Charles A. Andrews, Wolfe City.
William T. McDonald, jr., Wylie.

UTAH.

William T. Boyle, Beaver.
T. J. Wadsworth, jr., Santaquin.

VERMONT.

William B. Needham, Bridgewater.
Margaret I. Southgate, Concord.
Edward N. Aldrich, Graniteville.
Preston C. Skinner, Orleans.
Ruth S. Sheldon, Pawlet.
Jonas H. Brooks, St. Johnsbury.
Otis B. Dauchy, Townshend.

VIRGINIA.

Francis A. Haynes, Barboursville.
Mary I. Wight, Charlotte Court House.
Benjamin B. Parker, Middletown.
Edward P. Schultz, Onancock.
John J. Kinlighan, Staunton.

WASHINGTON.

Mary G. Wilkinson, Auburn.
Blanche A. Sines, Chelan.
Charles A. Bowen, Clayton.
Levi H. Niles, Ephrata.
Alonzo E. Emerson, Ellensburg.
Egbert K. Field, Ferndale.
Charles R. Bockmeir, Granite Falls.
John H. Gibson, Issaquah.
Arthur Bailey, Monroe.
John F. Samson, Oroville.
Andrew J. Cosser, Port Angeles.
Jessie Knight, Shelton.
Clyde J. Backus, Tacoma.
Augustus B. Eastham, Vancouver.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William M. Kidd, Burnsville.
William B. Hines, White Sulphur Springs.
Ruth Lewis, Buffalo.
Carl A. Dehner, Chester.
Andrew Smith, Filbert.
Cecil B. Dodd, Follansbee.

WISCONSIN.

Leon F. Pallister, Brandon.
Ambrose M. Steinuand, Colby.
Hattie B. Greene, Darlington.
Maurice Morrissey, Delavan.
Ellen E. Hains, Fall River.
Frances W. Kulwiec, Lublin.
Wilbur H. Bridgman, Stanley.
Joseph E. Kuzenski, Stetsonville.
Adolph C. Sveen, Westby.

WYOMING.

Roy Shaver, Greybull.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *March 3, 1923.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we approach Thy throne where the rainbow is set forever! We thank Thee that in all the lights and shades of the past Thy face has been leaning our way. Thy mercies have been as the flowers of the morning, which come from the blooming gardens of God. O bless us with the whisper of the Lord. Let the mutterings of toil die away and allow no grievances to be carried into the future. Let us shake ourselves free from the memories that hurt. For the friendships and companionships of these years we are grateful. May these bonds of the heart lend strength and give joy while time moves on in its relentless way. They have grown with our growth and strengthened with the strength of the years. While the world lures by we shall hear their voices and feel the pressure of their hands. If our paths lead through the green pastures, may we not forget Thee; if they wind their ways beside the still waters, let us be chastened in our spirits; if they stretch through the valley of sorrow and climb the hill of difficulty, O be Thou unto us the sweet, tender, and beautiful Shepherd. When the sun goes down and the West is red and all glory fades from our earthly sky may we be carried by the Father's love, in the Father's arms, and sink to rest with the Father's kiss, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTION IN DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois presents a concurrent resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 87.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of H. R. 14408 (an act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes), in the amendment of the Senate No. 72, concurred in by the House, to correct the date "March 2, 1917," wherever it occurs to read "March 2, 1907."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, that is to make this conform to the law.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resoltuion.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4637. An act for the relief of certain disbursing agents under the Department of Commerce;

S. 3615. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Becker;

S. 3895. An act for the relief of Benjamin H. Richardson;

S. 4437. An act to amend section 284 of the Judicial Code of the United States;

S. 4438. An act to amend section 1025 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 4614. An act to amend section 81 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and

S. J. Res. 278. A joint resolution providing for the continuation of registrar and receiver of the land office at Guthrie, Okla., at salaries in effect prior to act of January 24, 1923.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 4216. An act authorizing the sale of real property no longer required for military purposes;

The message also announced that, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution No. 53, the Vice President had appointed Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. SHORTRIDGE, and Mr. OVERMAN members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 8928) to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. STERLING, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. MCKELLAR as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PAYMENTS MADE TO NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE OFFICERS.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14077) to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act to June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to certain National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 14077, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have gone over the very lengthy amendment of the Senate to the bill which we passed about a week ago, providing relief for the National Guard. There is incorporated in this amendment a provision that I think should not be adopted by the House conferees, and that is the principle of longevity pay for National Guard officers when serving at camps in active duty. We did pass through the House, when the pay bill was under consideration, after it had been defeated twice, a provision grant-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ting to National Guard officers who had seen service, who are commissioned Regular Army officers, longevity pay of credit for service in the National Guard. Originally, as the gentleman knows, under the Army reorganization act the National Guard officers when they would go to camp on active duty would receive no higher pay than that of captain. Under a bill presented by the gentleman in the last session that was rescinded, and now they receive the pay of the grade, but I think we are going pretty far when we extend the principle to giving them longevity pay just for the time when serving in camp or in schools of instruction. If we can have an understanding that the conferees will not agree to that feature, I have no objection to the bill going to conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I want to ask the gentleman a question or two when the time comes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I can not say what the course of the conferees will be. I do not expect to be one of them myself, but I want to say to my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that he is unduly exercised over this matter, because the officers in the National Guard, as I am informed, have heretofore enjoyed this privilege of longevity pay when in camp. This simply is to put these officers on the same plane with the officers in the Regular Army when on active duty. That is the purpose of it. I hope the conferees will be able to agree upon something that will be satisfactory even to my technical friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in this particular the gentleman will recall that that provision was twice defeated upon its merits in the House, and when brought up a third time was carried by a very small margin. Members of the Military Affairs Committee opposed it very strongly. I am willing to trust the judgment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FROTHINGHAM], who, I understand, will be one of the conferees on that question, with respect to the views that I expressed to-day.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I may say this to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that he is stating the truth when he refers to the Committee on Military Affairs. That committee did not favor that amendment at the time, but the House adopted it, and it is the law now, and we believe that the National Guard officers should be treated fairly under the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly want the National Guard officers treated fairly, but I think we are treating them with undue partiality when we agree to the longevity principle when they happen to be in camps or schools of instruction.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was against this provision, and if I am to be one of the conferees, the understanding that I would have would be that the idea of this Senate amendment is merely to clear up the law as it exists to-day.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is the purpose of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I only want to ask the gentleman one question. Have there been any extraneous riders placed on this bill by the Senate?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that the only purpose of this bill and this amendment is to correct the law and overcome a certain ruling made by the comptroller.

Mr. BLANTON. Have there been any extraneous riders concerning nongermane matters placed upon this bill?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman from Texas there was no brigadier made or major general given an additional number or anything of that kind, but it simply applies solely to the National Guard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FROTHINGHAM, Mr. GREENE of Vermont, and Mr. FIELDS.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT, APPROPRIATIONS, ETC., UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

The Chairman laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a statement by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, of appropriations, expenditures, and balances of appropriations under the control of the Department of State for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1923.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of State.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent—

Mr. LANHAM was granted leave of absence for one day on account of sickness.

Mr. ALMON (on request of Mr. BANKHEAD) was granted leave of absence for the remainder of the session on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. LINTHICUM was granted leave of absence for the day on account of illness.

Mr. MONTAGUE (on request of Mr. BLAND of Virginia) was granted leave of absence for March 2 and remainder of session on account of sickness.

RECLASSIFICATION BILL.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 8928, disagree to the Senate amendment, and accede to the request of the Senate for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 8928, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this reclassification bill passed the House December 15, 1921. That was 14 months ago. Since then it has been reposing in the Senate. Recently the Senate took up the bill, struck out all of the House bill, and substituted an entirely new text. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think there ought to be reclassification legislation, and I think there is great need for it; but I think that it will be very difficult for a full and free conference at this late hour.

However, realizing the importance of the subject, if we can have an agreement that there will be no agreement on the part of the conferees of the House that the salary schedules shall be put into effect prior to July 1, 1924, then I am willing that the bill go to conference, because if it should turn out that there was some serious error made in the bill, we would have time to correct it prior to its going into effect; and so I shall not object if we can have that assurance from the chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like—I was not here when this colloquy took place—to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that inasmuch as the Senate has held this bill, after they have had it for 14 months, until the closing hours of the Congress, we will have no time whatever to study it or to see what effect the salary schedules may have; and therefore I want to ask the gentleman from New Jersey if he will agree, if the bill goes to conference, that the House provision requiring the postponement of the act until July 1, 1924, shall be adhered to—if he will agree not to enter into an agreement with the Senate unless that feature of the House bill is conformed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I will say in answer to the question, which is substantially the same as put by the gentleman from Texas, that the conferees on the part of the House will not agree to eliminate the provision of the bill which it contained when it passed the House here, to wit, that the classification be made and the allocation of the employees to their proper grades and payments; that that be made the basis of the estimate for the ensuing fiscal year, but the salaries do not take effect until the House has had an opportunity to scrutinize the estimate made on the basis of the classification; and therefore I can assure both gentlemen that no report will come from the conferees with that provision eliminated, and if the agreement otherwise can not be reached the bill will be brought back to the House for further instruction.

Mr. MADDEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, because I believe it is very important not only to the service but to the Treasury of the United States, and before this law is effective the Committee on Appropriations of the House shall have opportunity to study every schedule and pass upon the amount to be appropriated for every bureau and with the designations that are to be made, in order that there can be no doubt as to where chiefs shall put employees of the Government in the higher schedules provided in the different classifications; and with that understanding I shall not object to the bill going to conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey in just what way the bill as it comes from the Senate differs from the bill in reference to the provision for heads of departments and divisions in the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do not believe that as far as chiefs of bureaus and the heads of divisions and others—I do not believe

that there is a very substantial difference in schedules as the bill was reported in the House and the bill as passed by the Senate. There is a probability that in certain instances the Senate bill is somewhat higher than the House bill.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Now, may I ask the gentleman this question, and possibly the gentleman can not answer, but may be the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] can answer it. May I have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois on this matter?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. As I understand it, this classification, as it was perfected in the House and as amended in the Senate, does not in any way apply to the secretarial or clerical force of the House or of the Members?

Mr. MADDEN. No; it does not. But in the bonus act which we have just passed there is a provision for the appointment of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate to classify the legislative employees of the Government.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If this bill goes to conference and the conferees agree, and we adopt the report, will we be in the position of eliminating the bonus to the House employees and the employees of the Members?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all, because this joint committee would take care of that.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. So that the bonus would go into effect July 1, and there will be no difference in the pay of House employees and secretaries?

Mr. MADDEN. The bonus bill will have to be passed, no matter when this bill goes into effect.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is certainly a most remarkable thing that a measure concerning which there has been so much agitation as there has been concerning this, and which passed the House of Representatives early in 1921, should be held back by another legislative body until the very last day of the Congress before they messaged it back here to the House with their action. I suppose it is an indication of the wonderful efficiency of that body. [Laughter.] I do not know why it has been held back all this time. Manifestly it is going to require some time for the conferees to look into this matter, and I do not know whether they will have the opportunity to go thoroughly into it in time to pass it and let it be enrolled and engrossed for the signature of the President before noon to-morrow.

Something ought to pass. We ought not to have to pass a bonus bill which is in some respects inequitable but which, upon the whole, is necessary. Therefore I do not feel like taking the responsibility of objecting, but I think we all ought to understand exactly what is going on here now. It is understood that this proposition is to be brought back here with an amendment, or at least that the conferees on the part of the House will not agree unless there is a provision put into the bill that it shall not take effect before July 1, 1924. And I think gentlemen representing the other body ought distinctly to understand that that is the temper of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. That attitude is not confined to that side of the House. There are more Members on this side of the House who feel exactly as the gentleman from Tennessee does, that we should stop this thing unless that condition is complied with.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It ought to be so understood, so that it will have its psychological effect upon that rapidly moving body at the other end of the Capitol, that the House will not agree to this thing unless that proviso goes in.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the House passed this highly important measure after careful consideration in committee and thorough consideration in the House 14 months ago. It comes back to the House, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has suggested, in the last days of the session. Under almost any other circumstances and conditions than those that now exist the House would be justified in declining to act upon the measure. But the House can not take the odium of defeating this legislation when the odium, if the bill shall fail of final passage, must rest with the body that held it up without acting upon it for more than a year.

As to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], indorsed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], that the House provision should remain in the bill as to the time when the schedules shall take effect, I do not think there is a Member of the House familiar with the subject but who is determined that if the bill becomes a law—and we hope it will—it shall become a law with that provision in it; and if there be any doubt in the mind of anyone anywhere in regard to that, I hope the conferees on the part of the House will remove that doubt the moment they go into conference.

The House carefully considered that question when the bill was before the House. It is a logical, proper, reasonable provision for putting the law into effect in an orderly way and under the scrutiny of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is highly important that this bill should go to conference in order that we may continue to do all that we can to expedite its passage. I hope that the conferees will be able to bring back to their respective Houses a fair, reasonable, workable bill. But, Mr. Speaker, for one I am of the opinion that the House will not be inclined to agree to any conference report simply because we are under the pressure of the last day. This legislation is too important to be placed upon the statute books in a half-baked, illy considered manner. I hope that we shall be able to crystallize it into law; but if we do, it should be in reasonable form, and it should contain the provision under which its schedules shall not go into effect until the House has had time to scrutinize their effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has made the positive statement that the bonus bill is going to become a law applicable to the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 1923, regardless of action on this bill. The gentleman knows that under his bill—and we are all in favor of a proper reclassification—the gentleman knows that under his bill it was designed to take the place of the bonus; that when his bill became a law there should be no further bonus. The gentleman has made a positive statement that under no circumstances will he agree in conference to any reclassification bill which shall go into effect before June 30, 1924.

Mr. LEHLBACH. As far as the payment of salaries under it.

Mr. BLANTON. In that case the new Sixty-eighth Congress, even if it does not meet until December next, will have been in session seven months before any reclassification bill that has been passed by this Congress will go into effect. What is the necessity of agreeing so far in advance, and under such confusion as now exists, to something that even the gentleman from Illinois says he does not know what the effect will be upon the employees or the Treasury. If the Senate bill should be adopted, no one knows its effect either to the employees or the Treasury. We have given it no study and therefore I do not think we ought to thus go ahead in the dark, and I object.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey moves to suspend the rules and pass the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That House bill 8928 be taken from the Speaker's table, that the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate and acquiesce in the request for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore appointed the following conferees: Mr. LEHLBACH, Mr. FAIRFIELD, and Mr. BLACK.

EXCHANGES OF PROPERTY.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13774) to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to exchanges of property.

The Clerk read the conference report 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. 13774) to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to exchanges of property, 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 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

W. R. GREEN,
NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
OGDEN L. MILLS,
J. W. COLLIER,
W. A. OLDFIELD,
Managers on the part of the House.
P. J. MCCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,
A. A. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13774) to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to exchanges of property, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On Nos. 1, 2, and 3: These amendments are clerical changes, and the Senate recedes.

On No. 4: This amendment makes effective on the passage of the bill, instead of January 1, 1923, as provided by the House, an amendment to section 202 of the revenue act of 1921. The Senate recedes.

On No. 5: This amendment allows a taxpayer to exchange, without taxable gain or deductible loss, stock owned by him in a corporation for other stock in the same corporation. It also strikes out of section 202 of the revenue act of 1921 a definition of "reorganization." The Senate recedes.

W. R. GREEN,
NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
OGDEN L. MILLS,
J. W. COLLIER,
W. A. OLDFIELD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House unanimously. The Senate has receded on all the amendments. Unless gentlemen on the other side want time I will move the previous question. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 2984, for the relief of Thurston W. True.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to bill of the following title:

H. R. 2722. An act for the relief of W. W. McGrath.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 40, and 54 to the bill H. R. 14408, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill H. R. 14435, making appropriations to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill H. R. 14302, to establish and promote the use of the official cotton standards of the United States in interstate and foreign commerce, to prevent deception therein and provide for the proper application of such standards, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 14077, to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and had appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHEPPARD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 87.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of H. R. 14408 (an act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes) in the amendment of the Senate No. 72, concurred in by the House, to correct the date "March 2, 1917," wherever it occurs to read "March 2, 1907."

