.
H. R. 12347. Lavenia A. Collett.
H. R. 12353. Arminda Russell.
H. R. 12358. Georgia A. Scarbrough.
H. R. 12359. Hester E. Aldrich.
H. R. 12361. Florence S. Bradbury.
H. R. 12364. Charity I. Haskell.
H. R. 12366. Jennie E. Nelson.
H. R. 12373. Sarah Dobner.
H. R. 12375. Clara E. Brass.
H. R. 12380. John Keller.
H. R. 12388. Susan Clark.
H. R. 12294. Helen Calvert.
H. R. 12400. Mark Gilliam.
H. R. 12404. Caroline Hazen.
H. R. 12405. Mary J. Belt.
H. R. 12419. Amanda L. Hill.
H. R. 12423. Esther A. Deyo.
H. R. 12428. Jessie Parsons.
H. R. 12429. Emma A. Kline.
H. R. 12430. Theodore S. Steffy.
H. R. 12433. Elizabeth Tice.
H. R. 12434. Addie Peck.
H. R. 12438. Georgianna M. Burroughs.
H. R. 12439. Melissa S. Omans.
H. R. 12442. Isabella L. Williamson.
H. R. 12450. Emma Wilson.
H. R. 12462. Josinah Brinson.
H. R. 12463. Asa Daniel.
H. R. 12476. Martha L. Harris.
H. R. 12483. Rachel E. Kerby.
H. R. 12484. Charles M. Cornelius.
H. R. 12499. Lindia Bentley.
H. R. 12500. Harriett L. Sheets.
H. R. 12501. Belle Torrence.
H. R. 12503. Louisa Fields.
H. R. 12507. Elenor J. Valen.
H. R. 12518. Rosy J. Barnes.
H. R. 12519. Sarah A. Brown.
H. R. 12520. Senea Beamon.
H. R. 12521. Sarah C. Canan.
H. R. 12522. Virginia V. Deyo.
H. R. 12530. Mattie A. Tansil.
H. R. 12535. Mary J. Steele.
H. R. 12541. Mary S. Bisco.
H. R. 12546. Sarah F. Murdock.
H. R. 12547. Mary E. Buckley.
H. R. 12551. Ida M. Pierson.
H. R. 12552. Edith Bonter.
H. R. 12554. Louis Weiss.
H. R. 12565. Ella Clark Shoecraft.
H. R. 12571. Sarah Lightheart.
H. R. 12573. Mary Garno.
H. R. 12575. Martha Flener.
H. R. 12583. Ava Pinkerton.
H. R. 12585. Hannah M. Altha.
H. R. 12619. Esther E. Green.
H. R. 12630. Mary Koch.
H. R. 12633. Carrie S. Pierce.
H. R. 12634. Mary J. Robbins.
H. R. 12635. Martha A. Worden.
H. R. 12637. James W. Beckwith.
H. R. 12642. Carrie Wolbert.
H. R. 12645. Annie M. Hartzell.
H. R. 12653. Rachel Hagan.
H. R. 12654. Ada L. Kinsey.
H. R. 12655. Jennie G. Bourne.
H. R. 12664. Eliza J. Terry.
H. R. 12665. Elizabeth T. Cousens.
H. R. 12673. Isabel Sandlin.
H. R. 12678. Elenore C. Akers.
H. R. 12679. Mary J. Brown.
H. R. 12687. Della E. Hudson.
H. R. 12698. Mabel Ortz.
H. R. 12709. Emily Stewart.
H. R. 12710. Adelia Chill.
H. R. 12714. Virginia J. Sawrey.
H. R. 12722. Anna C. Walquist.
H. R. 12724. Julia Metzger.
H. R. 12771. Rachel E. Diehl.
H. R. 12772. Rachel Slaten.
H. R. 12773. Angeline Lacey.
H. R. 12775. Eliza F. Andrews.
H. R. 12784. Elizabeth Starr.
H. R. 12785. Nancy A. King.
H. R. 12787. Angie H. Skinner.
H. R. 12803. Sarah J. Hiatt.
H. R. 12812. Priscilla Metcalf.
H. R. 12813. Anna C. White.
H. R. 12833. Gertrude A. Robinson.
H. R. 12838. Maria L. Westgate.
H. R. 12843. Abram Jones.
H. R. 12845. William Karch.
H. R. 12852. Jesse Wilcox.
H. R. 12855. Freeman A. Burris.
H. R. 12867. Elizabeth Shaw.
H. R. 12871. Ruben Riley.
H. R. 12880. Margaret J. Essex.
H. R. 12888. Lizzie C. Masters.
H. R. 12901. Hulda J. Gilmore.
H. R. 12902. Cynthia R. Hess.
H. R. 12908. Charlottie E. Rockhold.
H. R. 12909. Ann K. Kindred.
H. R. 12914. Cora E. LaPage.
H. R. 12940. Sophie Hubbard.
H. R. 12942. Ella E. Johnson.
H. R. 12978. Mary E. Grayson.
H. R. 12989. Belle Blair.
H. R. 12993. Sarah A. Smith.
H. R. 12995. Rachel M. Goin.
H. R. 13008. Allie Powell.
H. R. 13018. George M. Howe.
H. R. 13027. Nettie M. Howe.
H. R. 13035. Laura I. Brown.
H. R. 13036. Emila Rueppel.
H. R. 13037. Zippora B. Sowards.
H. R. 13042. Lottie Frailey.
H. R. 13050. Sarah Palmer.
H. R. 13057. Laura Birkhimer.
H. R. 13062. Maude Monrean.
H. R. 13082. Jane L. Wagner.
H. R. 13083. Mary A. Huffman.
H. R. 13086. Mary A. Sims.
H. R. 13088. Margaret E. Zeek.
H. R. 13090. Amanda Kline.
H. R. 13098. Catherine Hogan.
H. R. 13101. Thomas Casey, alias Thomas Clancy.
H. R. 13106. Malissa A. Bostick.
H. R. 13109. Jessie Johnson.
H. R. 13117. James McCullough, alias James Smith.
H. R. 13168. Lottie Kyle.
H. R. 13172. Margaret Corr.
H. R. 13206. Sarah Burch.
H. R. 13210. Edna M. Johnson.
H. R. 13212. Hannah W. Manning.
H. R. 13248. Mary Marley.
H. R. 13254. Edith M. Ball.
H. R. 13260. Emma Page.
H. R. 13267. Catharine Hayden.
H. R. 13273. Etta E. Divine.
H. R. 13277. Lucretia Bernard.
H. R. 13278. Herman E. F. Schroer.
H. R. 13281. Julia E. Hammond.
H. R. 13282. Elizabeth Palmer.
H. R. 13290. Arthur R. Blakeslee.
H. R. 13333. Lucy Stevens Wilson.
H. R. 13354. Barbara Beaver.
H. R. 13359. Mary Burdick.
H. R. 13364. Nancy J. O'Connor.
H. R. 13369. James H. Arnold.
H. R. 13389. L. Ethel Bolton.
H. R. 13393. Lilly Hudson.
H. R. 13422. Luther L. Sloan.
H. R. 13435. Mary A. Shook.
H. R. 13437. Margarett E. Dotson.
H. R. 13439. Salina A. Julius.
H. R. 13443. Nellie L. Atkins.
H. R. 13445. Anna D. Arrowsmith.
H. R. 13470. Nellie A. Farley.
H. R. 13472. Elizabeth Fry.
H. R. 13485. Thomas C. Jones.
H. R. 13507. Adaline Donaldson.
H. R. 13533. David Graff.
H. R. 13564. William B. Williams.
H. R. 13582. Elida G. Cusick.
H. R. 13584. Margaret Wellman.
H. R. 13587. Kate Bantz.
H. R. 13602. Margaret Devlin.
H. R. 13667. Leona M. Ferguson.
H. R. 13669. Francis M. Lucas.
H. R. 13687. Laura A. Hurd.
H. R. 13701. Lewvina Hoffer.
H. R. 13717. Augusta A. Fiske.
H. R. 13725. Sarah Adams.
H. R. 13729. Sarah M. Hopkins.
H. R. 13732. Augusta Lambert.
H. R. 13734. Sarah Irene Brown.
H. R. 13765. Alice F. Parrigin.
H. R. 13783. Emma Tomlinson.
H. R. 13846. Lydia Bedortha.
H. R. 13885. Mary L. Cory.
H. R. 13902. Matilda D. Bell.

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

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the bill H. R. 12019, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up a bill and asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12019) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Isabel Bertrand, widow of Joseph Bertrand, alias Abraham Magnus, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clark Brown, late of Company I, Third Regiment Georgia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $18 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Ratliff, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Irene Sullivan Kehrmeyer, widow of Leonard P. Kehrmeyer, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, with $2 per month additional for each of the sailor's three minor children until the age of 16 years is attained.

The name of Anne Claude Howard, widow of Thomas Benton Howard, late rear admiral, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Isaac Townsend, late of the Fourteenth Company United States Coast Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Emily F. Hill, former widow of Gabriel Smoot, late of Captains Bryan's and Peden's company, North Carolina Volunteers, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William H. Mercer, as dependent father of Grover C. Mercer, late of the United States ship *Wabash*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frances A. Brown, widow of John R. Brown, late of Company A, First Regiment Nebraska Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel W. Higginbotham, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Robert L. Abston, late of Company I, First Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Coats, dependent father of Lafayette Coats, late of Company L, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida S. Guthrie, dependent mother of Charles E. Guthrie, late of the One hundred and forty-ninth Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Halbert, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmond L. Smith, late of Troops C and M, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Rebecca T. Alexander, dependent mother of Roy Alexander, late of Company D, First Regiment West Virginia Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert P. Cato, late of Company L, First Regiment Florida Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Julia Cannon, mother of Martin Cannon, late of Troop F, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgianna Cawthorne, dependent mother of Arthur Cawthorne, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Lanier, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company D, Second Regiment, United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William J. Phillips, late of Troop H, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, and Troop H, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Price, late of Company F, United States Mounted Rifles, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Helena Bunt, mother of Joseph W. Bunt, late of Troop B, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John M. Jeans, late of Captain J. W. Robertson's Company B, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret L. Ferriter, widow of John Ferriter, late of Battery H, Second Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Columbia A. Seaman, late of Troop H, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Bandhauer, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Homer E. Harlow, late of Company L, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lester W. Stoddart, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $15 per month.

The name of Elizabeth C. Grady, widow of William Madison Grady, late of Company C, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William C. Wooton, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George L. Porter, late captain and assistant surgeon, Second Regiment Tennessee Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Nix, late of Company M, Second Regiment North Carolina Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John Mesner, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oh Wan, alias Katok, late of Company B, First Battalion Arizona Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mo Ush Ak, alias Ush Mo, now known as Mosak, late of Company B, Battalion First Regiment Arizona Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Cochino Achuk, alias Coche Aar, late of Company B, Battalion First Regiment Arizona Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Wanatt Shoma, alias Shoma Wanatt, now known as Ramon White, late of Company B, Battalion First Regiment Arizona Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Machie Gulack, alias Gulack Machie, now known as Pantaloon, late of Company B, Battalion First Regiment Arizona Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Choor Aquisse, alias Cheroquis, late of Company B, Battalion First Regiment Arizona Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Margaret Kuhn, mother of John E. Kuhn, late of Company H, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Hunter, mother of Charles O. Hunter, jr., late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Walter Hughes, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and Troop B, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lee T. Philpot, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $18 per month.

The name of Russell Dewalt, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary Jane Lamb, widow of Evan M. Lamb, late of Captain Wilson's company, Georgia Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma E. Howe, widow of Alfred Howe, late of Troop M, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James H. Laflin, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Edward J. Bundschu, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Harris, late of Captain Nat Benton's company, Texas Volunteer Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Johnson, late of Company G, Signal Corps, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac C. Livingston, late of Company A, General Service United States Army, and Company B, First Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of William D. Scott, late of Company G, Forty-ninth Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Smith, late of the Ordnance Department, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry M. Conlin, late of Troop E, First Regiment United States Cavalry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Jane Fee, widow of John Fee, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frank G. Himes, late of Company M, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $18 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Chaney, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of James F. Lyons, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucian D. Copin, late of Battery F, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Charles L. Dewey, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Trask, widow of Samuel A. Trask, late of Troop E, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frederick W. Duden, late of Troop D, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Hoover, late of General Mounted Recruits, subsequently Troop I, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Keck, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred A. Martin, late of One hundred and eleventh Company, United States Coast Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Evan D. Lewis, late of Battery E, First Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Hermann, alias Hermann King, late of Company I, Fifth United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Casteel, dependent father of William S. Casteel, late of Troop G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and unassigned Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel F. Shannon, late of Company L, First Regiment Nebraska Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marion Lawson, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month, payments to be made to duly appointed committee or guardian.