CREDITS AND REFUNDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 13775, to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to credits and refunds.

The Clerk read the conference report and statement, 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. 13775) to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to credits and refunds, 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 amendment numbered 4.

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

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment and, on page 2 of the House bill, line 16, after the word "taxpayer," insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That if the taxpayer has within five years from the time the return for the taxable year 1917 was due, filed a waiver of his right to have the taxes due for such taxable year determined and assessed within five years after the return was filed, such credit or refund shall be allowed or made if claim therefor is filed either within six years from the time the return for such taxable year 1917 was due or within two years from the time the tax was paid"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert "(b)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 3226 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1318 of the revenue act of 1921, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'unless such suit or proceeding is begun within two years after the disallowance of the part of such claim to which such suit or proceeding relates. The commissioner shall within 90 days after any such disallowance notify the taxpayer thereof by mail.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. R. GREEN,
NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
W. C. HAWLEY,
J. W. COLLIER,
W. A. OLDFIELD,
Managers on the part of the House.

P. J. MCCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,
PETER G. GERRY,
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. 13775) to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to credits and refunds, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendment No. 1: This amendment is a clerical change, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment provides that in the case of income, war-profits, and excess-profits returns for 1917, if the taxpayer has, within five years from the time the return was due, filed a waiver of his right to have the taxes for 1917 assessed within five years from the filing of the return, then a claim for refund or credit may be allowed if claim therefor is filed either within six years from the time the return was due or within two years from the time the tax was paid. The House recedes with an amendment making clerical changes.

On amendment No. 3: The House bill allowed a claim for refund or credit of income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes to be filed within five years from the time the return was due or within one year from the time the tax was paid. The Senate amendment strikes out "one year" and substitutes "two years," and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 4: This amendment provides that where a corporation owned by enemy aliens failed to pay Federal taxes, and the stock of the enemy aliens was seized by the Alien Property Custodian and purchased from the United States by a domestic corporation wholly owned by citizens of the United States, which corporation has paid the taxes, then the Secretary of the Treasury shall collect the taxes from the proceeds of the sale of the stock of the enemy alien and refund the amount thereof to the purchaser. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 5: This amendment makes a clerical change, and the House recedes with an amendment making a further clerical change.

On amendment No. 6: This amendment provides that a taxpayer may file suit for recovery of internal-revenue taxes within two years from the disallowance by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of his claim therefor. The House recedes with an amendment making clerical changes.

W. R. GREEN,
NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
W. C. HAWLEY,
J. W. COLLIER,
W. A. OLDFIELD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the situation with reference to this bill is much the same as the other. The only amendment of any importance which the Senate made the Senate has receded from and left the bill in practically the same form that it left the House, except that one year more is given to taxpayers in which to apply for a refund under certain circumstances. Does the gentleman on the other side want any time? Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

ADMITTING FREE OF DUTY CERTAIN DOMESTIC ANIMALS.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on H. J. Res. 422, permitting the entry free of duty of certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to joint resolu- (H. J. Res. 422) permitting the entry free of duty of certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries, 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 1 and 2.

W. R. GREEN,
NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
W. C. HAWLEY,
J. W. COLLIER,
WM. A. OLDFIELD,
Managers on the part of the House.

P. J. MCCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,
A. A. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this bill permits, under certain circumstances, the free entry of animals taken over into Mexico for a short time to be returned free of duty. It passed the House with practical unanimity and the Senate has receded from its amendments.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This, I understand, is the emergency free-trade measure referred to yesterday. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Tennessee so referred to it. I did not so consider it myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in 8-point type by printing an address delivered by me before the California State Federation of Labor convention at Long Beach, Calif., on October 3, 1922.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. WALTER F. LINEBERGER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR CONVENTION AT LONG BEACH, CALIF., OCTOBER 3, 1922.

"Mr. President and ladies and gentlemen of the California State Federation of Labor, I am indeed proud of the opportunity and privilege afforded me to-day in addressing this convention. No other assemblage gathered under American skies and under American environment, where 'the right of the people to peaceably assemble' is specifically guaranteed under our Constitution, can be quite so representative of these same people, which the framers of the Constitution had in mind, as those who are gathered here to-day representing, as you do, a cross section of the toiling masses of America.

"To the student of the Constitution of the United States, that sacred guarantor of our liberties, it is evident that the guiding principle of those who founded this great Nation of ours had ever in mind was the preservation of the blessings of liberty to the people. The very preamble of the Constitution itself bears significant evidence of this fact, for does it not recite, in words which have become immortal, that 'We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America'?

"In fact, my friends, the people themselves are not only the founders but the guarantors of the perpetuity of the Constitution itself, and without them no government is possible under the system laid down by those great Americans who first voiced to the world the new doctrine of 'Freedom and liberty under God and the Constitution of the United States.' The word 'people' appears in numerous places in the various articles of the Constitution, and no doubt can remain in the mind of anyone who will seriously study the document that our Government must be 'of the people, by the people, and for the people,' lest it perish from the earth.

"Therefore, my fellow Americans, my position is this: That the yardstick of conduct—whether in private or official life—no matter how high or lowly be the place which we may occupy in the scale of general human activities, or of national endeavor, we should adhere to the spirit and intent of the Constitution of the United States.

"I energetically oppose the viewpoint that our Constitution and laws are to be ignored by the rich and powerful and enforced only on the poor and weak. I qualify as un-American the idea that any officer of our Government, no matter how highly placed in the admistrative, judicial, or legislative branches, may violate the spirit or intent under the guise of seeming public necessity or pressure of motives, political or otherwise. No man who can not, upon serious reflection, say that the action which he proposes will assist us in 'forming a more perfect Union,' will promote and 'establish justice,' will 'insure domestic tranquillity,' 'provide for the common defense,' 'promote the general welfare,' and 'secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity' is as much out of tune with the Constitution of the United States as the bootlegger who walks the street plying his iniquitous traffic in violation of the eighteenth amendment. Whether these acts of violation and usurpation are committed by an Attorney General, who, by injunction, abridges in violation of Article I of the Constitution 'freedom of speech' or 'the right of the people peaceably to assemble,' or a Supreme Court judge who nullifies a child labor law on a plain technicality when this law has been passed by the direct representatives of the people in Congress assembled, or, as recently, where the United States Railroad Labor Board, by a false interpretation of the transportation act, deprives workers of a living wage, the effect is the same and the wrong only magnified by the prominence of the principals and the far-reaching effects of their acts.

"If, under our Constitution, we are to safeguard unto ourselves that 'life, liberty, and happiness,' which is our heritage under its provisions, would it not establish justice and promote domestic tranquillity for the United States Railroad Labor Board to accept, without further quibbling or delay, the declaration of principles submitted by Mr. Wharton, one of its members, which reads in substance as follows: 'The right of workers, including common laborers, to a living wage? In fixing wages, minimum rates of pay shall be established, which will insure

the subsistence of the worker and his family in health and reasonable comfort'?

"Under section 307 of the transportation act of 1920, more commonly known as the Esch-Cummins bill, it is made mandatory on the part of the board that, along with other relevant circumstances, they shall consider 'the relation between wages and the cost of living,' and this declaration or instruction alone is sufficient evidence in the mind of any fair-minded person that the Congress which passed this bill certainly contemplated that the board in fixing wages would not attempt to fix the wages of any man at an amount which would be less than would be necessary to support him and his family in reasonable comfort, under existing conditions affecting the cost of living.

"When the 'hazards of employment,' which is also specifically mentioned in the transportation act, are taken into consideration, I would go even further and say that it was the intent of the Congress that the worker should be provided not only with a living wage, so that he may maintain life according to American standards, but that he may be enabled to lay aside a reasonable competence for old age or disability.

"I was not a Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress which passed the Esch-Cummins bill, and had I been I should not have voted for it as submitted. While it contains some few good features, provided certain of its provisions are interpreted as it was the manifest intention of Congress that it should be, still the very fact that it is so imperfect as to permit of such dubious interpretations as those to which I have referred has proven that it is dangerous legislation and that it has fallen far short of the beneficial results prophesied for it by its sponsors.

"Another criticism which I have to make of it is that in permitting certain net interest rate guaranties on investment to take precedence over the so-called living-wage rights of the workers it enacts into legislation a principle to which I am fundamentally opposed, to wit, the priority of property rights over human rights; the first must always yield to the latter if we are to continue to maintain this beloved Nation of ours in a state of domestic tranquillity and secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty and happiness vouchsafed to us by our forefathers.

"Since the legislation under which the Railroad Labor Board is functioning has failed so miserably, it is the duty of Congress without delay to repeal the existing law or to submit various amending acts to bring it in harmony with the views of all progressive-minded citizens, to the end that it may be a bulwark to our Constitution instead of a nullifying influence.

"To this accomplishment I pledge my support and influence through the medium of the Republican Party, of which I am a member.

"I make this declaration because I believe that constructive, progressive achievement in the national political sphere can be best obtained through party channels; I prefer to fight tooth and nail within my party for what is right and progressive, so that I may have a part in shaping its destinies and sharing its achievements, rather than to take part in demagogic exhibitions of omnipotence from without—the net results of which in the field of practical accomplishments are nil—lest it be the echo of rantings and ravings of impractical gentlemen of political mien who can not understand why they alone can not move heaven and earth, even as God created it.

"Remember, my friends, you who have created and perpetuated the great American Federation of Labor, of which this State organization is a branch, that in union there is strength. Organization for collective effort is a cardinal principle of your very existence; without it you can not function.

"So it is with Government—it can not function without party organization and responsibility. And while I would not presume to advise you, I am of the firm opinion that the interests which are dear to your hearts and to my heart, because we are all loyal American citizens, will be best served by having your friends and champions within, rather than without, the two great party organizations, which from time to time alternate in assuming the responsibility of directing the affairs of this great Nation.

"A notable example of the positions to which the champions of labor may rise is afforded by my friend, colleague, and fellow Republican, Hon. John I. Nolan, of California, member of the powerful steering committee in the House, and also chairman of the Committee on Labor in the same body.

"He has the respect and admiration of both parties and is of the timber of which Cabinet members are made. It is not too much to anticipate that he may some day be Secretary of Labor of the United States. What could he have accomplished as an 'independent' or an 'all things to all men' aspirant in the political field, with no set political principles or real party alignment? I leave you to supply the answer to my query.

"In passing, I am proud to have you know that my legislative record, particularly on all matters affecting labor, has had the unqualified indorsement of Mr. Nolan. I have received the same commendation from every other outstanding friend of labor in the lower House. While I did not come here to-day to discuss my own political fortunes in the present campaign or coming November elections, I have never had any doubt but that I would be given a square deal by those to whom I have given a square deal. The service which I have rendered to the cause of labor has not been mere 'lip service,' nor has it been rendered because I desired to court your votes or political support. It has been because the cause of the great laboring masses, forming as they do the vast majority of our people, is just and only when these are happy and contented can this Nation of ours flourish and progress as God intended. Patriotism, the highest of motives—next to obedience to God—should supply the incentive for a square deal toward all, and selfish and shortsighted is the man of wealth, worldly resources, and power who would deny to his fellowman that substance and degree of happiness which is the basis of the social instinct upon which society is builded and upon which the perpetuity of nations depends.

"May California and its Representatives in the National Congress continue to remain in the vanguard of progress, thereby justifying the evolution and betterment which we have attained, and in keeping with the spirit and conscience of the men and women who go to make up our citizenship.

"I have no patience and little toleration for the man of wealth who preaches the predatory doctrine that to the strongest should go the spoils in economic struggles. Their doctrine is often clothed in the guise of patriotism and their selfish motives are all too often concealed behind high-sounding and altruistic phraseology.

"I have no quarrel with the man of wealth per se, provided that it has been accumulated honestly and if he directs his resources toward a sympathetic and helpful solution of the problems which confront his less fortunate brother in labor and industry.

"I believe that labor and capital are the handmaids of progress, and that it behooves both to encourage a closer cooperation and understanding based upon mutual respect and a square deal toward each other as well as to society.

"Only thus can civilization be preserved; and the selfish man of wealth, who would wantonly override the inherent human rights of the many that the few may prosper, has not the right to call himself an American, and in reality is more of a Bolshevik than Lenin or Trotski, who have encompassed the ruin of Russia and estopped the development of free institutions in that great country for perhaps a century.

"I have no patience or sympathy with the I. W. W. or Bolsheviki here or elsewhere, and am proud to bear witness that the American Federation of Labor—through the unrelenting efforts of its venerable president, Samuel Gompers, that grand old man of labor—has practically purged all labor organizations which form a part of the federation of this undesirable, unpatriotic, and subversive element.

"In this he has had the active cooperation and assistance of labor leaders throughout the country. I am not unmindful of the terrific struggle which took place within labor for its control both during and immediately following the great World War. As a participant overseas in that great struggle, and as a member of that great peace-time organization of ex-service men and women—the American Legion—which feels itself in such close touch and sympathy with the ideals and aspirations of your organization, I want to here voice a word of praise for the contribution which patriotic American labor rendered in that great war to save civilization and make right the master of might, not only because of the fact that countless thousands of your organization entered the ranks of our armies but because you furnished your brawn and brains to help create and operate that vast industrial machine and to supply its army of toilers necessary 'to put it across.'

"In addition to these services you suppressed sedition from within your organizations and kept America safe for democracy at home while our armies, composed in great measure of your membership or their sons, laid low the head of the tyrant abroad.

"Hanford MacNider, national commander of the American Legion, only gave expression to the sentiments of the vast majority of the membership of the American Legion when he attended the recent national convention of the American Federation of Labor as their guest and in the magnificent address which he delivered said, in effect, that these two truly representative American organizations, the American Legion and the American Federation of Labor, representing, as no other

two organizations do, great cross sections of the American people, should maintain in peace that close comradeship and association which was established in war, and that together the two organizations should take counsel in an effort to give solution to the great national problems which have followed as war's aftermath, no less than to give effect to the principles for which we fought and for which thousands of our comrades gave their own life's blood.

"Any question as to the patriotism of American labor demonstrates either the grossest ignorance or the grossest prejudice. I fought side by side in four of the major offensives and in various defensive engagements with literally thousands who were recruited from the ranks of organized labor.

"Their patriotism and valor was of the highest order, and our casualty lists of killed and wounded bear mute evidence of their sacrifice.

"The record of labor at home during the war needs no repetition here. The wages paid were hardly commensurate with the cost of living under war conditions, and the fact that thousands of new millionaires grew from the ranks of the profiteers and not from the ranks of labor is additional evidence, if such were needed, that our national disgrace rests not upon the soul or conscience of the soldier of industry any more than it rests upon the soldier who wore a uniform and carried a bayonet.

"The proof of the pudding lies in the eating, and it is a significant fact that no laboring man or group of laboring men or discharged soldier has as yet been investigated or indicted for profiteering during the war.

"I had the privilege of voting for the appropriation of a special fund of $500,000, during the session of Congress just closed, for the purpose of enabling the Attorney General of the United States to proceed without delay to the investigation and prosecution of the so-called war graft cases. It is the confident expectation of Congress and the American people that these archtraitors who have been guilty of this unpardonable crime may be speedily and properly punished by long prison sentences in addition to being forced to disgorge their ill-gotten gains.

"I believe in placing the horse before the cart rather than the reverse, and I am convinced that it was the duty of Congress to proceed by making the necessary appropriation to the Department of Justice for the work in hand rather than to plunge into a Congressional investigation which would hamper rather than promote the ends of justice.

"The Department of Justice is that executive department of the Government created for this very work, and it is not so much an investigation but action in the form of prosecutions that is required.

"I am informed that courts have been created and that prosecutions, and I hope convictions, will ensue at an early date.

"The Attorney General has been given a square deal, and the proposition is now squarely up to him with no opportunity for shifting responsibility. I think I was right in my vote, and I followed my honest convictions. I have confidence in the Attorney General in this matter, and I have confidence in President Harding.