The name of Robert L. McFarland, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilbur C. Gahret, late of Company L, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rosa Reaves, widow of Transum Reaves, late of Troop A, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jane Ann Robinson, mother of John E. Robinson, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Ohio Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Marie Thorson, mother of Arthur P. Thorson, late of Company C, Third Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, National Guard, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Marcus C. Luttrell, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Waters, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Infantry, Company D, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry; Troop K, Fourteenth Regiment United States Cavalry; and Company E, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Chester, late of Company D, First Regiment South Carolina Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of James A. Childers, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet M. Miller, widow of Charles D. Miller, late of Company D, Powell's Battalion, Missouri Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane Tilly, widow of John W. Tilly, late of Company D, Santa Fe Battalion Missouri Mounted Volunteers, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Joseph McG. Lunsford, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Scott, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Missouri Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. King, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Tamar Ervin, mother of Grover Cleveland Ervin, late seaman U. S. S. *Nina*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Harris, mother of the late Hardy A. Harris, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Warren Algie Ritter, late of Company M, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $22 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Howe, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza J. Tyler, mother of Charles A. Tyler, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Shiloh Sally, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward P. Wolfe, alias Thomas B. Hixson, late of Company B, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles S. Kinman, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harry E. Snyder, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice Kingery, mother of William H. Kingery, late of Company L, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth F. Hampton, mother of Otto L. Hampton, late of Fourth Company United States Coast Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry E. Rubendall, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Annie McNamara, widow of Robert C. McNamara, major of the Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fred Rife, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Anne Brooks, mother of Walter J. Brooks, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lambert Weiss, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $18 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Brigance, widow of Phagan Brigance, late of Captain Gillespie's company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elize Hilpisch, mother of Carl Hilpisch, who served in the United States Marine Corps under the name of Charles Altan, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Swigart, widow of Eli Swigart, late of Troop M, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 511. Isabel Bertrand.
H. R. 2858. Clark Brown.
H. R. 3814. Benjamin Ratliff.
H. R. 5880. Irene Sullivan Kehrmeyer.
H. R. 5908. Anne Claude Howard.
H. R. 7475. Isaac Townsend.
H. R. 7576. Emily F. Hill.
H. R. 8093. William H. Mercer.
H. R. 8240. Frances A. Brown.
H. R. 8292. Daniel W. Higginbotham.
H. R. 8325. Robert L. Abston.
H. R. 8452. Francis M. Coats.
H. R. 8512. Ida S. Guthrie.
H. R. 8548. Charles A. Halbert.
H. R. 8580. Edmond L. Smith.
H. R. 8618. Rebecca T. Alexander.
H. R. 8751. Robert P. Cato.
H. R. 8833. Julia Cannon.
H. R. 8861. Georgianna Cawthorne.
H. R. 8915. William Lanier.
H. R. 8992. William J. Phillips.
H. R. 9001. William Price.
H. R. 9025. Helena Bunt.
H. R. 9118. John M. Jeans.
H. R. 9174. Margaret L. Ferriter.
H. R. 9355. Columbia A. Seaman.
H. R. 9375. William J. Bandhauer.
H. R. 9419. Homer E. Harlow.
H. R. 9423. Lester W. Stoddart.
H. R. 9438. Elizabeth C. Grady.
H. R. 9478. William C. Wooton.
H. R. 9488. George L. Porter.
H. R. 9523. Charles L. Nix.
H. R. 9533. John Mesner.
H. R. 9556. Oh Wan, alias Katok.
H. R. 9557. Moh Ush Ak, alias Ush Mo, now known as Mosak.
H. R. 9558. Cochino Achuk, alias Coche Aar.
H. R. 9559. Wanatt Shoma, alias Shoma Wanatt, now known as Raymond White.
H. R. 9560. Machie Gulack, alias Gulack Machie, now known as Pantaloon.
H. R. 9561. Choor Aquisse, alias Cheroquis.
H. R. 9660. Margaret Kuhn.
H. R. 9682. Margaret Hunter.
H. R. 9698. Walter Hughes.
H. R. 9704. Lee T. Philpot.
H. R. 9819. Russell Dewalt.
H. R. 9864. Mary Jane Lamb.
H. R. 9890. Emma E. Howe.
H. R. 9898. James H. Laflin.
H. R. 10049. Benjamin F. Johnson.
H. R. 9911. Edward J. Bundschu.
H. R. 10036. John W. Harris.
H. R. 10082. Isaac C. Livingston.
H. R. 10103. William D. Scott.
H. R. 10131. John W. Smith.
H. R. 10202. Henry M. Conlin.
H. R. 10205. Elizabeth Jane Fee.
H. R. 10232. Frank G. Himes.
H. R. 10255. Edward Chaney.
H. R. 10307. James F. Lyons.
H. R. 10339. Lucian D. Copin.
H. R. 10354. Charles L. Dewey.
H. R. 10389. Mary E. Trask.
H. R. 10396. Frederick W. Duden.
H. R. 10436. John H. Hoover.
H. R. 10475. Charles E. Keck.
H. R. 10534. Fred A. Martin.
H. R. 10545. Evan D. Lewis.
H. R. 10558. Joseph Hermann, alias Hermann King.
H. R. 10601. William Casteel.
H. R. 10679. Samuel F. Shannon.
H. R. 10684. Marion Lawson.
H. R. 10685. Robert L. McFarland.
H. R. 10691. Wilbur C. Gahret.
H. R. 10699. Rosa Reaves.
H. R. 10719. Jane Anne Robinson.
H. R. 10722. Marie Thorson.
H. R. 10788. Marcus C. Luttrell.
H. R. 10881. Charles A. Waters.
H. R. 10889. William J. Chester.
H. R. 10916. James A. Childers.
H. R. 10962. Harriet M. Miller.
H. R. 10983. Jane Tilly.
H. R. 11053. Joseph McG. Lunsford.
H. R. 11087. John F. Scott.
H. R. 11142. Charles F. King.
H. R. 11160. Tamar Ervin.
H. R. 11202. Margaret A. Harris.
H. R. 11208. Warren Algie Ritter.
H. R. 11267. Richard Howe.
H. R. 11311. Eliza J. Tyler.
H. R. 11314. Shiloh Sally.
H. R. 11367. Edward P. Wolfe.
H. R. 11370. Charles S. Kinman.
H. R. 11375. Harry E. Snyder.
H. R. 11420. Alice Kingery.
H. R. 11462. Elizabeth F. Hampton
H. R. 11468. Harry E. Rubendall.
H. R. 11486. Annie McNamara.
H. R. 11505. Fred Rife.
H. R. 11538. Anne Brooks.
H. R. 11539. Lambert Weiss.
H. R. 11540. Martha A. Brigance.
H. R. 11747. Elize Hilpisch.
H. R. 11759. Catherine Swigart.

During the reading the following occurred:

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KNUTSON: On page 9, strike out lines 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the House that John W. Harris has died since this item was allowed.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Later,

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the committee what policy has been followed by the committee in the award of these various pensions to these different individuals. What are the ranges of rate that the committee decided upon for various disabilities?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the policy of the committee, so far as it can possibly follow, is to allow applications for pensions that have been rejected by the Pension Bureau on some technicality. We waive technicalities. These two small omnibus bills represent a number of bills which have been allowed since last May, I think.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman does not exceed in any instance the rate for pay under the general law?

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, yes; where it is proved that the applicant is bedridden and in bad circumstances physically. I have in mind a case where the applicant was receiving $30 per month at the Pension Bureau and he was absolutely helpless, and I think we allowed him $72. The injuries were the result of his service, but there are few instances, and they are very exceptional, where a greater amount is allowed than under the general law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will these two omnibus bills complete the work, so far as omnibus bills are concerned, of this session?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I think we will probably have 40 or 50 bills reported out some time next month.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman means there are 40 or more claims that will have to be considered in an omnibus bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and that will clean up the work of the committee.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is fair to state in connection with what was stated by the gentleman in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that where you granted $72 to this Spanish war veteran you did not exceed the general law now in force for soldiers of the Civil War who are suffering total disabilities.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; we try to put all on the same basis and do exact justice to all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 13540, and ask that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13540) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Marianne H. D'Arcy, former widow of Abraham Edmunds, late of Company E, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Benjamin Dockery, late of the Thirty-first Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Carl Olson, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Marguerite B. Fitzgerald, widow of John Fitzgerald, late of Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary A. Blair, widow of Jesse Blair, late of Lieutenant Robert M. White's company, Texas Mounted Rangers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Raymond A. Zehnder, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Angus J. MacDonald, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert H. Claggett, late of Company E, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William B. Yeater, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Gardenhire, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment California Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William T. Marshall, late of Troop F, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary T. Schmidt, widow of John F. Schmidt, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account each of the minor children of said John F. Schmidt until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of David McMillan, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martha E. McDonald, widow of William B. McDonald, late of Captain Caldwell's company, First Regiment Georgia Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, payment to be made to duly appointed guardian.

The name of Claude Wallace, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lewis H. Tubbs, jr., late of Company F, First Regiment Texas Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Brubaker, dependent mother of Charles E. Brubaker, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Ohio Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Green W. Blakely, dependent father of John W. Blakely, late of Eighty-first Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Walter L. Hartman, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $18 per month.

The name of Green A. Settle, late of Troop D, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert B. Campbell, late of Battery M, Second Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Daniel J. Graves, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles N. Cannon, late of Company E, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Shaw, late of Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of James Wise, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, Spanish-American War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Shannon, late of Troop B, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lee Byrd, dependent father of Clarence Byrd, late of Troop B, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Anderson, late of Troop F, Eleventh Regiment United States Cavalry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Williams, late of Company G, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Alice C. Downey, widow of James C. Downey, late of Company K, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Long, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles R. Taylor, late of Troop H, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harry L. Hoff, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lillie E. Trego, widow of Jacob A. Trego, late of Company L, Third Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Thompson, late of Troop L, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of David Miller, late of Company D, Second Regiment Infantry, West Virginia National Guard, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Charles E. Kidder, late of Company H, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Chester A. Herd, late of Company B, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Floyd A. McPherren, late of Company F, Third Regiment Iowa Infantry, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert J. Jones, late unassigned recruit for foot service, white, United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $15 per month.

The name of William W. Kinne, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary R. Philbrick, dependent mother of John Philbrick, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, Philippine insurrection, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank McCoy, late of United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Kate Garrity, dependent mother of Joseph P. Garrity, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Dennis F. Higgins, late of Company I, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Silas G. Burkett, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward Jackson, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mike Grubb, late of Fifty-eighth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William H. Stanbery, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Clifford Baldwin, late of Thirty-fifth and Sixth Companies, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas Devine, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Dudley J. Howell, late of Company C, Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy C. Range, widow of Weldon E. Range, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional for each of the soldier's two minor children until they shall attain the age of 16 years.

The name of Joseph Houser, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John S. Combs, late of Troop I, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Clyde Wardlow, late of the Ninth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $14 per month.

The name of Margarett Davy, dependent mother of Harry N. Davy, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie E. B. Davidson, former widow of Albert Burford, late of Troop F, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jasper O. Craig, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Reuben R. Romey, late of United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Byam, widow of William C. Byam, late of the United States Navy, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Grant Brown, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Wilson, late of Troop G, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James R. Daniel, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John A. C. Hazel, late of Company E, Second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bradford R. Sarton, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James F. Davis, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank E. Jacobs, late of United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Alfred J. Yarber, former member of Company M, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Forman, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis Toupin, alias Louis Beaudette, late of Battery F, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Orville H. Mills, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thé name of Henry Langley, late of Troop C, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Yelle, widow of Charles Yelle, alias Charles Telli, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry E. Kiste, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $14 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael V. Murray, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Turner, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Gillis W. Webb, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate $12 per month.

The name of Philip L. Schwager, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edith Hampel, former widow of Edward J. Hampel, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Flora B. Warren, widow of Louis W. Warren, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and the continuance of the additional $2 per month for each of the soldier's minor children until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Clara J. Gillespie, dependent mother of Edward D. Gillespie, late of Battery D, Fifth Regiment United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Michael Halloran, late of Troop K, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert S. Kelley, late of Company I, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $15 per month.

The name of Cornelia de C. Williams, widow of Constant Williams, late brigadier general, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Mullen, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Freeman H. Johnson, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Christopher S. Alvord, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orville Harvey, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter S. Swanger, late of Company I, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dudley H. Wright, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Dennis B. Conley, late of Company M, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Vasen, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Illinois Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Akridge, late of Company A, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara D. Fielding, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Ann Cross, widow of William H. Cross, late of General Service, United States Army (Greely Arctic Expedition), and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William G. Jones, late of the Eighteenth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $14 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grant Combs, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna O'Neil, widow of James O'Neil, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Nancy D. Nixon, dependent mother of Marion Nixon, alias Mace Nixon, late of United States ship *Newport*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Powell, late adjutant One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmond L. Klamroth, late of band, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Oscar Sheffield, late of Seventy-eighth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph A. Lilliard, late of Company L, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, Philippine insurrection, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Collins, late of prison guard, United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martin V. Stanton, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Antoinette Eppens, widow of George Eppens, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harry W. Feldman, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grover Colter, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William G. Glasgow, late of Company C, Second Regiment Nebraska Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Hall, late of Company M, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Hird, widow of Charles R. Hird, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William Smallwood, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Patrick A. Galvin, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David C. McDonald, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Brannon, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Watt F. Fultz, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Ligon, late of Company G, First Infantry, North Carolina National Guard, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Clarissa Nehiser, widow of William Nehiser, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles C. Chadick, late of Troop A, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Xaver Becherer, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 507. Marianne H. D'Arcy.
H. R. 658. Benjamin Dockery.
H. R. 1755. Carl Olson.
H. R. 1957. Marguerite B. Fitzgerald
H. R. 4299. Mary A. Blair.
H. R. 4563. Raymond A. Zehnder.
H. R. 6003. Angus J. MacDonald.
H. R. 7809. Robert H Claggett.
H. R. 8011. William B. Yeater.
H. R. 8610. John D. Gardenhire.
H. R. 8616. William T. Marshall.
H. R. 8653. Mary T. Schmidt.
H. R. 8864. David McMillan.
H. R. 8960. Martha E. McDonald.
H. R. 9062. Claude Wallace.
H. R. 9208. Lewis H. Tubbs, jr.
H. R. 9254. Mary E. Brubaker.
H. R. 9654. Green W. Blakely.
H. R. 9740. Walter L. Hartman.
H. R. 9900. Green A. Settle.
H. R. 9985. Albert B. Campbell.
H. R. 9993. Daniel J Graves.
H. R. 10132. Charles N. Cannon.
H. R. 10135. Edward Shaw.
H. R. 10218. James Wise.
H. R. 10416. John Shannon.
H. R. 10422. Lee Byrd.
H. R. 10455. William Anderson.
H. R. 10467. John E. Williams.
H. R. 10511. Alice C. Downey.
H. R. 10539. John Long.
H. R. 10552. Charles R. Taylor.
H. R. 10573. Harry L. Hoff.
H. R. 10610. Lillie E. Trego.
H. R. 10642. John W. Thompson.
H. R. 10693. David Miller.
H. R. 10746. Charles E. Kidder.
H. R. 10762. Chester A. Herd.
H. R. 10764. Floyd A. McPherren.
H. R. 10789. Robert J. Jones.
H. R. 10896. William W. Kinne.
H. R. 10914. Mary R. Philbrick.
H. R. 10921. Frank McCoy.
H. R. 10934. Kate Garrity.
H. R. 11045. Dennis F. Higgins.
H. R. 11063. Silas G. Burkett.
H. R. 11124. Edward Jackson.
H. R. 11341. Mike Grubb.
H. R. 11342. William H. Stanbery.
H. R. 11612. Clifford Baldwin.
H. R. 11615. Thomas Devine.
H. R. 11618. Dudley J. Howell.
H. R. 11619. Lucy C. Range.
H. R. 11681. Joseph Houser.
H. R. 11702. John S. Combs.
H. R. 11748. Clyde Wardlow.
H. R. 11751. Margarett Davy.
H. R. 11768. Annie E. B. Davidson.
H. R. 11817. Jasper O. Craig.
H. R. 11840. Reuben R. Romey.
H. R. 11864. Sarah A. Byam.
H. R. 11881. Grant Brown.
H. R. 11890. Charles Wilson.
H. R. 11920. James R. Daniel.
H. R. 11944. John A. C. Hazel.
H. R. 12006. Bradford R. Sarton.
H. R. 12014. James F. Davis.
H. R. 12040. Frank E. Jacobs.
H. R. 12054. Alfred J. Yarber.
H. R. 12087. Elijah Forman.
H. R. 12100. Louis Toupin, alias Louis Beaudette.
H. R. 12103. Orville H. Mills.
H. R. 12137. Henry Langley.
H. R. 12205. Catherine Yelle.
H. R. 12225. Henry E. Kiste.
H. R. 12227. Michael V. Murray.
H. R. 12230. David Turner.
H. R. 12232. Gillis W. Webb.
H. R. 12267. Philip L. Schwager.
H. R. 12288. Edith Hampel.
H. R. 12306. Flora B. Warren.
H. R. 12313. Clara J. Gillespie.
H. R. 12316. Michael Halloran.
H. R. 12334. Robert S. Kelley.
H. R. 12350. Cornelia de C. Williams.
H. R. 12367. James Mullen.
H. R. 12385. Freeman H. Johnson.
H. R. 12427. Christopher S. Alvord.
H. R. 12443. Orville Harvey.
H. R. 12455. Walter S. Swanger.
H. R. 12498. Dudley H. Wright.
H. R. 12505. Dennis B. Conley.
H. R. 12525. David Vasen.
H. R. 12540. David Akridge.
H. R. 12582. Clare D. Fielding.
H. R. 12587. Mary Ann Cross.
H. R. 12594. William G. Jones.
H. R. 12615. Grant Combs.
H. R. 12618. Anna O'Neil.
H. R. 12641. Nancy D. Nixon.
H. R. 12657. George W. Powell.
H. R. 12674. Edmond L. Klamroth.
H. R. 12696. Oscar Sheffield.
H. R. 12697. Joseph A. Lilliard.
H. R. 12712. Francis M. Collins.
H. R. 12725. Martin V. Stanton.
H. R. 12808. Antoinette Eppens.
H. R. 12847. Harry W. Feldman.
H. R. 12850. Grover Colter.
H. R. 12919. William G. Glasgow.
H. R. 12925. Thomas Hall.
H. R. 12939. Mary A. Hird.
H. R. 12946. William Smallwood.
H. R. 12951. Patrick A. Galvin.
H. R. 13043. David C. McDonald.
H. R. 13044. John T. Brannon.
H. R. 13148. Watt F. Fultz.
H. R. 13167. John R. Ligon.
H. R. 13242. Clarissa Nehiser.
H. R. 13266. Charles C. Chadick.
H. R. 13386. Xaver Becherer.