"If the Attorney General shall fail to function in a reasonable length of time, I shall be compelled to lend my efforts to procure his resignation or removal through the proper constitutional channels. I have no apology to make to my critics "of the demagogic appeal" in the matter. I shall continue to use my best judgment and act progressively constructive in legislative matters rather than as an obstructionist. I shall keep my conscience and knowledge of the facts as my yardstick and act as I believe any one of my fair-minded constituents, like yourselves, would act if similarly placed.

"I claim no infallibility, and I find that those who do either are mentally dishonest with a view to the ballot-box returns or else otherwise promoved by an inordinate hankering for office or, to put it more charitably, 'know not whereof they speak.'

"If I continue in the next Congress I shall practice the same sincerity which I have attempted to embody in my address here to-day. I shall never stoop to misrepresentation or demagogic appeal. I shall never adopt any of the questionable expedients of the so-called professional politician to gain an end, political or otherwise, nor seek refuge in political subterfuge or misrepresentation.

"I desire to merit your support and commendation and shall strive to do so so long as it is not at the sacrifice of a principle. My politics shall be those of 'no politics,' and I believe that our minds and experiences, our mental outlooks, as it were, have been along sufficiently parallel lines to warrant me in feeling that we shall not find ourselves in any great disaccord on many, if any, of the paramount issues of the day.

"Because I stand so firmly for a square deal toward labor I am no less convinced that a square deal should be given to capital, as well as to those who have no specific connection with either. I have observed, however, that the man of means is pretty well able to look after himself in this day of organized capital, and it is because of the hopelessness of individual effort in the face of this same organized capital that labor should have and exercise the same privilege of organization; furthermore, it seems to me that another reason for labor organizations is that they devote their power and energies to helping the weak, whereas the strong are usually able to take care of themselves. I see no gulf between honest capital and honest labor which can not be spanned by the chords of human sympathy, mutual respect, and a rigid application of the golden rule to your associations and relationships.

"A fine example of this spirit of mutual helpfulness is exemplified by your presence here to-day in this beautiful home of the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce. They recognize your worthiness and you recognize theirs. There is no place in America for class hatred or distrust if it can be honestly avoided, and to this end labor and capital alike should devote their best efforts.

"Now, there is another matter to which I wish to address myself, inasmuch as it has from time to time engaged the attention of serious-thinking citizens from the inception of our Government. This matter is a question of the limitation of the power and authority of the Supreme Court of the United States, which, since the setting aside of the child labor law, passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, has brought this question back into the limelight of public interest more forcibly than at any previous period of our national existence.

"It is a question which statesmen must ponder and which mere politicians can not side-step or evade.

"Believing, as I do, that the Constitution of the United States means exactly what it says when it says that 'we, the people, * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution,' and that the first clause of this same Constitution declares explicitly that 'all legislative power shall be vested in Congress,' I can but view with alarming disapproval the acts of judicial or administrative authorities which operate to nullify the legislative dictum of the people, expressed through their representatives in Congress.

"It is a situation which urgently requires a remedy, and such must be provided through the proper legislative channels in the National Congress.

"My own views in the matter can not be better expressed than by quoting that venerable California statesman, ex-United States Senator Cole, who has just celebrated his one hundredth birthday at his home in Hollywood. No one who knows Mr. Cole could ever accuse him of being a radical, although his entire career has been devoted to constructive progress in government and politics.

"He has this to say in his Memoirs, published not recently but back in 1908:

"'The first clause of the Federal Constitution declares that "all legislative power shall be vested in Congress." In like manner the executive power is vested in the President of the United States and the judicial power in the courts. The three departments were designed to act independently of each other. This could hardly have been more clearly indicated. For either, therefore, to exercise the functions of another must be usurpation; nevertheless such usurpation repeatedly occurs. The department most frequently encroached upon is the legislative.

"'The people have too often viewed with indifference these encroachments. The executive branch—the President or department minister—has at times taken a free hand in shaping legislation when the interest of a favored few was at stake or when corporate authority was likely to be invaded. Instances are remembered when the veto power was invoked to thwart needed legislation which happened to disagree in some unimportant particular with the personal views of the Executive.

"'In the early years of the Republic the veto was rarely, if ever, called into play, unless to enable the legislative body to correct some slip, inadvertance, or mistake. When properly exercised, the veto is doubtless a wise provision, but it has been grossly misused by some of our Executives. Certainly it was never intended to afford an opportunity for the gratification of the mere whim of the President or to enable him to promote his individual opinions.

"'It has come to pass that legitimate work of the legislature, the only lawmaking power, has been defeated entirely by the arbitrary action of another department. Such abuse could never have been anticipated by the framers of our fundamental law, the language being "all legislative power shall be vested in Congress." The specific duty of the President is not to de-

feat, but to see that the legislative work is effectual, even though it may not accord with his notions.

"'But not by the Executive alone are acts of Congress defeated. The use of the veto for that purpose has found a parallel in the freedom and frequency with which the Supreme Court has assumed to nullify laws on the ground of unconstitutionality. The court claims the exclusive right to interpret the Constitution and to ascribe unlooked-for meanings to that instrument; and, moreover, to give their construction, however arbitrary, the full force of a law of the land.

"'As a matter of fact, each individual employed by the Government, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial departments, is required to subscribe to an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, an obligation not less binding upon one than upon another, not less upon a Member of Congress than upon a Justice of the Supreme Court. Each swears to support the Constitution of the United States as understood by himself and not as understood by some one else, and surely the Constitution is not so cabalistic and abstruse that persons of ordinary understanding and capable of performing the duties of public office can not comprehend its meaning. On the contrary, it is remarkable for its simplicity and perspicuity. It would be most unreasonable to require an oath for its support were its meaning even doubtful.

"'The Constitution is essentially the creation of the people. Its opening declaration is, "We, the people, * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution." It was created by the people for themselves, and no person or tribunal can be presumed to have a better comprehension of its meaning and purpose than the immediate Representatives of the people assembled in the two Houses of Congress.

"'Whether wise or not, their interpretation must be conceded to be more in harmony with the views of the common people and with the purposes of the Constitution than that even of the highest court, the members of which are selected for their legal training. These exalted functionaries on the Supreme Bench, owing to their life tenure of office, are as far removed from popular influence as possible and, being but men, are much more likely to sympathize with the powerful than with the weak. Naturally, too many of them, by refinement of reasoning in the construction of the Constitution, favor the few as against the many, the rich as against the poor.'

"When one considers that all the foregoing was written by ex-Senator Cole nearly 15 years ago and that his conclusions were principally based upon his legislative experiences and observations as a Member of both the upper and lower Houses of Congress from 1863 to 1872, we see that this is an old and underlying problem of our system of government. That great American, Theodore Roosevelt, when President of the United States, tried to remedy this same situation when he sponsored the recall of judicial decisions, particularly those which outraged the public conscience.

"I quite agree with Mr. Cole in his observations as well as his conclusions, and I am sorry that he did not go further and supply a remedy for the evil, which of late has become increasingly evident to all who are not so blind as to be unable or unwilling to see.

"I believe the remedy to lie along constitutional legislative lines, to be enacted by the people themselves through their representatives. The President and the Members of Congress are each individually and collectively subject to removal by the people, who at stated intervals exercise the referendum in elections which may result in the recall or confirmation of the individual or party in office.

"Supreme Court judges being appointed for life, no such recall or referendum can be exercised.

"To that extent their position, so far as tenure of office is concerned, is inviolate, but I do not believe that they should continue to occupy, so far as their opinions concerning the interpretation of constitutionality of laws enacted by Congress is concerned, that impregnable position which by practice they have arrogated unto themselves.

"The Executive can be overridden in his veto by a two-thirds vote of both Houses, and I believe that the judicial branch of our Government should not be exempt from similar limitations; a lack of limitations confers upon it greater prerogatives than those enjoyed by the Executive.

"I am, therefore, in favor of the necessary legislation to give Congress, by a two-thirds vote, the right to override the decisions of the Supreme Court affecting the constitutionality of laws passed by Congress. I believe this is in the interest of a greater balance of power between the three great departments of our Government, and while it is anticipated that it will cause Congress to exercise the greatest care and diligence in the preparation and passage of legislation, it will in the last analysis keep the power in the hands of the people, through their representatives, and prevent any tendency toward the creation in our Republic of a tyranny of the judiciary, which, unbridled, may be likened unto the tyranny of kings.

"A child-labor amendment may then be added to our Constitution with solid assurance that the children of the land shall receive equal consideration with that buttery and plebeian article of food, oleomargarine.

"This and other progressive legislation must be written into our laws if we are to keep abreast of the times in which we live. I hope the day is not far distant when our Presidents, under a properly safeguarded constitutional amendment, may be nominated and elected on a party ticket by the direct vote of the people. Thus would the last barriers of privilege and bossism in party politics be broken down.

"The direct primary is the most sacred possession of the people and must be preserved at all costs, but it must have its imperfections corrected where they are found to exist, and I am now talking particularly about the California law—I do not care what party or set of men are responsible for those of its provisions which are politically unmoral and dishonest. I refer to the provision which permits a man to seek nomination and election as a member of a political party in whose principles he does not believe and of which he is not a member.

"It encourages political chameleonship and mental dishonesty among candidates, and is subversive of good government in the interests of the people.

"It provides a sickening spectacle from which the enemies of the direct primary law draw inspiration and hope for discrediting the whole system, and our law ought to be moralized by amending it in the coming legislature so that men in politics will be forced to practice the same honesty and sincerity before the people in seeking political preferment which men are called upon to practice in order to merit the respect of their fellow men in the ordinary affairs of life.

"Would the corner grocery storekeeper be justified in professing the religion of Jew, Gentile, and Pharisee, all at the same time, in order to draw patronage from all quarters?

"Let us have progressive honest members of all parties, but let us know where they stand, and let them seek their political laurels within the party of their choice and convictions, for 'he that assumeth to be all things to all men knoweth not from whence he cometh nor whither he goeth.'

"I am a Republican and seek your suffrage as such and nothing else. I am proud of my party and its achievements. It has its reactionary and radical elements, just as labor and capital have, and just as other parties have—and it is made up of human beings with all the imperfections and frailties of human nature. I would not be honest with you if I did not admit as much—I have come here to-day to meet you as men and as fellow citizens—on the level—and I am going to talk to you on the square—right down the line.

"I shall not pose as a high brow nor perform before you as a demagogue; such action would not only reflect upon your intelligence but would also bring into question my own. We have not accomplished all we promised or set out to accomplish; but, on the whole, the batting average of the Republican Party in power, individually as well as collectively, I believe you will admit, has been good.

"To substantiate these conclusions I desire to point toward some of the things which the Republican Congress and Republican administration have accomplished since they came into power.

"Cut the Nation's debt $1,000,000,000 in one short year.

"Cut appropriations for expenditures of the Government below what they were for the year ending June 30, 1921, by over $1,000,000,000.

"Cut actual expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, more than $3,000,000,000 below what they were for the year 1920.

"Cut taxation for this year more than $818,000,000.

"Cut the pay roll of the Government, including Army, Navy, and civilians, down from 1,186,052 persons—which it was in 1920—to about 770,000 for this fiscal year.

"Passed the budget law which had been vetoed by President Wilson in the previous Congress, and which has placed the Government on a business basis and been responsible for saving millions upon millions of dollars of the people's money.

"Brought the selling value of Liberty bonds up to above par, adding about $3,000,000,000 to the value of these issues, which are still largely owned by the patriotic citizens of small means,

"Given to the country a tariff bill which will protect American labor and industry by equalizing the difference between the cost of production, under decent living conditions, for the American workman and the pauper labor of Europe and Asia.

"Revived the War Finance Corporation which has loaned—not appropriated—over $350,000,000, and has proved to be of immense value to the farmers of the country and kept down the price of essential foodstuffs to the laboring classes of the great cities.

"Initiated and led in the great limitation of armament conference, which is the greatest step yet taken toward world-wide peace, and its results have not only already stopped the 'rumors of war' here on the Pacific but will save this country of ours untold billions of dollars which we would otherwise expend in the mad race of naval armaments.

"I think this is a record of which I and those among you who are Republicans may well feel proud. I know that my party has been criticized from within as well as from without, constructively as well as destructively, but I have more confidence in the sincerity of that which comes from within and is constructive than I have in the other kind, which is of the 'Irish confetti' or brickbat kind and usually comes from without.

"It usually comes from the Democrats or their political attachés, sailing under various 'isms' or 'ists,' and is calculated with astute concern in the returns of the ballot box. The mandate of 7,000,000 majority given by the American people two years ago has on the whole been well exercised, and I do not believe they will desire to change it.

"Labor must continue to have its friends in Congress, sitting as members of the dominant party, and quite frankly I solicit your support as such, as a Republican, on the Republican ticket in the coming elections.

"The criticism which I have voiced here to-day is as an American rather than as a partisan. I have intended that it be constructive and in consonance with the progressive ideals for which I and my constituents stand.

"I propose to assist in bringing about these corrective changes through the medium of the great Republican Party—founded by Lincoln, perpetuated and strengthened by Roosevelt, and now presided over by President Harding—to the end that the great principles upon which it is builded may prevail for the upbuilding of our country and the happiness and prosperity of all of its citizens.

"If the people of this district do not desire a progressive dry Republican to represent them in Congress, I am not the man to keep in Congress. My opponent, of course, claims to be progressive as well as dry, and I do not question the latter; as to the former, he sat and voted with the Democrats and now is running as one, although he did but recently 'recommend himself very highly' for the Republican nomination, but his appeal fell on deaf ears so far as the Republicans were concerned.

"Quite a paradox—he does not consider us good enough to belong to, yet he appealingly and most persistently tries to garner in good Republican votes against a perfectly good Republican candidate. I admit it myself. Yet for publicity my opponent challengeth much.

"Now, in conclusion and quite briefly, I want to say to you, if you have not already surmised it, that I do not look with favor upon government by injunction, either temporary or permanent. If the laws of the land be infringed let the law take its course, but let not the constitutional rights of free-born American citizens be invaded. According to my way of thinking no man, not even the Attorney General of the United States, has a right to ask that our court processes be made independent of statutory restrictions and constitutional limitations, so that they may become responsive to his conceptions of necessity or convenience.

"It is a far-reaching precedent which he proposes to establish. Let the legal practices of our forefathers and something of their homely fair-mindedness and justice still prevail; let the jury system and the constitutional rights of our citizens still remain inviolate, no matter what the seeming justification to satisfy opinion or mere form.

"I am not a lawyer, but this is my view of the matter as a plain American, and I am sure it is concurred in by millions of others whose stock, like my own, came to this country long before the American Revolution.

"Just another word and I am done. I would not feel that I had fairly covered the field of national questions were I not to express my views to you on law enforcement, and particularly in regard to the eighteenth amendment and Volstead Act. I do not raise this issue in any sanctimonious or 'holier than thou' attitude, but, as a fellow citizen addressing a body of his peers, I want you to know that I am for the strict adherence to the Constitution of the United States and all the laws which are provided for the enforcement of its provisions.

"I am uncompromisingly opposed to any letting down of the bars in favor of light wines and beers, and have voted and worked to this end during my present incumbency and will continue to do so in the future. I am for this legislation for moral, sociological, and economic reasons, and I believe that its enactment has been the greatest boon to the laboring classes and their dependents of any reform in the world's history. I hope the Wright Act, coming up as a referendum measure on the November ballot, will pass. I want to see California ratify the eighteenth amendment and augment the power of the Federal Government with the police power of the municipal, county, and State governments to the end that the law may be rigidly enforced for rich and poor alike; that effect may be given to the Constitution; and last, but not least, that this country may be a better place for us, our children, and our children's children to live in.

"In conclusion—and I mean it this time—I want to thank you as a citizen of Long Beach for honoring us with your presence by having chosen this as your convention city for this year. Labor has had an outstanding part in the building of this beautiful city by the western sea. Some of your State and local officials live among us, and I can assure you that none of our citizens are held in higher esteem than these 'soldiers of industry' and their families who live in Long Beach.