During the reading of the bill,

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, strike out all of lines 24 and 25; and on page 10, lines 1 and 2.

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Well——

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Wardlow has died since the bill was reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

CARL OLSEN.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 13397, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to call up the bill H. R. 13397, and asks that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13397) repealing so much of an act approved September 22, 1922, granting pension to certain soldiers and sailors and their widows, as grants a pension of $24 per month to Carl Olsen, late of the United States Navy.

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and widows of such soldiers and sailors," approved September 22, 1922, as authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to place on the pension roll the name of Carl Olsen, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month, this being in addition to the Navy pension he is now receiving under section 4756, Revised Statutes, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I will say for the information of the House that through an error on the part of the Pension Bureau in sending the wrong papers to the committee, this man, Carl Olsen, was placed on the pension rolls where it should have been Carl "Olson." They are two different individuals, and the committee intended to place Carl "Olson" on the pension roll. This is to correct that mistake.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. What provision was made to provide for the Swede "Olson" rather than the Norwegian "Olsen"?

Mr. KNUTSON. That will have to be taken up later, I will say to the gentleman. There is no provision made.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am surprised that the gentleman would display so much ignorance. The one is a Swede and the other is a Norwegian.

Mr. KNUTSON. It may be Danish. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I accept the word of the gentleman, who is an authority on Scandinavian matters. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. KNUTSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

VOICE-AMPLIFYING SYSTEM.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a privileged resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is the gentleman going to offer that now?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will do it now if it is thought best. I call up House Resolution 470, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas calls up House Resolution 470, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 470.

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules is hereby authorized and directed to make full inquiry into the matter of the permanent installation in the House wing of the Capitol Building and in the Hall of the House of Representatives of the apparatus or device, now experimentally in operation therein, designated as a "Public address or voice amplifying system." The committee may sit during the sessions of the House and shall report to the House at the earliest practicable date its recommendations as to the desirability and advisability of such system for use in the House of Representatives, together with detailed information covering the cost of installation, operation, and maintenance. The Architect of the Capitol Building and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall assist said committee in the discharge of its duties hereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 1, after the word "Rules," insert "or a subcommittee thereof."

On line 7, after the word "committee," strike out the words "may sit during the sessions of the House."

On line 12, after the word "maintenance," strike out "The Architect of the Capitol Building and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall assist said committee in the discharge of its duties hereunder."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRIVATE CALENDAR.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the next thing in order is to take up unobjected bills on the Private Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the bills be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill.

O. H. TITTMANN.

The first business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of Dr. O. H. Tittmann, former Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that no gentleman would object to the consideration of this bill. The bill is for the relief of a man who has given probably the longest continuous and at all times distinguished service to the United States of almost any man who has served in that position. He never had anything but a very meager compensation for his services. The nature of his work kept him from engaging in any kind of business that would enable him to accumulate any of this world's goods. He is now a very old man, practically an invalid, and at longest has but a few months or years to live; and this bill is for the purpose of enabling him to finish up his days with just some of the comforts and the necessities of life.

We have passed a large number of pension bills here this afternoon that in principle are on all fours with what is being sought to be done for this man.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Is there any difference in principle between this sort of legislation and such legislation as we have enacted for the benefit of retired Army officers and naval officers, and Mr. Justice Moody, and Mr. Justice Pitney, and the civil-service employees of the Government generally?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is in principle exactly the same.

Mr. ROGERS. Of course it may be said that the remuneration contemplated here, which I think is $150 a month, is very much less than prevailed in most lines of endeavor at all comparable with the service that Doctor Tittmann rendered to his country.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is true. Doctor Tittmann has been a specialist in his line of work. I have not the report, and I will be glad if the gentleman from Massachusetts would go in some detail into the facts, or if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] will give in more detail the service that Doctor Tittmann has rendered.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to report this bill. They gave it very careful consideration. Their report is unanimous. We discovered that this bill had passed the Senate; that it was favorably reported upon by Mr. Alexander, of the former administration, and by Mr. Hoover, of this administration. It refers to a man of great age who possibly can not survive another year. For 48 years he was a faithful servant of the Government. He was at one time head of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and acted as commissioner in the boundary dispute between the United States and Canada, for which he received no compensation. He is a man whose advice has been sought by scientific men watching the development of this country for years. We found no objection to this claim from any source. All of Doctor Tittmann's contemporaries are either dead or drawing pensions. This is a simple act of justice to a faithful servant of the American people who represented them for nearly half a century.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HAWES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it not a fact that in addition to his extreme age this gentleman is now afflicted with some physical infirmity?

Mr. HAWES. He is bedridden at the present time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And utterly unable to do anything to make a living?

Mr. HAWES. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RANKIN. If this man had retained his health and had continued in the service, how long would it have been under the present law until he would have gone on the pension roll?

Mr. HAWES. Approximately four years only.

Mr. RANKIN. What would that pension have amounted to, or how would it have compared with the amount provided in this bill?

Mr. HAWES. I am advised that it would have been a considerably larger amount than is provided by this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. And would have lasted for the remainder of his life, would it?

Mr. HAWES. It would.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this case is a very meritorious one. This man gave practically half a century of his time to the great work of the Government. To-day he is without funds, ill, decrepit, and yet, proud of the fact that he is an American citizen, he will not accept charity. In view of the service that he has rendered, attested to by everyone who has come in contact with him and who knows the facts, I feel that he is worthy of the consideration of this House, and I sincerely hope our friend from Wisconsin [Mr.

STAFFORD] will not press his objection to such an extremely worthy measure as this which we are now considering.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under reservation of objection, this is not the first time that Doctor Tittmann has been calling upon Congress for some special extraordinary relief.

Mr. EDMONDS. And it will not be the last time, either.

Mr. STAFFORD. The chairman of the committee, Mr. EDMONDS, says, "nor will it be the last time." I hope it will not be. I wish that all these faithful civilian servants of the Government who have retired on account of age may live long, but we have never established the precedent of pensioning a civil employee of the Government other than in the instances cited by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the case of Justice Moody, and the recent case of Justice Pitney. When that of Justice Moody was brought before Congress for consideration, there was considerable opposition to its award for fear it would establish a precedent. We all knew then that he was afflicted with a disease that rendered him unfit for further service on the Supreme Court, and it was an emergent case, in order to provide a vacancy so that the work of the court could be performed, and for that reason Congress made an exception. The cases of retired Army officers are not akin at all to this case. If we should allow this pension or gratuity of $150 a month in this case we would have to open the doors to many other similar cases. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Does the gentleman know that the former head of the Lighthouse Service was taken care of just in this way?

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman refer to Doctor Kimball?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I am not sure about his name, but he was the former chairman of the Lighthouse Board, and they tell me at the department that that is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. There may have been exceptions. I recall the case of Doctor Kimball. It may have been necessary to create a vacancy in order to provide a younger man to fill that position rather than a person who had grown old in the service. It may have crept through on a general bill, but not in a private bill like this.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. In the case of Arthur Rump, of St. Louis, who had been but 15 years in the service, Congress passed a specific bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I think that bill passed by unanimous consent, not by reason of submission of the question to the decision of the House. He had suffered tremendous injuries in the service of the Government. The case appealed to me. There are other cases of that kind where persons have been injured in the service of the Government. He had received injuries while in the performance of service for the Government. Doctor Tittmann suffered no injuries by reason of his service. There are many superannuated employees of the Government who have retired who would be entitled to the same consideration on the part of Congress if we should award this man an honorarium of $1,800 a year.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

FAMILY OF TATSUJI SAITO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1078) to authorize the payment of $2,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Tatsuji Saito, a Japanese subject, killed at Camp Geronimo, Mexico, May 25, 1916.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects. The Clerk will report the next bill.

LIEUT. COL. HENRY C. DAVIS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5210) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Henry C. Davis.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ANNA M. TOBIN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2323) for the relief of Anna M. Tobin.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve my objection. I did not know this was the bill in which the gentleman was interested.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to my friend that if objection is to be made it seems to me we do not gain anything by discussing the bill, and we do prevent the consideration of bills that might not be objected to. My hope is that after we dispose of the bills that are not objected to we may come back and take up the calendar and thrash out these matters that are objected to.

Mr. HUDSPETH. My hope is that I may convince the gentleman from Wisconsin so that he will withdraw his objection. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that this is a bill for the relief of a lady, Mrs. Tobin, of El Paso. The bill passed the House about two years ago, but for lack of time failed to pass the Senate. It passed the Senate over a year ago, but it failed to pass the House.

The history of this case is that Mrs. Tobin owns some property at a town called Tobin, about 8 miles from the city of El Paso, and close to Fort Bliss, a military post. The soldiers of the Pennsylvania National Guard that were camped there destroyed the property in the town. She asked General Clements to place a guard around the property and he refused to do it. At the time she made the request they had destroyed about $30 worth. He wanted to arrest them and put them in prison, but she said: "No; all I ask you to do is to place a guard around the property so that they will do no further damage." General Clements made an investigation and found that he was responsible for damages to the property. They had destroyed the house, taken doors off the hinges, taken bricks from the house, and all this was ascertained by General Clements, who found them doing it. The private guard that she placed around the building found them doing it.

Now, upon investigation by General Clements and Major Taggart they ascertained that the damage was $1,000, and they recommended that $1,000 be paid to this widow lady. There is an itemized statement, sworn to, and everything is set forth, and all the damages she sustained. Not only is this recommended by Major Taggart, but here is a letter from the Secretary of War.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inform the gentleman that I was not advised that any information in reference to this case had been inserted in the RECORD, and so I have not had the benefit of it. I wish to call attention to the difficulty I have had in allowing this bill to become a law. General Clements, who was the commanding officer, states that if his position had been carried out and not objected to by this woman further damage would not have been done. Permit me to read from page 2 of the report:

> At the time of the original damage and complaint General Clements did offer to have the parties found upon the premises make restoration, but in the presence of the offenders the representation was made on behalf of Mrs. Tobin that she did not care that the boys should do this, but was anxious that a guard should be established about the premises for the protection thereof from further injury. General Clements is of the opinion that had he been permitted to handle this matter as he thought best, all future trouble would have been avoided and Mrs. Tobin saved the damage to her property and the expense of maintaining a civilian guard.

Here we have the owner of the property dissenting from the will of the commanding officer as to what is necessary for the control of the troops and who is of the opinion that if his will had been carried out there would have been no further transgression or depredation. She is now asking for relief from the very act which can be charged up to the generosity of her heart perhaps in not wanting to have the boys punished.

Mr. HUDSPETH. At this time there had only been about $38 damage. General Clements wanted to imprison these splendid young men, and this widow said "No; I do not want them in prison, for they have not done much damage; all I ask is that you place a guard around the property so that they will not commit any further damage."

Mr. STAFFORD. General Clements was in charge of the men who did the damage and had the right to say how the men should comport themselves and what should be the discipline, but his rule was interfered with and he yielded to the importunings of the owner of the property.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Let me read a part of General Clements's report. He says:

> I am unable to report the exact damage done, but I do not believe that the estimate of $1,000 is excessive.

Now, that occurred after the lady had requested that a private guard be put around the property so that no further damage could take place.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not attacking the bill on the quantum of the damages but on the ground that the owner of the

property dissented from the rule of the commanding officer, which he wanted to enforce.

Mr. HUDSPETH. She did not want the boys imprisoned for doing this small amount of damage, which amounted to $38. All she asked then was that a guard be placed there. She placed a private guard there and he caught them taking away bricks and pump engine and doors from the building, and so forth.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to say that the wishes of this woman did not have a thing to do with the officer's carrying out his military instructions or his military duties. Now, for him to come up and say that he permitted the depredations later because she did not want the men imprisoned is what is known in Army circles as "passing the buck." It is no answer to the charge that he permitted the destruction.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, he could have exercised his full authority and punished the boys for the original depredation, but on an appeal to him by the owner of the property, who did not want to have it done, the commanding officer desisted. He offered to pay for the damage, but she declined to receive it.