"We are proud that they are our fellow Americans and we feel a particular patriotic thrill when we see your great organization gathered here to-day with 'Old Glory' hanging o'er. We know that you share in large measure not only in placing there those stars of white on a field of blue which represent the great galaxy of States, but that the white of its folds represents the purity of your patriotism, as the red of its stripes represents the crimson sacrifice of your own flesh and blood to preserve unsullied the principles and traditions of our beloved country, of which our flag is but the proud emblem.

"American institutions are safe so long as American labor is patriotic, and may God stay the hand and thwart the purposes of those who, by unfair dealing or oppression, would crush the Americanism out of American labor.

"That day will never come when this will come to pass, but were such a thing possible it would be a sad moment, not only for us but for the world. He who thinks otherwise is naught of a patriot.

"May your sessions be productive of great good, not only to your own organization but to others, and above all to America, which is the hope of the world. May you enjoy our sunshine and flowers, be cooled by our gentle sea breezes, bask in the smiles of our Long Beach maidens, and be showered by the good will and hospitality of the residents of this, our Long Beach, one of the finest cities, in the best district, in the best State of the best country on earth."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I incorporated an article on interest by John B. Barnhill. This is done by request of parties interested in this subject, but I express no opinion on the merits of the article.

"MONEY"—INTEREST—THE NATION'S OLD MAN OF THE SEA—UNESCAPABLE UNDER THE PRESENT MONEY SYSTEM—JAMES HOLDEN'S REACTION TO THE FACTS OF EVERYDAY BUSINESS.

(By John Basil Barnhill, in the Dearborn Independent.)

[Editor's note: The following article is not presented with any purpose save to throw a light on "interest." Holden's reaction to the question in his proposal of land certificates may or may not be wise—on that we say nothing. The Dearborn Independent is not proposing any cut-and-dried solution. It is primarily interested in encouraging its readers to look the money question in the face. To this end it publishes articles from all angles.]

Many years ago I was in the business of lending eastern money to Kansas farmers. I loaned a million and a half dollars, and I watched those farmers sweat over their rich soil to pay the interest. It was my business to get that interest, so I watched them closely, and I know what it meant to them. Then one day it struck me as absurd that these men who owned their land, their horses, and their tools should have to hire the money with which to carry on their work. Why shouldn't they own their money, too? It was but another tool of their trade. I then discovered that Congress provides only a small fraction of the money that producers require to carry on production, and that the needless dearth of money forces the use of bank credit in commercial transactions.

In the foregoing words James Holden explained how he, a real estate agent and usurer, was transformed into a reformer and opponent of

interest; like Paul of Tarsus, he was smitten to his knees by a great light; he saw the "vision splendid" of a liberated humanity.

The record of his struggles against poverty, apathy, and countless obstacles while fighting for the recognition of his remedy would transcend the bounds of human belief if one did not know that in every prophet is a Mother Calculus, which measures its joys by its sacrifices.

The inspiration was complete when Holden realized that all the banker does is to monetize the value of the farm. And as there must be an entering wedge to every movement, the prophet proclaimed his doctrine of land currency. The Government says that currency issued on gold shall be legal tender; Holden would add valuable land and other forms of wealth.

DOCTOR CRANE A CONVERT.

One of Holden's converts is a journalist, Dr. Frank Crane, who in a magazine article says:

"The proposal is to base currency, not on gold, which varies in quantity, but upon the most stable, get-at-able, and the most indestructible thing known, to wit, land. Let any man owning a piece of land, town or country, go directly to the Government, monetize—not mortgage—his land to it at 1 or 2 per cent, and receive 40 per cent of its value in Government bills, which shall be legal tender for everything. This land currency can be issued without disturbing present conditions and without introducing any new and debatable principles in finance.

In an indorsement of the Holden plan, Arno Dosch-Fleurot, at present European correspondent of the New York World, writes:

"Holden holds that the dearth of legal tender is the cause of poverty. According to Holden, the root of all evil is not money but the lack of money. He wants us to issue money on land because he feels land is safe backing. But his primary object is to create enough money to go around. We are always up against it for money because there is not enough money. The dollar is elusive because there are six owners of each real dollar. We can not get what does not exist. Five of us are bound to be disappointed. More than five—as it has worked out—are disappointed, because most of it has already been caught. We are compelled to borrow it of those who have been clever or canny enough to corner the scant supply. In course of time they have accumulated more than their share, and, if we want any of it, we must pay them for the use of it and help them to accumulate more. This process has been going on for centuries. In every new country it starts anew. That is why the wealth of the world concentrates in few hands, and the older the country the harder the conditions of life. Interest does it, and, as things stand, we must pay the interest annually on more than $30,000,000,000—thirty thousand millions—of bank credit substitutes for real (legal tender) money."

THE RAVAGES OF INTEREST.

The writer might have said that this tribute is paid to the banks by the people on the people's own money.

Paul Thieman, former editor of the Denver Post, in an editorial review of Holden's book, "The Disturbing Factor in Human Affairs," says:

"Holden's proposition is not humanitarianism; it is not confiscation; it is not socialism—it is something new and unique, though simple, that fits with the present laws and order of society. He traces the origin of all social ills to a fundamental cause, namely, to the ravages of interest. Interest, the unescapable. Unescapable under the present money system. Why unescapable? For the simple reason that all business is transacted with a circulating medium that is limited in amount, and no matter how much wealth you possess you must pay interest to the owners of the fixed circulating medium. Why, to be sure, whether it's the gold standard, free silver, or even the old Greenback Party idea, the same would be true, namely, a circulating medium for which interest must be paid. I saw clearly the distinction—the enormous and utterly complete distinction between wealth and money. I saw the startling point that while civilized society possesses wealth so vast that the figures mean something incalculable, it transacts business with a meager fraction of that wealth in the form of dollars of gold and silver. And this man in calm words was pointing out that the gigantic fabric of modern society was the victim of the rude money system of our barbaric ancestors.

"It was all so horribly simple. It was interest on top of interest, endless and everlasting. Fancy a hundred families on an island instead of millions of families on a continent! Fancy that the 100 families had prospered and had plentiful herds and goods and luxuries but that they had limited themselves in exchanging the fruits of their labor and thrift to 10 pounds of gold or silver—or anything else—and every time they wanted to buy they would have to 'borrow' of the possessors of the 10 pounds of precious metals!

"And finally they used notes and obligations on paper, and to discharge these they had to pay 'interest' to the owners of the circulating medium. And one day the owners of most of the 10 pounds of gold or silver refused to lend it—then what? Why, of course, starvation and hardship in the midst of plenty, if the rule held inviolate.

"Apply that to the population of a continent and its vast and varied industries and you have the money system of Christendom."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. STAFFORD. 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:

Almon	Carter	Denison	Hudspeth
Anderson	Chandler, N. Y.	Drane	Humphreys, Miss.
Arentz	Chandler, Okla.	Dupré	Jacoway
Barbour	Clark, Fla.	Dyer	Johnson, Miss.
Bird	Classon	Ellis	Jones, Pa.
Bland, Ind.	Clouse	Freeman	Kahn, Calif.
Brennan	Codd	French	Keller
Britten	Cole, Ohio	Fuller	Kelley, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Connolly, Pa.	Garner	Kennedy
Brown, Tenn.	Cooper, Ohio	Gorman	Kindred
Browne, Wis.	Copley	Gould	King
Buchanan	Coughlin	Hadley	Kirkpatrick
Burke	Crago	Hardy, Tex.	Kitchin
Burtness	Cullen	Hawes	Kleczka
Carew	Davis, Minn.	Hays	Kline, N. Y.
Knight	Nolan	Ryan	Thomas
Lanham	O'Connor	Sabath	Thorpe
Larson, Minn.	Olpp	Schall, Minn.	Treadway
Lazaro	Overstreet	Scott, Mich.	Vaile
Linthicum	Paige	Scott, Tenn.	Voigt
Luhring	Park, Ga.	Sears	Wheeler
McClintic	Patterson, Mo.	Shelton	White, Me.
McPherson	Patterson, N. J.	Slemp	Williams, Tex.
Maloney	Pringey	Smith, Mich.	Wise
Michaelson	Rainey, Ala.	Stiness	Wood, Ind.
Miller	Riddick	Stoll	Yates
Montague	Rodenberg	Sullivan	Zihlman
Mudd	Rose	Summers, Wash.	
Newton, Mo.	Rosenbloom	Taylor, Ark.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll 312 Members have answered to their names—a quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

MICHIGAN BOULEVARD BUILDING CO.—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 5918) for a relief of the Michigan Boulevard Building Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report, 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. 5918) for the relief of the Michigan Boulevard Building Co., 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.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
H. B. STEAGALL,
Managers on the part of the House.
ARTHUR CAPPER,
F. R. GOODING,
PARK TRAMMELL,
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. 5918) for the relief of the Michigan Boulevard Building Co. submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The amount is reduced from $31,931.69 to $18,931.69.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
H. B. STEAGALL,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. BOX. Am I correctly informed that the Senate receded from its amendments to this bill, and that the bill now stands as it passed the House?

Mr. EDMONDS. The Senate advanced the sum awarded the Boulevard Co. by some ten or twelve thousand dollars and receded from the amendment and accepted the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14144) to limit and fix the time within which suits may be brought or rights asserted in court arising out of the provisions of subdivision 3 of section 302 of the soldiers and sailors' civil relief act, approved March 18, 1918, being chapter 20, volume 40, General Statutes of the United States, with Senate amendments, and move to agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 14144, with Senate amendments, and moves to concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reported the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14077) to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 14401) to amend and modify the war risk insurance act.

PER DIEM ALLOWANCE TO OFFICERS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13430) to amend section 370 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the bill H. R. 13430, now on the Speaker's table, with a Senate amendment thereto, and moves to concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

GRANT ROAD, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table Senate bill 4117, authorizing the closing of certain portions of Grant Road in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls up from the Speaker's table Senate bill 4117, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to close, vacate, and abandon so much of Grant Road as lies between Reno Road and Connecticut Avenue NW., upon the acquisition by the District of Columbia by dedication, purchase, or condemnation of the land lying within the lines of Davenport Street between Reno Road and Connecticut Avenue, and within the lines of Thirty-sixth Street between Davenport Street and Connecticut Avenue, as laid down upon the permanent system of highways for the District of Columbia, the title to the portion of said Grant Road so closed and abandoned to revert to the abutting property owners.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to sell a tract or parcel of land owned by the District of Columbia, numbered for purposes of assessment and taxation as parcel 46 over 20: *Provided*, That said tract or parcel of land shall not be sold by said commissioners at a price less than the assessed value thereof: *Provided further*, That the money so realized shall be expended in the purchase of a playground or school site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

A similar House bill was ordered to lie on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-six Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Classon	Glynn	Kindred
Aswell	Codd	Gorman	King
Benham	Connolly, Pa.	Gould	Kitchin
Bird	Copley	Graham, Pa.	Kleczka
Bland, Ind.	Crago	Greene, Vt.	Kline, N. Y.
Brand	Cullen	Hawes	Knight
Brennan	Dale	Hayden	Lanham
Britten	Davis, Minn.	Hays	Larson, Minn.
Brooks, Ill.	Denison	Husted	Lazaro
Brown, Tenn.	Drane	Jacoway	Linthicum
Browne, Wis.	Dyer	Johnson, Miss.	Longworth
Burke	Echols	Jones, Pa.	Luhring
Burtness	Ellis	Jones, Tex.	McClintic
Carew	Fenn	Kahn	McCormick
Chandler, N. Y.	Freeman	Kearns	McDuffie
Chandler, Okla.	Garner	Keller	McFadden
Clark, Fla.	Gifford	Kennedy	McLaughlin, Pa.
Maloney	Patterson, N. J.	Smith, Mich.	Voigt
Michaelson	Pringey	Sproul	Wheeler
Montague	Rainey, Ala.	Steagall	White, Me.
Morin	Riddick	Stiness	Williams, Ill.
Mudd	Rogers	Stoll	Williams, Tex.
Newton, Minn.	Rose	Sullivan	Wise
Newton, Mo.	Rosenbloom	Taylor, Ark.	Wood, Ind.
Ogden	Ryan	Taylor, Colo.	Wright
Olpp	Schall	Thomas	Yates
Overstreet	Scott, Mich.	Thorpe	Zihlman
Paige	Sears	Treadway	
Park, Ga.	Shelton	Vestal	
Patterson, Mo.	Slemp	Vinson	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this call 308 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

REORGANIZATION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4245) to provide the necessary organization of the customs service for an adequate administration and enforcement of the tariff act of 1922, and all other customs laws, with an amendment thereto reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to appoint, pursuant to the civil-service laws and regulations, fix the compensation, and prescribe the duties, when not otherwise defined by law, of one director of customs (in lieu of chief, division of customs), two assistant directors of customs (in lieu of two assistant chiefs, division of customs), one director, special agency service of the customs, and one assistant director, all with headquarters in the District of Columbia. The director of the special agency service and assistant director shall be officers of the special agency service familiar with the statutory and prescribed duties of that service.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby further authorized and directed to appoint deputy collectors, deputy comptrollers, deputy surveyors, deputy and assistant appraisers, examiners of merchandise, inspectors, and such other customs officers, laborers, and other employees as he shall deem necessary, prescribe their designations and duties when not otherwise defined by law, and fix their compensation. He is authorized to appoint special agents of the customs service in number as now provided by law and fix their compensation, and to appoint and fix the compensation of such number of customs agents as he may deem necessary, all of whom shall perform their duties as defined by existing law or prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, under the immediate supervision of the director, special agency service of the customs. He shall likewise appoint and fix the compensation of the clerks and other employees of the Board of United States General Appraisers. The appointment of such customs officers and employees shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and regulations upon the nomination of the principal officer in charge of the office to which such appointments are to be made.

SEC. 3. That the collectors of customs, comptrollers of customs, surveyors of customs, and appraisers of merchandise shall each, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, appoint a customs officer familiar with the customs laws and procedure, to act and be known as the assistant collector, the assistant comptroller, the assistant surveyor, and the chief assistant appraiser (in lieu of the special deputies), and the Secretary of the Treasury shall fix their compensation. The collector of customs at the port of New York shall also, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, appoint a customs officer qualified in the law and familiar with customs procedure, to act and be known as solicitor to the collector, whose compensation shall likewise be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 4. That in case of a vacancy in the office of a collector of customs, comptroller of customs, surveyor of customs, or appraiser of merchandise, such assistant collector, assistant comptroller, assistant surveyor, or chief assistant appraiser shall give bond when required, act as such officer, and receive the compensation of such office until an appointment thereto has been made and the person so appointed has duly qualified. Whenever a vacancy occurs in the position of such assistants, chief assistant, and solicitor to the collector, herein provided for, it shall be filled, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, by the promotion or transfer of a trained and qualified customs officer, and the assistant, chief assistant, and solicitor to the collector so appointed shall continue in office and shall not be reduced or removed except for cause and in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations.

SEC. 5. That all customs officers and employees, including customs officers and employees in foreign countries, in addition to their compensation shall receive their necessary traveling expenses and actual expenses incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty and away from their designated station, and when transferred from one official station to another for duty may be allowed, within the discretion and under written orders of the Secretary of the Treasury, the expenses incurred for packing, crating, freight, and drayage in the transfer of their household effects and other personal property, not exceeding in all 5,000 pounds.

SEC. 6. That the compensation of all customs officers and employees, including the director and assistant director of customs, herein provided for, and the expenses authorized by section 5 of this act, shall be paid from the appropriation for the collection of the revenue from customs.

SEC. 7. That section 1 of the act entitled "An act fixing the compensation of certain officials in the customs service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1909, is repealed. Except in the case of laborers, no compensation fixed under this act shall be greater than 30 per cent in excess of the limitations of existing law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. COLLIER. I demand a second.

Mr. FORDNEY. I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this bill is simple in character and easy to understand, but nevertheless it has far-reaching effect in the way of a sounder administration of the customs service and in the way of remedying a great injustice which now exists. In order to understand just what the bill accomplishes it is necessary to understand the present situation. Mr. Speaker, may I suspend? I think I am interfering with the conversation of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the distinguished gentleman should have a quorum here, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Focht	Logan	Schall
Bell	Frear	Longworth	Scott, Mich.
Bird	Freeman	Luhring	Sears
Bland, Ind.	Garner	McArthur	Shelton
Brand	Glynn	McClintic	Sisson
Brennan	Gorman	McFadden	Slemp
Britten	Gould	McPherson	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Graham, Pa.	McSwain	Smithwick
Brown, Tenn.	Hawes	Maloney	Stedman
Browne, Wis.	Hayden	Michaelson	Steenerson
Burdick	Hays	Montague	Stiness
Burke	Herrick	Moore, Ill.	Stoll
Burtness	Husted	Mudd	Sullivan
Cantrill	Jacoway	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Ark.
Carew	Johnson, Miss.	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler, N. Y.	Jones, Pa.	Ogden	Ten Eyck
Chandler, Okla.	Kahn, Calif.	Olpp	Thomas
Clague	Keller	Overstreet	Thorpe
Clark, Fla.	Kelley, Mich.	Paige	Treadway
Classon	Kennedy	Park, Ga.	Volgt
Codd	Kiess	Patterson, Mo.	Ward, N. C.
Connolly, Pa.	Kindred	Patterson, N. J.	Wheeler
Copley	King	Paul	White, Me.
Crago	Kitchin	Pringey	Williams, Ill.
Cullen	Kleczka	Rainey, Ala.	Williams, Tex.
Dale	Kline, N. Y.	Riddick	Wise
Davis, Minn.	Knight	Rodenberg	Wood, Ind.
Denison	Lanham	Rogers	Wright
Drane	Larson, Minn.	Rose	
Dyer	Lazaro	Rosenbloom	
Ellis	Linthicum	Ryan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will open the doors——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The motion was not put on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama objects to dispensing with further proceedings under the call. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 103, noes 27.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote, because there is no quorum present on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The roll call has just disclosed the fact that there is a quorum and no business has been transacted except the attempt to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. POU. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina demands the yeas and nays on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. Thirty-nine gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The roll call has just disclosed there is a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order respectfully that the yeas and nays are demanded by one-fifth of the Members present. Thirty-nine Members arose, and if there should not be five times 39 present, 39 would be a sufficient number, and I ask for a count of the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The roll call just disclosed that 307 Members are present. Thirty-seven gentlemen arose demanding a roll call.

Mr. BLANTON. It is very evident there are not 307 present now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, to properly understand this bill I remind you of the fact that to-day the Secretary of the Treasury fixes 95 per cent of the salaries in the Treasury Department subject to certain maximum limitations imposed by law, and that except for deputy appraisers, deputy collectors and employees of that class, and the heads, of course, such as the collector, he fixes the salary of all other employees. Now, what does the bill seek to accomplish? In the first place, it takes these employees from outside of the classified civil service and puts them in the classified civil service, which is in line with the best civil-service reform. There is another great advantage in that it gives to the examiners, who are the most important men in the Customs Service because the Government has to rely on their judgment to pass on millions of dollars worth of merchandise, hundreds of millions; every year it gives them the opportunity of ultimate promotion to an executive position with a salary commensurate with their work. In the second place, it provides that the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion may increase the existing limitations provided by law by 30 per cent. Now, the purpose of that is to render the whole salary list more flexible and to permit in certain individual cases an increase to men who are worth to the Government every year three or four times what the Government is paying them and who could get three or four times what the Government is paying in private employment. I refer to the examiners in particular.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. Briefly; I have only five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. It does not mean all are going to be increased 30 per cent.

Mr. MILLS. It does not mean that all, of course, are going to be given the increase of 30 per cent, but it does mean in certain cases where men are of extraordinary value to the Government because of their unusual knowledge of the value of merchandise to give them to the extent of 30 per cent an increase of salary in an effort to retain them. And how important this is is indicated by the fact that in the course of the last year the Government out of some 120 of these employees lost 22 of its best examiners by reason of its inability to increase their salary adequately.

Finally, I come to what I consider the third most important provision of the bill. The limitation on the salaries of ordinary laborers is what it was 50 years ago, fixed at $840. I submit to this House that such a salary paid by the United States Government is literally indecent. There is not a man with a family in the city of New York or Philadelphia or Boston, or in any of the great cities, who can support a family on $840, and if this is true the Government of the United States is paying starvation wages to these men.

But there is another side to it. The salaries of laborers in these great cities are fixed by the economic conditions which govern in those cities and which fix the salaries or wages earned by laborers in other lines of industry. The result is that the United States Government to-day is obliged to take the cripples, the halt, almost the blind, to perform its work, and with the increasing labor shortage, which any man can see, I prophesy that it will shortly be literally impossible in a city like New York to obtain labor sufficient to carry on the work of the Government.

There is another great disadvantage which applies to all inadequate salaries. These men take fees or tips from private individuals to supplement their inadequate resources.

Now, there are other minor features of the bill which I would be willing, of course, to go into and explain if there were time, but I have got only five minutes. This bill comes to us from the Treasury Department with the strongest kind of recommendation that it do pass. It is desired to increase the efficiency of the service and enable the United States to do justice to its employees. Gentlemen suggest that it necessarily will increase the amount of money expended. I say it does not create a new position. It does not in any way change the situa-

tion, so far as the money is concerned, because the money expended by the Treasury Department will be, as to-day, limited by the amount appropriated by Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one more minute to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. MILLS. I say the money expended by the Treasury Department is simply limited by the amount appropriated by Congress. Congress in the future, as it does to-day, will fix the amount to be expended by that department. But if this bill passes the Secretary of the Treasury, within the amount provided by Congress, will within certain definite limitations be able to fix the salaries of men in accordance with their ability and in accordance with the service rendered to the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. This is a very important matter we are considering, and we should have a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is dilatory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hardly thinks so.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina withhold that point for a moment?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will withhold it a moment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two or three minutes in the midst of this in order to make a brief statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is the last day of the session. Gentlemen, of course, understand that it takes a certain amount of time to enroll bills and put them in shape where they can receive the signature of the Executive. The time that is left is not sufficient to permit any very great number of bills passing and reaching the stage where they can be signed and become laws. I think it would help things very much if the Speaker pro tempore could, within a little while, lay before the House the program that he intends to follow for the rest of the day; that is to say, who is going to be recognized for suspension. Of course, so far as unanimous consents are concerned, that it is not important. I think if the House could have that information—could have the program before it—we might expedite matters very much.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. POU. Does not the gentleman think we could expedite matters very efficiently if the agreement should be carried out that was made with me to follow immediately after the farm credits bill and not have it broken?

Mr. MONDELL. What is that? I do not know what that is.

Mr. POU. The agreement as to the $10,000,000 boll weevil nitrate revolving fund bill, to which the Committee on Rules gave a unanimous report.

Mr. MONDELL. It has no more to do with the boll weevil than with the potato bug. Why does the gentleman give it a name that does not apply?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I can not answer the gentleman's question, but I do not know about that agreement. But I do think it would be quite desirable, if possible, if we might have—I do not ask it now—if we might have, in the course of half an hour or so, the program laid before the House, in so far as the Speaker pro tempore is able to do it. I realize, of course, it would have to be conditional, because there are matters coming up that the Speaker pro tempore would be bound to give recognition to, as, for instance, conference reports.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, you would not agree that this filibuster would stop, even if the program was presented, unless it had on it the things you desired or had off of it things that you did not want to have considered.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have not heard anything about a filibuster or anything of that sort. [Laughter.]

Mr. SNYDER. I was wondering whether, even if the program was presented, we would be permitted to go on.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A quorum ought to be here to do business. I have not heard anything about a filibuster. The gentleman from New York may have.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a constitutional requirement, that there should be a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] withhold his point of order?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will withhold it for a moment. I will withhold it, if the gentleman from Wyoming desires to make a statement, for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, as the power of recognition rests with the Chair under suspension, the Chair must determine what gentlemen shall be recognized and what measures are to be considered.

My own view of the situation, so far as I have any influence over it, is that we should endeavor to dispose of the important and essential public business, bills of a public character that must be disposed of, or at least should be disposed of to avoid the necessity of an extra session.

I am in hopes that we may agree on a farm credit bill; I hope before we adjourn we may agree on a reclassification bill. I hope that before we adjourn that matters between the House and Senate of importance and of a public character may be disposed of—that all the bridge bills may be passed. I think it would be a little difficult for the Speaker to say at this time just what business would be taken up—that is, to enumerate all the bills that are to be taken up. I do not think I should have very much disagreement with the gentleman from Tennessee as to what ought to be considered in this time. Frankly, I do not think that the bill referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] should be taken up and considered. I do not believe it is wise legislation, and I do not see how an opportunity can be given to consider it without setting aside other important matters.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago a hearing was had by the Rules Committee on a joint resolution which had been unanimously passed by the Senate providing an appropriation of $10,000,000 to be used by the President of the United States in furnishing nitrate of soda and calcium arsenate for the purpose of meeting the boll-weevil menace. The measure, as I have just said, passed the Senate unanimously, was unanimously reported from the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Rules of the House unanimously reported a rule giving the resolution privileged status. I was assured on several different occasions by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that in so far as he had the power the rule would be presented to the House immediately following the disposition of the farm credits bill. Now it appears that that agreement is not to be carried out, and the House is to be denied a vote on it.

Mr. MONDELL. The farm credits bill has not yet been disposed of.

Mr. POU. The understanding was as soon as the farm credits bill came to a vote in the House the $10,000,000 revolving fund was to be considered. The gentleman now in the chair, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, will not deny that statement. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is not fair treatment. Gentlemen have the right to vote as they see fit, of course; but it is nothing short of tyranny to use the power gentlemen possess because of their official position to prevent the matter coming to a vote before the House.

Mr. MONDELL. How about Cape Cod?

Mr. POU. That has nothing to do with the matter about which I am speaking.

Mr. MONDELL. How about Mount Weather?

Mr. POU. I have not yielded, Mr. Speaker. Cape Cod has nothing to do with the question under discussion. If gentlemen want to assume that position, all well and good, but I give notice that we are going to resort to such measures as we deem fair, out in the open, to force the Republican side of the Chamber to carry out their agreement if we can do so. [Applause.]

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty Members present—not a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were 132 ayes and 23 noes.

So a call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abernethy	Ellis	Larson, Minn.	Rose
Almon	Faust	Layton	Rosenbloom
Barkley	Focht	Lazaro	Rucker
Bird	Freeman	Lee, Ga.	Ryan
Bixler	Garner	Lehlbach	Sanders, Tex.
Black	Gould	Linthicum	Schall
Bland, Ind.	Graham, Pa.	Little	Scott, Mich.
Brand	Hardy, Tex.	Luce	Sears
Brennan	Hawes	Luhring	Shelton
Britten	Hays	McClintic	Sisson
Brooks, Ill.	Hogan	McDuffie	Slemp
Brown, Tenn.	Hukriede	McFadden	Smith, Mich
Browne, Wis.	Jacoway	Maloney	Stevenson
Burke	Jefferis, Nebr.	Michaelson	Stiness
Burtness	Johnson, Miss.	Montague	Stoll
Carew	Jones, Pa.	Morin	Sullivan
Chandler, N. Y.	Jones, Tex.	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Chandler, Okla.	Kahn	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Fla.	Keller	Ogden	Thomas
Classon	Kelley, Mich.	Olpp	Thorpe
Codd	Kennedy	Overstreet	Timberlake
Collins	Kiess	Paige	Treadway
Connolly, Pa.	Kindred	Park, Ga.	Watson
Copley	King	Patterson, Mo.	Webster
Crago	Kirkpatrick	Patterson, N. J.	Wheeler
Cullen	Kitchin	Pringey	White, Me.
Davis, Minn.	Kleczka	Purnell	Williams, Ill.
Denison	Kline, N. Y.	Rainey, Ala.	Williams, Tex.
Drane	Knight	Ransley	Wise
Drewry	Kreider	Riddick	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Lanham	Rodenberg	Wright
Echols	Larsen, Ga.	Rogers	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this call 298 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were—ayes 177, noes 8.

So the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

BONUS TO CIVIL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14435) making appropriations to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 14435, the bonus bill, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reported the Senate amendments.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman kindly state the effect of these amendments?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill providing for the $240 annual bonus. The Department of the Interior in reporting the number of people they had on their pay roll reported a number less than they really had, and they sent up a subsequent report which showed the necessity for adding $12,560 more to the bill, which is incorporated in the Senate amendments. That is all there is to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

W. W. M'GRATH—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 2722) for the relief of W. W. McGrath.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report, 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. 2722) for the relief of W. W. McGrath, 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.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
Managers on the part of the House.
ARTHUR CAPPER,
F. R. GOODING,
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. 2722) for the relief of W. W. McGrath submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The amount is increased from $180.50 to $459.50.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

VALIDATING PAYMENT TO NATIONAL GUARD OFFICERS.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 14077) to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentlemen on the other side to yield some of their time.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, when this bill first came over from the Senate the minority and several other members of the committee were disposed to object to it, and did object to it in the form in which it came, because there was absolutely no limitation upon the amount by which the salaries could be raised by the Secretary of the Treasury other than the amount of money appropriated in a lump sum for that purpose. However, the bill has been amended in such a manner that it is now satisfactory to us. We believe that it is a bill of much importance to the Government at this time and that it will enable the customs officials to function in a much better way. Therefore the committee has made a unanimous report, and we are satisfied, so far as the minority is concerned.

There is one thing to which I invite attention, and that is that it puts deputy collectors and appraisers under civil-service regulations, which we think is desirable, and as there is a lump-sum appropriation only so much money can be expended. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] stated, I can not find where this bill increases the appropriation. It simply permits the Secretary of the Treasury to rearrange certain positions. Some men doing technical work, I understand, are receiving salaries that are utterly inadequate, and it is claimed that the laborers are being paid an inadequate compensation. A great deal of very necessary work has to be done by them, and we have not been getting the kind of labor we think we can get when this bill is passed. There is no limitation upon that. I do not care to take up any further time of the House on the bill, and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS].

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this Congress I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to express to all the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle my appreciation, as a new Member, of the courtesies which have been extended to me by those who have been here a longer time.

At this time I wish to say a few words on a point which I think is very important. I believe something will be developed to correct what seems to be an apparent miscarriage of justice at the present time under present conditions. I am not prepared to-day to suggest the actual remedy, but when the next Congress meets I believe it will be taken up and some remedy worked out.

I refer to the way certain individual Members, making what I consider wrongful use of the power vested in them on account of their positions of importance and authority, have arbitrarily stood themselves as stumbling blocks in the way of some meritorious pieces of legislation, thereby blocking consideration by Congress of legislation desired and duly reported out by committees, and upon which the representatives of the people here have really wanted to take action.

We have had here before this House for some time a comprehensive report from the Committee on Military Affairs with respect to a great question of really national importance. A short time ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, stood before the House Committee on Rules and implored the chairman of the Rules Committee to give him a rule for the consideration by this House of this great question of the disposition of the properties at Muscle Shoals and the adoption of a definite policy in connection therewith. Mr. MCKENZIE on that occasion not only stated that the Military Affairs Committee had given careful and thorough consideration to this matter, but stated also that he believed the membership of the House had duly considered the subject and were ready to vote upon it.

In answer to a question from Mr. POU, of North Carolina, Mr. MCKENZIE stated to the Rules Committee that he was duly authorized by the Committee on Military Affairs to come before the Rules Committee and formally ask for a rule for the consideration by the House of the Ford proposal for Muscle Shoals, and he further stated that of all bills that he had to bring up from his committee, that the business of paramount importance coming out of his committee was undoubtedly the Muscle Shoals matter.

Mr. MCKENZIE very frankly stated that while he might not agree with all details of the Ford offer, he wanted the House to have the chance to express itself upon the proposition, because it was up to the House to decide, and not altogether up to him.