Mr. RANKIN. All she asked then was that no further damage be done and that guards be placed around the property and the men restrained from committing further damages.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

WILLIAM HOWARD MAY ET AL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill S. 2746, an act for the relief of William Howard May, ex-marshal of the Canal Zone; William K. Jackson, ex-district attorney of the Canal Zone; and John H. McLean, ex-paymaster of the Panama Canal, now deceased.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

ELIZABETH MARSH WATKINS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill S. 841, an act for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the objection.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a case that particularly ought to appeal to the Congress. Elizabeth Marsh Watkins was a pupil in the Indian school at Flandreau, S. Dak., and while engaged in laundering at the request of the superintendent in charge was injured by the mangle that she was using. The palm of her hand was largely torn off, and the skin from the wrist was rolled down over her palm and fingers so that her hand has become seriously and permanently crippled. This bill passed the Senate in the Sixty-fourth Congress and I think in every Congress since that time, and has been favorably acted upon by the Committee on Claims of the House on at least two different occasions. I feel that in this case the objection ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. BURTON. How much does the bill provide?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Twenty-five hundred dollars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in this case, as I remember it, the report shows that she is not permanently incapacitated from performing work. Her left hand has been disfigured, and she is able to do manual labor as before. Twenty-five hundred dollars is a pretty large sum to pay merely for disfigurement of the hand by doing work which she was not directed to do by the Government authorities.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I notice that Dr. W. O. Wetmore, of Washington, D. C., examined this girl at the time she was in Washington. He states in his report that the fingers of the left hand are atrophied and useless, and that contractures have occurred in the palmnar fascia; also that as a result of the injury her nervous system in general fails to respond to normal stimuli and insomnia is present. That conforms with her own affidavit, which also appears in the record. She is in a condition to-day where she is able to do very little, if any, work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the testimony that she is to-day incapacitated from performing work? If that is the fact I do not wish to interpose any objection.

Mr. SNELL. Was that brought out at the hearings before the committee, that she was incapacitated? That is the important part of it.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That certainly was brought out before the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing in the report that shows it.

Mr. EDMONDS. The report shows that she has very little use, if any, of this hand, if one could call that permanent incapacity. Here is the picture of the hand which was injured. She can not use the hand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the statement of the chairman of the committee, amplifying the report, which does not show that she is incapacitated, and the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON], I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500, to compensate Elizabeth Marsh Watkins, of Wakpala, S. Dak., for permanent bodily injuries sustained by her on the 9th day of November, 1908, at the Government Indian school at Flandreau, S. Dak.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

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

J. W. HARRELD.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next bill on the calendar, H. R. 8025, for the relief of J. W. Harreld, be withdrawn from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean to lay the bill on the table?

The SPEAKER. Taking it from the calendar would lay it on the table. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MRS. M. P. RODGERS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill H. R. 4314, for the relief of Mrs. M. P. Rodgers.

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

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I object, and I ask that the bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RICHARD MURPHY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill H. R. 9916, to provide for the issuing of a patent to Richard Murphy for a certain tract of land in what is known as the Big Pasture of Oklahoma, and upon which he has made full payment of purchase price.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That by reason of the fact that on April 22, 1907, under the act of June 6, 1906, Richard Murphy made homestead entry 06742 upon the southwest quarter of section 13, in township 3 south of range 15 west, Indian meridian, in Oklahoma, and in June, 1916, made his full and final payment of all installments and interest thereon as required by said act and extension of payment acts and his bidding agreement therefor upon said tract, the said Richard Murphy has earned a valid title to said tract, and it is now provided that the land department shall issue a patent for said land to the said Richard Murphy.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue to Richard Murphy patent to the southwest quarter of section 13, in township 3 south of range 15 west, Indian meridian, in Oklahoma, being homestead entry, Guthrie 06742.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read as follows:

A bill authorizing issuance of patent to Richard Murphy.

MEDICAL SOCIETY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill H. R. 10973, to amend an act entitled "An act to revive, with amendments, an act to incorporate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia," approved June 7, 1838, as amended.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

IRON GATES ON WEST EXECUTIVE AVENUE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the Senate bill 3046, an act to donate the gates at the head of West Executive Avenue, in the city of Washington, D. C., to the Hayes Memorial Museum, Fremont, Ohio.

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

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DONATING CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill H. R. 10841, authorizing the transfer of 500 feet of Indian land, in the State of Washington, for a public school to which Indian children shall be admitted without payment of tuition.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this to carry with it the construction of a new school building, which is not provided for in the Indian bill?

Mr. EDMONDS. Some gentleman from the Indian Committee will have to answer that.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is to provide additional land for the use of a public school.

Mr. BLANTON. Already in existence?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not going to require the building of a new one out there not authorized by the present bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not that I know of.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman on the Indian Committee?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not on all the committees of the House; the Appropriations Committee is sufficient to keep me occupied.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the reason I made the inquiry; I did not think the gentleman could speak for the Indian Committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am speaking on this bill, so far as the bill itself shows, and the report; it is for the transfer of Government lands for public-school purposes to which Indian children shall be admitted without payment of tuition. It safeguards the interests of the Government in every way, donating land owned by the Government for public-school purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to take half a minute. The point I am making is this, that, unless it is a school already built that is provided for in the Indian bill, if we pass this measure it will make in order an appropriation that is to come afterwards to build public schools that has not had legislative consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. The facts are these. The Government owned some lands——

Mr. BLANTON. Is there a school building already established?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Just to have the facts correct, the Government owns some land adjoining a public-school building. This public school is attended 60 per cent by Indian pupils. By reason of their accepting the Indian children, it is proposed to give them additional land without expense—a very commendable course.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to transfer and convey to school district No. 30, in Ferry County, State of Washington, being the Meteor-Inchelium school district, the north 500 feet of lot 5 in section 5, township 32 north, range 37 east, Willamette meridian, for public-school use, upon condition that Indian children shall be admitted to the schools of said district without discrimination, and that any Indian children who are not Federal wards shall be admitted without payment of tuition.

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

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

HORACE G. KNOWLES.

The next business in order on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8656) for the relief of Horace G. Knowles.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

SOUTHERN TRANSPORTATION CO.

The next business in order on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7010) for the relief of the Southern Transportation Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of Southern Transportation Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, and doing business in the State of Virginia, owners of the barge *Moccasin*, against the United States for damages alleged to have been caused by collision between the said barge *Moccasin* and the United States Navy lighter *No 467*, in tow of Navy tug *Kewaydin* in Hampton Roads, Va., on the 5th day of October, 1920, may be sued for by the said Southern Transportation Co. in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court, and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the said Southern Transportation Co. or against the said Southern Transportation Co. in favor of the United States upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That suit shall be brought and commenced within four months from the date of the passage of this act.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "457" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "462."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer another amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 4, page 1, strike out the word "Pennsylvania" and insert in lieu thereof "New Jersey."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the chairman whether the damage had arisen from the barge or from the merchandise on the barge?

Mr. EDMONDS. No; they were incurred in regard to a collision.

Mr. WATSON. Did they arise out of damages sustained by the barge or the merchandise also?

Mr. EDMONDS. No; I believe not.

Mr. WATSON. Is the gentleman sure? Because it would make a great difference whether it was damages to the barge or merchandise in the barge. It does not say in the report.

Mr. EDMONDS. No; it does not say in the report, but it does say in the bill for damages alleged to have been caused by collision between the barge and a United States Navy lighter.

Mr. WATSON. Arising out of damages sustained by the barge. Now, whether it includes merchandise in the barge makes some difference, whether it was insured or not, and whether the Government was responsible.

Mr. EDMONDS. If the Government is responsible, why would that make any difference?

Mr. WATSON. We ought to know the facts.

Mr. EDMONDS. My understanding is that it was a collision between the barge and a lighter. I never heard any report made of its being in regard to merchandise on the barge.

Mr. WATSON. It ought to be clearly set forth. There might be half a dozen people hurt and damages brought.

Mr. EDMONDS. No; there is nothing of that kind; and all of our cases have been about the same in regard to admiralty cases.

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

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

GULF, FLORIDA & ALABAMA RAILWAY CO.

The next business in order on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2599) for the relief of the receiver of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

NAVAJO TIMBER CO. OF DELAWARE.

The next business in order on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 1945) to reimburse the Navajo Timber Co. of Delaware for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I rise to obtain information from the committee as to whether the $5,000 forfeit money that was deposited by the Navajo Lumber & Tim-

ber Co., which the late Secretary Lane reported against, has ever been returned to the company.

Mr. EDMONDS. Not that I know of.

Mr. BURTON. This is not a bill of mine, but it is one in which my colleague [Mr. KNIGHT] is interested. He is absent to-day. They have abandoned, as I understand, the other claim; at least there is no bill pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what I wanted to ascertain. The Secretary of the Interior in 1915 offered no objection to the reimbursement and return of this $5,000, but he strenuously objected to the return of a like sum by another company composed of the same persons as this company.

Mr. BURTON. Practically the same persons.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the Navajo Timber Co., of Delaware, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States standing to the credit of the fund "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Fort Apache Indians," the sum of $4,904.10, the same to be a reimbursement for a deposit made by said Navajo Timber Co. with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of the United States on October 15, 1913, to accompany a bid for the purchase of certain timber on the Apache and Sitgreaves National Forests, Ariz., and on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that motion for a moment?

Mr. EDMONDS. I do.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days, on account of public business in his district.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that January 25 they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 11626. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution for the appointment of three members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 27, 1923, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

922. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing the number of documents received and distributed by the Treasury Department during the calendar year ended December 31, 1922, together with the number remaining on hand January 1, 1923, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13807. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware State highway department to construct a bridge across the Nanticoke River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1456). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13410. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the city of Aurora, Kane County, Ill., a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River; with amendments (Rept. No. 1457). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 393. A resolution directing the Attorney General to make an immediate investigation of the school fund of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 1458). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TILLMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 13571. A bill to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1459). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SWING: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2390. An act to redistribute the number of officers in the several grades of the Supply Corps of the Navy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. S. J. Res. 248. A joint resolution to provide for the payment of salaries of Senators appointed to fill vacancies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9309. A bill for the relief of the Neah Bay Dock Co., a corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 8733. A bill for the relief of Harold L. McKinley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 5369. A bill to compensate the owners of the steamship *Brynhild* for damages and expenses in repairing the said steamship, and to make an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 8051. A bill for the relief of the Commonwealth & Dominion Line (Ltd.), owner of the British steamship *Port Phillip*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on War Claims. S. 3118. An act for the relief of Herbert E. Meilstrup; without amendment (Rept. No. 1468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 14033) in recognition of the valor of the officers and men of the Seventy-ninth Division who were killed in action or died of wounds received in action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 14034) to amend the war risk insurance act and the vocational rehabilitation act with amendments prior to the passage of this act, and to extend all of the provisions of said act to all disabled veterans of all wars of the United States, and to their dependents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 14035) to amend the copyright law in order to permit the United States to enter the International Copyright Union; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAYDEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 14036) for the relief of water users under United States reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 14037) to punish official misconduct of any officer of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 14038) to amend the laws relating to the postal-savings system, authorizing rural routes from 36 to 75 miles in length, to encourage commercial aviation, extending the insurance and collect-on-delivery privilege to third-class matter, and prescribing the computation of overtime to employees in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 14039) authorizing the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building at Keytesville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 14040) to extend payments on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14041) to amend sections 3, 4, 9, 12, 15, 21, 22, and 25 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KISSEL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 427) authorizing the President of the United States, under the provisions

of the first sentence of section 202 of the transportation act, 1920, to pay just and meritorious claims for loss of and/or damage to freight in transportation arising out of or incident to Federal control, and declaring the intent of section 206 (a) of said act in relation to the provision authorizing actions at law against an agent appointed by the President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 80) providing for the appointment of a congressional committee to call upon the President of the United States to request him to call a world peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota urging that immediate action be taken toward the passage of such law as will make possible the early completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterways project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota urging Congress to give immediate and careful consideration to Senate bill 4130; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota requesting and demanding modification and reduction of the present freight rates for grain and live stock; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota requesting and demanding modification and revision of the present Federal standards for grading grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota requesting Congress to amend section 2 of House Resolution 8744, approved December 21, 1921, and enact in lieu thereof an act to require the completion of a steel bridge at Chamberlain, S. Dak., as required by act of Congress approved April 28, 1916, said bridge to be completed during the year 1923; 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. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 14042) granting a pension to Clara A. Bicknell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 14043) granting an increase of pension to Ella M. Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 14044) granting a pension to Hannah K. Hallowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 14045) granting a pension to James T. Cowan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 14046) for the relief of Frederick MacMonnies; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 14047) granting an increase of pension to Daisy W. Lyman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14048) granting a pension to William M. Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14049) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Morrow; 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:

7050. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Board of Aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., opposing any organizations which can not give a complete support to the United States Government and fealty to our flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7051. Also, petition of Richard W. Mulcahy Post, No. 47, of the American Legion, Portage, Wis., urging the United States Government to enact a soldiers and sailors' adjusted compensation bill containing a provision requiring the raising of the necessary revenues by means of the sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7052. Also, petition of the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1565; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7053. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the City Parliament of the Community Councils of the City of New York, urging the President to recommend to Congress the passage of such legislation as will either regulate the proper mining of coal and its distribution or that the Government of the United States take over such mines and operate the same for the public welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7054. Also, petition of Civil Employees' Association of World War Veterans, New York City, N. Y., urging the House Military Affairs Committee to report the Bursum bill (S. 1565); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7055. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging that aid be extended to the people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7056. Also, petition of 2,486 citizens, favoring the modification of the Volstead law on prohibition so as to allow the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7057. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 42 citizens of Galien, Mich., protesting against discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7058. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Walter W. Law, jr., president Tax Commission of the State of New York, favoring passage of a Senate bill regarding taxation of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7059. Also, petition of Hon. Alfred E. Smith, Governor of the State of New York, approving a Senate bill amending the national banking act and permitting States to validate prior taxes on national-bank shares; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7060. Also, petition of George P. Nicholson, corporation counsel of the city of New York, requesting the passage of legislation providing for the taxing of national-bank shares; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7061. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 42 residents of Santa Rosa, Calif., to abolish the discriminatory tax on small arms, ammunition, and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7062. By Mr. J. M. NELSON: Petition of 562 citizens of Wisconsin, favoring immediate aid being extended to the people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7063. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Hanks National Farm Loan Association, Hanks, N. Dak., objecting to the Strong bill, H. R. 13125; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7064. Also, petition of Henry Stute and 61 others, of Mercer, N. Dak., praying that aid be given the suffering peoples of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7065. Also, petition of Carl A. Vogle and 61 others, of Lefor, N. Dak., urging the passage of a resolution providing for the extension of aid to the famine-stricken peoples of Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7066. Also, petition of Wildrose National Farm Loan Association, Wildrose, N. Dak., protesting against the Strong bill or any similar legislation intended to change the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7067. Also, petition of Y. M. C. A. of Fargo, N. Dak., supporting the Sheppard and Sterling bills, to strengthen the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7068. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Rev. C. Springer and others, of Rome, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House Joint Resolution 412, for the relief of the people of Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *January 27, 1923.*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 23, 1923.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

DEPARTMENTAL USE OF AUTOMOBILES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Labor, in response to Senate Resolution 399, agreed to January 6, 1923, reporting relative to automobiles and garages owned and controlled by the Department of Labor in Washington, D. C., which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the commissioner (American section), International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, in response to Senate Resolution 399, agreed to January 6, 1923, relative to the use and upkeep of automobiles by the commission, which was ordered to lie on the table.