But there at the head of that table that day sat Mr. PHIL CAMPBELL, of Kansas, and his opposition and antagonism to the proposition was very clearly apparent. It was evidenced by his remarks to Mr. MCKENZIE, and also by his remarks to Judge ALMON, of Alabama, who also appealed to the committee to grant the rule for the consideration of the matter. Mr. CAMPBELL has all along been known to be opposed to the consideration by Congress of the Ford proposal for the Muscle Shoals properties.

Now, my friends, here is a man, chairman of the Rules Committee, already repudiated at the polls by his own party, sitting up here denying the prayers of the farmers of this Nation and failing to carry out the expressed will of a great committee of this House by a misuse of his powers as such chairman. [Applause.] And just here I want to call attention also to the actual words of the distinguished leader of the majority party in this House.

On the 25th day of August, 1922, when the Muscle Shoals project was mentioned and briefly discussed on the floor of this House, Mr. MONDELL, the Republican leader, said:

> I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] that this matter ought to be considered and settled by this Congress, and as soon as it can properly be done.

He said that it ought to be considered and settled by this Congress, and that was on the 25th day of last August. But that promise went for nothing. If Mr. MONDELL, the Republican leader in this House, after making that solemn declaration, had done everything within his power since the 25th of last August to get this matter before Congress, it would have undoubtedly been before Congress and some definite action had on it. As Republican leader he has done his part to block consideration of this question.

Mr. MONDELL is another one who was turned down last fall by his own people out in Wyoming. And now the prayers of the farmers of the Nation and of the citizens of all walks of life have been denied by these men, who themselves have been defeated and repudiated by their own people at home but who, under present conditions, are still here in Congress, in positions of authority, and misusing their power at the behest, or at least in accordance with what is the will and desire, of such giant interests as the National Fertilizer Association, the great chemical interests, the Chilean nitrate interests, the power company interests, and the aluminum interests of this country. And, by the way, let it be remembered that Andrew W. Mellon, the present Secretary of the Treasury, is one of the aluminum kings of the country, and he has the ear of the administration.

And here on yesterday another gentleman, also defeated by his people at the polls last fall [Mr. JEFFERIS of Nebraska], inserted into the RECORD a long statement which is nothing in the world, my friends, I tell you now, except the brief of the Alabama Power Co. on the proposition. He inserted their brief in the RECORD of yesterday.

Now comes to-day, and Mr. POU tells us here that the Rules Committee had unanimously reported a rule for this $10,000,000 revolving fund bill, providing for the purchase of nitrate of soda and calcium arsenate. Mr. POU tells us that he had had repeated assurance from Mr. PHIL CAMPBELL, chairman Rules Committee and Acting Speaker in the chair now, that this revolving fund bill should be allowed to come up in the House for consideration immediately following the farm credits bill. Now, we voted several days ago on the farm loan bill, and as yet the nitrate of soda and calcium arsenate $10,000,000 revolving fund bill has not been allowed to come up. Again, my friends, the farmers have been denied after a solemn promise had been given. And so we have here the spectacle of men, defeated by their own people at their homes, misusing their authority as leaders and turning aside the will of the people and actually thwarting the wishes of this Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KNUTSON. Reserving the right to object, on the same subject?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I insert a telegram to Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, sent to him by N. S. Smith, ex-lieutenant, Eleventh Infantry, United States Army, and which is in protest of the failure of Congress to pass the so-called Bursum bill which provides for the retirement, under certain conditions, of disabled emergency officers of the Army.

This justifiable protest by ex-Lieutenant Smith is similar to protests that have been coming in on this subject from every section of the country. The bill in question is not what it should be, but as a matter of fairness and justice some legislation should have been enacted to retire disabled emergency officers of the Army upon the same basis as disabled regular officers of the Army. The emergency officers of both Navy and Marine Corps are retired as, of course, are the regular officers of Navy, Marine Corps, and the Army, so why should this one particular class, namely, the disabled emergency officers of the Army, be thus so unfairly discriminated against? It is not right; it is not justice!

The Republican ex-service men in the House caused a Republican caucus to be called for the purpose of trying to get the Republicans in the House to indorse this legislation and to order that it be brought up in the House for consideration. Sad to relate, it appeared that the Members of the majority party in this House were not even sufficiently interested to attend that caucus, so no quorum was present and nothing was done.

Shortly thereafter the Military Affairs Committee of the House tabled the bill. They killed it. The caucus of the Republican Party had not developed a quorum, showing that the party responsible for the legislative program in this Congress was not interested in this matter, so the committee killed the bill, leaving the existing discrimination stand against this one particular class of disabled officers.

It seems to me that the lack of interest shown simply indicates that in the minds of some people "the war is over."

I sympathize with the feelings of the sender of this wire, which is as follows:

SCOTLAND NECK, N. C., *February 28, 1923.*

Congressman CLAUDE KITCHIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

It is beyond comprehension how Senators and Representatives in Congress can adjourn and go home with a clear conscience and peace of mind after having failed to do justice and grant relief by retirement to emergency officers sorely wounded in the service of their country through a controversy over a technicality as to how less than $1,000,000 of compensation shall be paid. Some of these men have died and others are dying for lack of proper attention and treatment, and some are in want while waiting for what is acknowledged by all as their just due. This message is written by a former officer who, though beyond the draft age, with a wife and family of three children, as well as a dependant mother, volunteered for service; went to France; was wounded; spent 14 months in a Government hospital; has just had a hospital bill of $400 to pay at a private hospital for treatment of wounds due also to a technicality, and who is facing another operation. Please have this statement read before the Rules Committee of Senate and House as a favor to me. It may have no effect, but it will give them something to take home with them. There is yet time if there is a will.

NORFLEET S. SMITH,
Late Lieutenant, Eleventh United States Infantry.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERNERD].

Mr. COLLIER. I yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. GERNERD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not here to find fault with a single man of this House or any leadership. I think this House has done remarkable work, and I desire to express to my colleagues my appreciation for the many courtesies that have been accorded me. There is not a man here who is not interested in the history of the rescue of the Liberty Bell.

With your indulgence, I wish to relate a story of historical value, which I am certain you will all be interested in knowing:

Mr. Speaker, among America's greatest and most sacred treasures is that of the old Liberty Bell, which, on the 4th day of July, 1776, rang forth the stirring proclamation of American independence to all the world. Conceived in the spirit of freedom, it was cast and dedicated to the principles of human liberty. Across its face were inscribed the prophetic words, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Destiny cast its radiant shadows before it, for the bell was hung in the belfry of Independence Hall in August, 1752, nearly a quarter of a century before it proclaimed that fateful declaration, the realization of which was only to be achieved through the human sacrifices of thousands of American patriots.

Few Americans know of the great peril that threatened its destruction and the heroic measures that were taken to protect it for all posterity. It was after the Battle of Brandywine, September 11, 1777, that General Washington ordered the transfer of all military stores to Bethlehem, Pa. Even before that critical hour had arrived, the Pennsylvania assembly awoke to the gravity of the situation and passed a resolution on the 16th day of June authorizing the removal of all bells, as well as all the copper and brass, in the city of Philadelphia to some place of safety; the Liberty Bell was not taken from Independence Hall until after General Washington's order had been given. It constituted a part of the military train of 700 wagons, which carried the whole of the heavy baggage of the Army, which was escorted by 200 Virginia and North Carolina soldiers under the command of Col. William Polk, of North Carolina. That famous caravan proceeded along the banks of the Delaware River to Trenton, and from there traveled through wild and rugged country to Bethlehem, arriving there on the 24th day of September, 1777. After the military train had reached Bethlehem the wagon upon which the Liberty Bell was loaded broke down in the street.

The next day the bell was placed on the wagon of Frederick Leaser, who, together with John Jacob Mickley, escorted by a small guard of soldiers, brought it and the chimes of Christ Church, eight in number, to Allentown, where they were placed in the basement of the German Zions Reformed Church, where it was kept in hiding until the following spring, when the British Army evacuated Philadelphia. It was then returned to Independence Hall, where it was rehung in the belfry on June 27, 1778. [Applause.] This same church was converted into a hospital for the sick and wounded of the Revolutionary Army during the entire time that its membership kept their silent watch over the hidden treasure. Allentown was then a thrifty little town of 300 inhabitants, located but 6 miles north of Bethlehem on the banks of the Lehigh River. It was in these two towns that the supplies and baggage of the Army were temporarily stored, and where approximately 2,000 sick and wounded soldiers were cared for. This entire community was filled with military activities, for Allentown had works for the repairing of military arms, the manufacture of saddles, and scabbards for bayonets; it also served as a depot for military supplies and maintained a large prison dock, in which were kept the captured prisoners of war. Its people were intensely loyal to the cause of the Revolution, for 27 members of the congregation in whose church the Liberty Bell was secreted served as members of the Continental Army. What a responsibility the consistory of that church assumed, but John Griesemer, Nicholas Fox, Michael Kolb, John Miller, and Peter Rhoads were patriotic and God-fearing men who earnestly and courageously assumed this sacred task.

General Washington and the other leaders of the Revolution knew the character and loyalty of the people who inhabited this frontier country, and because of their great faith in their loyalty intrusted to them the protection of this priceless treasure. They were mostly Germans with a sprinkling of Scotch-Irish, Swiss, Dutch, and French Huguenots. They originally came from the Palatinate, from which Province they fled to escape the cruel persecutions to which they were subjected because of their religious beliefs. It was William Penn who in their plight offered them an asylum in Pennsylvania. Encouraged by his sympathy, thousands of them came to these shores, experiencing all the terrible hazards that a voyage across the Atlantic entailed in those dreary days. They were a thrifty people and soon became prosperous. They despised tyranny and oppression and vigorously opposed British rule. They naturally became champions of freedom and intensely supported the cause of American independence. Hundreds of them and their offspring were with General Washington at the Battle of Long Island, where under the command of Col. Peter Kichlein they stood alone fighting the overwhelming British forces as heroically as did the famous "Legion of the Light Brigade." Their valor and great sacrifices made it possible for General Washington to inaugurate his famous retreat. They proved their worth in every subsequent battle, for they were at Princeton, Trenton, Brandywine, and Germantown, and many of them shared with their comrades the untold hardships of the winter at Valley Forge.

What a rare and conspicuous part these sturdy citizens of Allentown played in that great and tragic drama, the American Revolution. By their vigilance they preserved that precious symbol of liberty for all time, enabling future generations to visit the shrine of American liberty and there in the presence of the Liberty Bell to rededicate themselves to the principles of liberty and human justice. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, from April 16 to April 21, next month, there will be held in Greenville, S. C., two conventions of nation-wide concern. They will be the annual meetings of the United States Good Roads Association and of the Bankhead Highway Association.

Greenville, with only 45,000 human souls population, is another one of "the biggest little cities in the United States," and I invite every one of you to come to attend those conventions. I guarantee that you will have a good time, because you will all be given the opportunity to make speeches. [Laughter.]

I want all of you who can and will come to be guests at my home. [Applause.] And when it overflows, the hospitable homes of my neighbors will be opened wide to you, because so long as I am in Congress no one of my friends shall ever pay a hotel bill in my home town. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, in a few hours this Congress will adjourn, and most of us will go home for a nine months' vacation unless the President should decide to call us back for an extra session.

During this time I am hopeful that the good people of Washington who are in authority will endeavor to enforce the law a little more fully than they have done heretofore. I am speaking particularly along the line of the use of the automobile. [Applause.]

People coming here from a distance say this is a beautiful city, with magnificent parks and handsome buildings, but human life is not safe here on the streets. We should endeavor to make Washington not only a city beautiful but also a safe place in which to live. This can be done by better enforcement of the law. I have ridden on the street cars a great deal since I have been here, and I have observed people driving automobiles, and I find that the motormen on the street cars in every instance endeavor to take care of the man driving the automobile and endeavor to take care of the man walking, but that the man driving the automobile in a great many instances puts the burden on the men driving the street cars of taking care of him, and puts the burden upon the man who is walking and makes him resort to running in order to get out of the way of the machine. In other words, they drive in a way that is careless.

I hope that the authorities of this city will do all that is possible to enforce the laws here, so that the people who come here will not only say that Washington is a city beautiful but they will say it is a safe city. [Applause.]

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.
Mr. McARTHUR. Even with all those great disadvantages of loss of life and limb, there are a great many gentlemen in civil life who would like to come and live here?
Mr. LANKFORD. Certainly; that is true, but many of them can not. When they do come on a visit, if ever, they should be protected and those of us who are sent here by our people as Members of Congress as well as all people living here should have the protection of the law.
It is to be hoped that when we return we will find a more decent effort to enforce law here, more safeguard thrown around people who walk on our streets and more courtesy between the people living here and visitors.
People visiting here go away saying, the city is beautiful in the extreme but there is such a disregard for law, such an absolute disregard for life by people using automobiles, such a desecration of the Sabbath, and the negroes are something awful.
Washington ought to be not only beautiful but decent. This city ought to be a model of law enforcement, instead of a city awful. Time is too limited to speak fully on these matters now. I hope to do so later. There is a slight improvement in enforcing laws against the would-be murderers at steering wheels of automobiles. I hope the courts will some day go the limit in favor of innocent people against the speed maniacs. Let the people plead for law enforcement and race segregation, and we may hope for a city beautiful and a city decent. I have pleaded and still plead for equal but separate accommodations for the races as being best for both. I do not mean to nag at anyone about this proposition, but I honestly believe that with race segregation the two races can live here on better terms. The South is right about the race question. I have never seen a white person from the North go South and get thoroughly familiar with the situation there who did not become fully convinced that the South is absolutely right about the race question and the North absolutely wrong. William J. Bryan is the latest noted convert on this subject. I have never known of a white southerner who came North and decided that the South was wrong about segregation of the races; in fact they become more convinced than ever that the North is wrong on the question of segregation. The northern negro is afraid that he will in some way admit the supremacy of the white race. I truly believe in the supremacy of the white race. I believe the white race gave us the greatest possible form of government. No other race could have added to it. This government of the white man was not helped when the negro began voting. He will not make it better in the future. I wish to refer in this connection to one suggestion made by a colored paper recently.
The Washington Tribune in its last issue mentioned my remarks of the 19th of last month and still opposes segregation of the races. This paper, though, is right about my belief. It says that I believe "that when this planet was created the Almighty personally turned it over to the whites."
Here is what I said in Congress on January 18, 1922:

He (the Almighty) took the dust of the earth and molded it into His own image, into the form of a man, and breathed into its nostrils His own creative, everlasting, immortal breath; and the image came forth a human being, a living soul, all dominating, all conquering, everlasting, eternal, immortal, a part of God Himself, a Caucasian, a white man; and God gave that first white man dominion over all things and told him to reach to the bottom of the sea and up to the highest skies and understand and know the mysteries of all time and space, and that first man, a white man, went forth to solve, understand, conquer, and know the universe in which he had been placed. And that first white man from that day to this has been the all-powerful, all-controlling, all-dominating man of the world. He has conquered the depths of the sea; he has flown like a bird through the very gates of the skies; he has whispered around the world in the twilight of a new era; he has weighed the moon, the earth, and the sun; he is solving and knowing and bringing under his subjection and dominion all the mysteries of life, of space, and of all the universe of God, and as time goes by he is learning to think, understand, and know the thoughts of the Almighty God of the skies.
Commissioned by the Great Creator, he is the governing power of the world and is gradually shaping the nations of this earth into the highest and best forms of government, and is the ruler and the supreme power of all other races, whether the yellow, the red, or the black. He is the all-controlling, all-powerful, all-dominating man of the world. He always has been and always will be to the end of time.
Forces of nature may oppose him, but he overcomes them. Other peoples, races, and colors of humanity may resist him, but of no avail; he marches onward, conquering, and holding his God-given supremacy.

[Applause.]
White supremacy is not oppressive tyrannical supremacy, but is compassionate, God-like supremacy exercised for the good of our Nation, the happiness of the human race, and the civilization of the world. [Applause.]
Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for four minutes.
Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, you have heard with pleasure and recall with interest the history of the Liberty Bell and what it stands for. You have heard of the Constitution of the United States and what it stands for. The ringing of that Liberty Bell in Philadelphia and over the East is heard very indistinctly in the islands of the Pacific, particularly in the Hawaiian Islands, which constitute a Territory of the United States. Under the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States the American people solemnly declared that involuntary servitude could not exist in the United States or in any of its Territories.
To-day we have upon the calendar of the House, Joint Resolution 171, which violates at least nine positive laws of the United States and directly violates the Constitution of the United States. It provides that in the year 1923 we are to admit peon and contract labor into the Territory of Hawaii and put them under the condition that existed under the dominion of the Chinese in bygone days.
I want to call public attention to the fact that that resolution stands upon the calendar to-day. It ought to be stricken from the calendar instead of remaining there, to the end that the American people might know the exact attitude of this Congress. There is no possibility of the American Congress ever placing upon the statute books that resolution, which will permit 50,000 or more Chinese to be brought in under the old method to Hawaii to labor under bond—contract labor—involuntary servitude.
Mr. MONDELL. May I remind the gentleman that it will go off the calendar at 12 o'clock noon to-morrow?
Mr. RAKER. I want the public to know that it is on the calendar. It is on the calendar now.
Now, one of the conditions of the contract under which laborers would come to Hawaii contrary to the provisions of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution is as follows:

32. Should the laborer have a bad character and violate the rules successfully the employer shall report to the Commissioner of Immigration and shall consult him as to the kind of punishment to be inflicted.

That is a part of the contract that will have to be entered into between this Government and the Chinese Government when the laborer comes to Hawaii. The employer may consult the Immigration Commissioner as to the punishment to be inflicted upon these people.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.
Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection.
Mr. MacLAFFERTY. I object.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO NATIONAL GUARD, ETC.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 14077) to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes.
The Clerk read the conference report, 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. 14077) to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, 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 2, 3, 5, 6, 7.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 8, 9, and renumber section 9 section 5; and section 10 section 6; and agree to the same.

FRANK L. GREENE,
LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM,
Managers on the part of the House.
J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
D. A. REED,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?
Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Was this conference requested by the Senate?

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Requested by the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Has the Senate acted upon it?

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. The Senate has acted upon it, the papers are here, the Senate accepted it.

Outside of a validation section and putting those to whom pay had accrued on the same basis as those who had been paid, the Senate amendments allow a National Guard man who is injured on duty in camp at a Federal encampment not to get their pay after the encampment is over but to remain in the Government hospital, which he could not do before.

Mr. STAFFORD. That applies not only to the National Guard man but to the members of the Officers' Reserve Corps.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I believe that is so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were 189 ayes and no noes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote because it shows the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair counted in the neighborhood of 50 Members that did not vote at all, which, added to the 189, makes a quorum. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I congratulate the Chair on his counting ability. [Laughter.]

BRIDGE BILLS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there are six Senate bridge bills and seven House bridge bills on the calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that those bills may be taken up and considered at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to take up and consider Senate and House bridge bills on the calendar, and consider them at this time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bills in their order.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Wyoming if he will defer his motion for three minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I did not intend to allude to, but my attention has just been drawn to a resolution that is pending and which I hope will receive consideration. The political history of England is marked, as I recall, by at least three documents of outstanding interest—the Magna Charta, the Petition of Right, and the Act of Settlement. Correspondingly our political history is marked by three documents that are of primary importance—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the message of President Monroe to Congress enunciating the policy which has come to be called the Monroe doctrine.

The resolution to which I referred proposes that our Government shall take official notice of the anniversary of Monroe's message and arrange for some participation in a celebration of the fact that the message was sent to Congress on the 2d of December, 1823, 100 years ago. It was on that date that he proclaimed the views which represent the policy that bears his name [applause] and which has made for the peace of this continent and, in large measure, for the avoidance of war with European nations. [Applause.]

I trust that when the gentleman from Ohio presents the resolution, which, I understand, is not to carry any appropriation, but provides for the appointment of a commission made up of Members of the Senate and House and citizens, which will be able to take some active part in the matter of commemorating the great event which occurred a century ago, it will be adopted without objection. Monroe was a man of great qualities which he showed in each one of the many offices he occupied, and there could be no finer display of his intellectual vigor, his far-sighted wisdom, and his patriotic spirit than was embodied in the message in giving the Monroe doctrine to our Republic and the world. [Applause.]

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, N. DAK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first bridge bill, S. 3580.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto authorized by the act of Congress approved June 5, 1920, to be constructed by the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., across the Red River of the North at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak., are hereby extended two and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

BRIDGE ACROSS HUMPHREYS CREEK, SPARROWS POINT, MD.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (S. 4503) granting the consent of Congress to the Bethlehem Steel Co. to construct a bridge across Humphreys Creek at or near the city of Sparrows Point, Md.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Bethlehem Steel Co., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Humphreys Creek at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the city of Sparrows Point, the county of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, 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 ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGING OF OHIO RIVER AT MOUNDSVILLE, W. VA.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (H. R. 14351) to authorize bridging the Ohio River at Moundsville, W. Va.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Marshall-Belmont Bridge Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of West Virginia, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation near the central portion of the city of Moundsville, W. Va., 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 ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, S. DAK.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (H. R. 14382) granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Hughes County and Stanley County, S. Dak.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of South Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between Hughes County and Stanley County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of an 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 ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, S. DAK.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill H. R. 14383, granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Brule County and Lyman County, S. Dak.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of South Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between Brule County and Lyman County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of an 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 ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER BETWEEN POTTER COUNTY AND DEWEY COUNTY, S. DAK.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill H. R. 14384, granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Potter County and Dewey County, S. Dak.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of South Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point suitable to the interest of navigation between Potter County and Dewey County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of an 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "interest" and insert the word "interests."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, WALWORTH COUNTY, S. DAK.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (H. R. 14385) granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Walworth County and Corson County, S. Dak.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of South Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between Walworth County and Corson County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the contsruction 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "contsruction" and insert in lieu thereof the word "construction."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

RECONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (H. R. 14429) granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Great Northern Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, its successors and assigns, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate its existing bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River between Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, 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 ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

RECONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER, MOORHEAD, MINN.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (H. R. 14428) granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Moorhead, Minn., and Fargo, N. Dak.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Great Northern Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, its successors and assigns, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate its existing bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River between Moorhead, Minn., and Fargo, N. Dak., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, 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 ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE RIVER.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (S. 3874) granting the consent of Congress for a bridge across the Rio Grande River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Citizens Bridge Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande River, at or near the city of Del Rio, State of Texas, 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 ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS SULPHUR RIVER, TEX.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (S. 4631) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Bowie and Cass, State of Texas, for construction of a bridge across the Sulphur River at or near Paces Ferry, in said counties and State.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the counties of Bowie and Cass, State of Texas, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Sulphur River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Paces Ferry, in accordance with the provisions of an 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 ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER AT MARCUS, WASH.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (S. 4638) authorizing the Great Northern Railway Co. to maintain and operate, or reconstruct, maintain, and operate, its bridge across the Columbia River at Marcus, in the State of Washington.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 4638) authorizing the Great Northern Railway Co. to maintain and operate, or reconstruct, maintain, and operate, its bridge across the Columbia River at Marcus, in the State of Washington.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Great Northern Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, its successors and assigns, to maintain and operate, or reconstruct, maintain, and operate, its existing bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River between the town of Marcus, Wash., and a point across the river opposite thereto, all in Stevens County, Wash., 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 ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE BETWEEN EAGLE PASS, TEX., AND PIEDRAS NEGRAS, MEXICO.

The next bridge bill in order was the bill (S. 4592) granting consent of Congress to the Eagle Pass & Piedras Negras Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande between Eagle Pass, Tex., and Piedras Negras, Mexico.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 4592) granting consent of Congress to the Eagle Pass & Piedras Negras Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande between Eagle Pass, Tex., and Piedras Negras, Mexico.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress be, and is hereby, granted to the Eagle Pass & Piedras Negras Bridge Co., a corporation organized under the laws of Texas, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, across the Rio Grande between Eagle Pass, Tex., and Piedras Negras, Mexico, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906: *Provided*, That the consent of the proper authorities of the Republic of Mexico to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the bridge shall also be obtained.

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

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in approaching a discussion of the subject of what the future holds for Muscle Shoals it is extremely difficult to know where to begin and where to leave off. This question has been a much mooted one for the past year and a half. In that time the public has become bewildered by a mass of evidence, much of which is false and some of which is true. In this time the paid propagandist has had his opportunity to shower upon the public a hazy mass of unfounded statements. Many of these men who are paid to do this sort of thing have thrown truth to the winds and have drawn entirely upon their imaginations.

Mr. Ford submitted an offer for the Government interests at Muscle Shoals, I think, sometime in July, 1921. Since that time men with literary ability have been hired to influence the public. They have been paid to write newspaper and magazine articles and circulars on the subject of the Ford offer. The public mind has been deluged with these writings regardless of whether they contained any truth or not. Those who are Ford advocates for pay have attempted to make the people believe that Henry Ford is a superman, and strange as it may seem they have succeeded in some instances. I am not sure but that their efforts have been attended with some success with a small part of the membership of Congress, as ridiculous as this statement may seem.

This contention has grown in favor until there are those who believe and claim that the law should be written and placed upon the statute books of our country for the guidance of every man and woman except Mr. Ford. They would exempt him from the law's restrictions. Personally, I do not believe that anyone is so distinctively superhuman that he should have a class created entirely for himself. I think all, without exception, should be made to obey the same law.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal water power act that was finally passed by the Congress of the United States after years of diligent work upon the part of its proponents was made to apply to all alike. The intention of this law was to preserve the great water-power sites of our country for the use of the people. It was therefore made general in character and no one was exempted from its provisions. This great act was written into the statute books of our country so that unprincipled and greedy corporations could not get unrestricted control of our rivers and thereby create cheap hydroelectric power for themselves and sell to the people at unconscionable prices. This, in brief, was the reason that actuated those great proponents of conservation of the water power of the United States. The great corporations to-day that secure license to use any of the streams of the United States for the purpose of building dams to be used in creating power must be governed by the Federal water power act. In this way no power company can exploit the users of hydroelectric power because the Government through this act throws its arm of protection about the public. Strange as it may seem there are those in and out of Congress to-day who would pass a special act exempting Mr. Ford and his company from any such restrictions. They would transfer in fee simple to Mr. Ford, for practically nothing, about 3,900 acres of land upon which is built the two great nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals, Ala., known as plant No. 1 and plant No. 2. These great sites with all of their numerous buildings and machinery and railroad tracks would be turned over to Mr. Ford and his heirs and assigns forever for the comparatively paltry sum of $5,000,000. This property to be thus transferred to him cost the taxpayers of this country something over $85,000,000. Besides this, if his proposal is accepted, the taxpayers of this country would build two dams across the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, together with the locks, gates, and machinery necessary in the production of hydroelectric power at a cost to these taxpayers of about $67,000,000, and when completed would turn them over to Mr. Ford, who is reputed to be the richest man in the world, for a period of 100 years.

When thus ready for use Mr. Ford would pay to the Government 4 per cent on $50,000,000 of the investment throughout this lease period of 100 years and would be given the use of $17,000,000 for that time free. It will be seen from this that the people of the United States would be required to build the dams and install the machinery at a cost of about $67,000,000 and Mr. Ford would not be required under his offer to pay full interest on this money while the work was under construction.

Mr. Speaker, because of the long period of time that has been and will be required to build these dams it is estimated that the Government would lose in interest during the process of construction on the new money put into the project since Mr. Ford made his offer about $13,320,000. This is quite a subsidy by way of interest to hand over to this very wealthy man when it is remembered that every other company that gets a lease of water-power rights must build its own dams and install its own locks and gates and machinery with its own money and therefore must bear all interest charges while the work is under construction.

Up until this time no man has thought to ask the Government to build for him dams for this purpose out of the funds in the Public Treasury. It will be remembered, too, that no other man can get a lease under the Federal water power act for more than 50 years, but of course some of those who advocate the Ford offer have schooled themselves into the belief that he is superhuman. Let it be said in his behalf that Mr. Ford makes no such foolish or silly claim for himself.

It is well understood that dams of this character require huge sums of money to keep them in repair, and all companies who have water-power rights must not only build but must maintain the dams at their own expense. However, in this remarkable offer that has been made by Mr. Ford for Muscle Shoals, it is proposed by him that he pay to the Government of the United States $55,000 per annum, to be used by the Government in repairing these two dams when such need may arise. The best engineers of our country agree that the minimum maintenance cost of such dams is about 1 per cent per annum of the cost of construction, and the maximum cost of maintenance is about 3 per cent of such cost. If this maintenance should cost only the minimum, it will be noticed that this would amount to $670,000 per year. Mr. Ford only pays $55,000 of this, leaving a balance of $615,000 to be paid by the weary taxpayers of this country. But if it should cost the maximum, or 3 per cent, the taxpayers would have the bag to hold to the extent of three times this sum, or $1,245,000 per annum.

However, the proponents of the Ford offer claim that $55,000, the sum that Mr. Ford agrees to pay in annually as a maintenance fund, will be sufficient to meet the cost of all repairs. Then I would suggest that if he thinks this sum will be sufficient that we write into the contract that he will maintain the dams at his own expense. He certainly can lose nothing, because he says this amount will be sufficient, and by good luck he might save some of the $55,000. The fact is it is well known among engineers that $55,000 for this purpose is hardly a drop in the bucket. If Mr. Ford and these men who make this claim are sincere, why does he not change his proposal and agree to maintain these dams at his own expense? He is the only man who is going to get any advantage out of them.

Natural deterioration over a period of 100 years will require huge sums of money to keep them in perfect repair. It is also well known that at any time these dams may go out through natural causes. Floods may wash them away, earthquakes may cause the earth to gap and in an instant destroy the dams. An invading army might some time destroy them with explosives, but from whatever cause these dams may go out Mr. Ford holds the taxpayers of this country bound to rebuild them for him without any expense to him except the $55,000. To my mind this seems to be asking too much. It would seem that this company should be compelled to keep these dams in repair provided the Government, at the expense of the taxpayers, builds the dams for him and turns them over to him fully equipped for the rather insignificant annual rental of 4 per cent of only $50,000,000. Let us remember as we go along that these dams will have cost the Government $67,000,000, yet it is only proposed that the taxpayers get a return on $50,000,000 of this cost. Remember also that he is to use this hydroelectric power thus created in any way that he may see fit, unrestrained by the hand of any authority, either Federal or State, with one exception. The exception to which I refer is the proposal that he use about 100,000 horsepower in the manufacture of fertilizer, provided he can make it at a profit of 8 per cent to himself.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noticed, too, that there is no provision in the contract that would bind this company to pay any damages that might arise should these dams from any cause break and allow this imprisoned water to suddenly rush down over the surrounding lower country, destroying life and property. Should these dams break, I do not know how many lives would be lost or the value of the property destroyed. The money cost might reach, in the course of 100 years, into the billions. I am sure if such a disaster as this should ever occur the loss would mount high into the millions. Mr. Ford rather cleverly, I would say, guards his company against the payment of any loss of this character.

Every other set of men who build dams for this purpose build them at their own expense, pay interest on the money invested while the construction is going on, equip them at their own expense, maintain them at their own expense, and should they go out from any cause rebuild them at their own expense and be liable for the payment of all damages arising by reason of the escape of the empounded waters. To my mind the Ford offer is a very astounding proposition, and I can not follow the process of reasoning of those who advocate that this Government should stand quietly by and allow this company to manacle it hand and foot. If we should accept this Ford offer we ought to amend it so often that it would be rewritten from beginning to end. The interests of the Government ought to be safeguarded in some instances if we turn this gigantic

property over to Mr. Ford practically as a gift and finance him for 100 years.

This offer further contemplates that the Government must turn over the addition it built to the steam plant belonging to the Alabama Power Co. on the Warrior River, known as the Gorgas plant. This Muscle Shoals project was commenced by the Government when the war was on and at a time when it needed immediate power. The agents of the Government negotiated with the Alabama Power Co. at that time for power and it was agreed that the Government should build this addition to its Gorgas plant, together with certain transmission lines leading from there, a distance of 88 miles, to Muscle Shoals. At this time the Alabama Power Co. had greater demand for electric power than it could meet and it had commenced to build an extension to its steam plant at this place. It had already built the foundations for this extension and had constructed its intakes and outlets for the necessary water to operate the plant.

It was agreed between the Federal agents and the Alabama Power Co. that the Government should build this extension to the Gorgas plant on these foundations and over these water intakes and outlets and also build the transmission lines from that place to Muscle Shoals. This was done on the part of the Government at a cost of $4,900,000. At the commencing of this work on the part of the Government a contract was entered into with the Alabama Power Co., by the terms of which the Government, when through with the Gorgas plant and transmission lines, was to sell these holdings to that company at a "fair value."

Claiming its right to purchase under this clause of the contract, the Alabama Power Co. has first offered the Government $2,500,000 for this property and later the offer was raised to $3,000,000.

When we remember the disgracefully low and ofttimes criminal prices at which war properties have been sold, ranging from practically nothing to 10 and 12 per cent of the original cost to the Government, this price of $3,000,000 would seem to be one of the best bargains that the Government has ever been offered for any of its war property. Yet it will be remembered that the Ford offer contemplates that the Government must reject this offer of $3,000,000 and include the Government's interest in the Gorgas plant and transmission lines in the transfer to Mr. Ford. Just why he would ask this rather strange conduct on the part of the Government has never been clearly explained.

It is constructed as one building and one plant and the same machinery operates it as a single concern. It needs this plant in furnishing electric service to its numerous customers that are located throughout all that section of the country. It has an investment of about $40,000,000. It has built its own dams and pays the upkeep of these dams. These users of light and power have a right to be supplied. I do not know what number of consumers it has to-day but two years ago the number was 58,500. Take away from it this plant and you cripple the service to 58,500 consumers. You effect the industries of that entire section, many of them you kill. Can any man assign a sane and truthful reason why these industries should all be crippled, why some of these municipalities should be put in darkness, why the wheels of these industries should be stopped, in order to give Mr. Ford this property? The most speculative mind can not offer one sound and legitimate reason that is based upon the facts surrounding this offer.

Perhaps it would be well to state that Mr. Ford is offering for the Government's real-estate holdings at Muscle Shoals only $5,000,000. These holdings cost the Government, to be exact and without any accumulative interest, $85,343,296. For this real estate, with all of the gigantic buildings constructed upon it, together with all the railroad engines, steel freight cars, steam shovels, picks and shovels, rock crushers, cement mixers, railroad tracks, and numerous other machinery and tools, he is offering the ridiculously low and unconscionable price of $5,000,000.

This property includes Waco quarry, cost $1,302,962; Gorgas Steam Plant, $4,900,000; Nitrate Plant No. 1, $12,887,941; and Nitrate Plant No. 2, $66,252,393. These figures, of course, do not include accrued interest on these huge sums now amounting to many millions.

For the Congress of the United States to authorize the sale of more than $85,000,000 worth of Government property to probably the richest man in the world for $5,000,000 would seem to me to come dangerously near being criminal. Especially do I say this when I remember that Mr. Ford could immediately sell and ought to sell to the Alabama Power Co. the Gorgas plant for $3,000,000. He could easily sell personal property at nitrate plants Nos. 1 and 2, which I have just enumerated and which he could declare as surplus, for at least the other $2,000,000. Therefore, at the very lowest estimation you would be deeding by warranty deed to Mr. Ford, his heirs and assigns forever, more than $75,000,000 worth of property without consideration. Because he would have already recovered for himself in these two sales the full amount that he paid and have at least $70,000,000 worth of property left that would not have cost him one cent.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ford by his offer also demands that the Government shall furnish him the overflow right at Dam No. 3, the cost to be paid by the Government. These rights will cost anywhere from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000. Of course he says he will pay 4 per cent interest on whatever this cost may be, but he agrees to pay nothing for the great reservoirs that the Government must build to hold the water that is backed away from Dam No. 3. I do not know how many millions of dollars these reservoirs would cost.

He may fool Congress, but I am only mentioning these facts to show you that Mr. Ford would have a decidedly hard job before him in fooling a set of high-school boys with a proposition of this kind.

The Ford propagandists, in order to sooth the nerves of the taxpayers of this country, heralded abroad the statement that while it will require $50,000,000 of new money to complete Dam No. 2 and build Dam No. 3, Mr. Ford is going to pay back to the taxpayers this $50,000,000. They claim it is only a loan that the Government is making to him and that he will make full restitution during the period of 100 years. They claim he will repay this huge amount dollar for dollar, and here is the very amazing scheme that Mr. Ford has of paying it back. Listen to it carefully because I think it is something new to the financial world.

He agrees to pay to the Secretary of War for the use of the Government the sum of $23,363 semiannually to be used in retiring at the end of 100 years the $50,000,000, the additional money put up for him by the Government to build the two dams. As this method of discharging a debt is so unique you will pardon me for analyzing it a little further. He proposes to pay $23,363 each six months of the 100-year period. The total amount of annual payments, therefore, would be $46,726. This same amount paid yearly for 100 years, of course, would be one hundred times $46,726, or $4,672,600.

This offer that is now disturbing the minds of the membership of this House proposes that the Government shall accept these semiannual payments and immediately invest them at 4 per cent interest payable semiannually, and when the interest is due add it to the principal and loan it again at 4 per cent interest, and if it is thus compounded throughout the term of the lease, which is 100 years, he says it will amount to $49,071,935, which is practically the $50,000,000, although you will see even with this rather doubtful scheme of financing he has short changed the Government nearly a million dollars. But what is a million dollars when the United States Government is playing Santa Claus to Mr. Ford? The richest man in the world would hardly take note of such an insignificant gift as that.

You will notice in this very startling method of discharging a debt of $50,000,000 with the comparatively small sum of $4,672,600 that Mr. Ford leaves the matter of investing these semiannual installments to the Government. It matters not to him whether the loans prove to be bad or successful. It matters not to him to what additional cost the Government will be put in order to make these loans, collect the semiannual interest, add it to the principal, and reinvest again.

It is perhaps pertinent to say here that by observing the same rules of finance that he has laid down it would cost the Government considerably over a billion dollars to complete and deliver these new dams to Mr. Ford, together with overflow rights at Dam No. 1.

Oh, I know you claim that Mr. Ford has promised to manufacture fertilizer at nitrate plant No. 1 and sell it to the farmers cheaply; and, in this way, compel the other manufacturers of fertilizer throughout the United States to sell their product to the farmers at one-half the price for which they are now selling it. Mr. Ford only agrees, that in the event he can make nitrate at all at Muscle Shoals, to manufacture it at the approximate present annual capacity of nitrate plant No. 2.

This present capacity would mean the manufacturing of about 1,500,000 tons of standard fertilizer per year, provided he can manufacture it at all. No one knows whether he can manufacture fertilizer successfully by any known process at this time; and, even if he is successful in manufacturing this amount, let me call your attention to the fact that about 15,000,000 tons of fertilizer have been used per annum in the United States, and 18,000,000 could be used to a good advantage.

Can anyone explain to me how the manufacturing of 1,500,000 tons of fertilizer can bring down 15,000,000 tons of fertilizer one-half in price? This is going on the assumption that fertilizer can be made at all there. The amount would require only about 100,000 horsepower to manufacture it. Mr. Ford says that he is going to create 1,000,000 horsepower. If he does you will readily see why Mr. Ford wants this water-power lease for 100 years. It means that he is going to get at practically Government expense 900,000 horsepower to use as he may see fit without Government interference of any character. He would have nothing like the Federal water power act curbing him in his activities. If he saw fit he would use this 900,000 horsepower with which to exploit the people. He could use it in manufacturing for himself anything that he might see fit. Whether it would be the manufacturing of threshing machines or bird cages would be left to the judgment of Mr. Ford and his company, and they would use that 900,000 horsepower in the manufacture of the latter if it would yield them greater profits than would the manufacture of other articles.

You are deceiving the farmer by telling him that Mr. Ford wants this great water-power privilege down there in order that he can manufacture and sell to him cheap fertilizer. If that is true, then why not write into this contract a clause that will require him to use all of this power, whatever it may be, in the manufacture of fertilizer? Else if you do not, then tell the farmer plainly and honestly that it is one-tenth fertilizer if he can make it at all and nine-tenths power to be used by Mr. Ford in manufacturing anything that he may see fit.

You tell another class of men, in order to elicit their sympathy and their support, that he is going to create a new era in the United States by furnishing cheap transportation and cheap power for the industries all over this country. The man who has carefully read the proposal and the hearings and makes these statements unqualifiedly knows that he is misleading the farmers and the laborers and the industries of America. He does not agree to sell an ounce of this energy to the factories throughout the country or to electrify railroads or to furnish power for traction companies. They tell the farmer and the business man and the poor washerwoman of the country that he will furnish them cheap power to run all of their machinery on the farm, to turn the wheels of the industries, to run the washing machine of the woman who does laundry work for a living. Let me call your attention to the fact that this is a base fabrication, that it is devoid of a single element of truth, and the men who are informed about the Ford offer know that it can not be true.

Mr. Mayo, who represents Mr. Ford in this matter, has testified for days before the Military Affairs Committee of the House and the Agriculture Committee of the Senate. Let me call your attention to Mr. Mayo's testimony as recorded in the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-seventh Congress, volume 1, page 243:

Mr. MAYO. Mr. Ford has given that a great deal of thought, and he thinks that very few really know the magnitude of this project, and as he proposes to use all this power for himself eventually it will take a very large investment down there and quite a few years to build up to it.

The CHAIRMAN. He proposes to use all the power himself?

Mr. MAYO. He expects to.

Again on page 262 Mr. Mayo testified as follows:

Mr. MAYO. Mr. Ford intends to use that power himself. It is not a question of selling the power.

On page 286 will be found the following testimony:

Q. Does Mr. Ford put very much stress on this clause relating to after the 100-year period?—A. I think so. He will have built up a plant to consume all the power, and if you took the power away from him the plants would have no value.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing testimony is only a small part of the statements made by Mr. Ford's representative on the subject of what is intended to be done with Muscle Shoals provided this offer is accepted. This testimony is recited for the purpose of disclosing that Mr. Ford has no intention of selling power to electrify railroads, or to operate traction lines, or to grind the farmer's feed for his stock, or to light cities or dwellings, or to turn the wheels of the industries of the South that are idle because of lack of power. It is recited to refute the many misstatements that have been made on this subject. It is recited to show that Mr. Ford is going to use all of this power in the manufacture of whatever suits him best at his own plant and unrestrained and unhampered by any commission or other authority, either State or Federal.

Muscle Shoals was placed in the Tennessee River in order that its power might be used by and for the benefit of all and not one. This Congress has no right to set aside the great scheme of the Creator of the universe and thwart His plans by giving this great opportunity to one man. If Mr. Ford desires this property and can get it, it ought to be leased to him at a fair rental value and then he ought to be made to operate under the Federal water-power act and distribute this electric energy to all parts of the South. Every man in that section of the country who desires to start a business ought to have the right to obtain this cheap power. This is the plan of Him who created it. It was the purpose of those who fought for and struggled long overcoming obstacles and finally succeeded in giving to the country the Federal water-power act that conserves this power for the benefit of those to whom it rightfully belongs—the entire people.

As I have said before, no one knows that Mr. Ford can manufacture nitrates by any known process at Muscle Shoals. No one knows that any process will be found in the future that will prove successful, and Mr. Ford's representative frankly tells you that if he can not manufacture fertilizer at a profit to himself he will abandon the attempt. In verification of this statement let me call your attention again to the House hearings and the testimony of Mr. Mayo. On page 245 will be found the following testimony:

Question. I will simply speak of it as nitrate which can be produced at Muscle Shoals, and I understand you to say that as long as it is profitable or can be produced without a loss Mr. Ford would be glad to continue to produce that product.

Mr. MAYO. Yes, sir.

Question. And I think you stated it very correctly when you said that it is a fair assumption that if it was being produced at a loss it would only be a matter of time when even Mr. Ford with all his wealth would go out of business, and therefore the element of profit or the cost of manufacture has to be taken into consideration.

Mr. MAYO. Yes, sir.

Again, on page 254, is the following testimony:

Question. If found by Mr. Ford, after the starting of operations, that he can not produce ammonium nitrate in competition with the wholesale market price of the same materials from other sources, do you understand that his agreement binds him to continue the operation of the plant for nitrogen compounds at a loss?

Mr. MAYO. I do not think so.

Question. It would not bind him to continue?

Mr. MAYO. I hardly think so.

Again, on page 255, in response to a question, Mr. Mayo said:

Mr. MAYO. The only reason for him to discontinue (fertilizer) would be his actual inability to manufacture at a profit.

Again, at page 309, this testimony is found:

Question. What does that mean—that he does not have to do it (manufacture fertilizer)?

Mr. MAYO. In my opinion he would not have to do it (manufacture fertilizer), as I have said before, if he exhausted every known effort and still could not make it except at a great loss.

Question. He could make it, whether he makes it at a loss or not, can he not?

Mr. MAYO. I do not think he could do it very long.

This testimony is recited for the purpose of showing that Mr. Ford does not know for a certainty that he can make fertilizer at Muscle Shoals, and that he will not make it unless he can make it at a profit to himself. Those who contend otherwise simply fly in the face of the facts without regard to the Ford proposition and the testimony in support of it.

The Ford proponents may succeed in deceiving the public for the time being and barter away the rights of the people, but the day of retribution will come. I would like to see the taxpayers' interests guarded in this matter and I would like to have the country advised of the facts as they are and not what we would like them to be.

Remember that nitrate plants Nos. 1 and 2 with their 3,900 acres of land and all these buildings and machinery are to be transferred to him with a fee-simple title. It is true we ask him to make a certain amount of fertilizer and keep nitrate plant No. 1 in a stand-by condition for the making of nitrates should war come, but Mr. Ford has not written into his proposal any recapture clause in the event that he should either fail or neglect to do these things. And Congress is arrogantly told that it must accept this offer just as Mr. Ford has written it without the changing of a sentence. So sacred is this offer that Congress must not presume to change it or amend it in any way. It must be accepted just as he wrote it and presented it and Congress shall only have the poor privilege of ratifying the proposal without having any right to say what the proposal shall contain. For Mr. Ford states in his proposal as follows:

The above proposals are submitted for acceptance as a whole and not in part.

So you see we must sign on the dotted line, or if we have courage to defend the rights of the United States, then we must refuse his offer in its entirety. But you see if we accept his proposition by signing on the dotted line, then we give him among other things an unqualified lease for 100 years—twice the length of time any other man can secure a leasehold.

So you see this estops Congress from safeguarding the Nation's rights. This lease ought to have a clause written into it that would render that instrument void provided the Ford Co. failed to do the things for which the lease provides.

Would any Member of Congress part with his own property without a reconveyance clause in the event the consideration for the transfer should fail? If it were your own property would you insist upon safeguarding your rights? I think you would demand a clause of recapture, but we can sometimes become very generous and bountiful with other peoples' property.

While Mr. Ford says that he will generate a million horsepower at Muscle Shoals, personally I think his statement is not borne out by the facts. I think also that a statement by Mr. Mayo to the effect that 900,000 horsepower can be generated there is somewhat in excess of the Muscle Shoals possibilities.

One of the great water-power conservators of this country and one who labored for many years to save these rights for the people, Mr. Gifford Pinchot, now Governor of Pennsylvania, thinks that 700,000 horsepower would be all that could be counted on at that place and it is very pertinent to quote from a statement made by him on the subject of Muscle Shoals, and I quote as follows:

"The Ford offer," says Gifford Pinchot, "is seven parts water power to one part fertilizer, even if the fertilizer part should work out. For the water power itself Mr. Ford would pay nothing, and he would be free from all taxes on the property. Other lessees to water-power rights from the Government not only bear the total cost of building their own dam and power houses and pay taxes on them, but they also pay for the water power in addition. The Ford offer is like offering a man 4 per cent on the cost of his factories as rent, and then asking him to throw in a coal mine to supply fuel for the engines for nothing."

Mr. Speaker, this is the view taken on this subject by most men whose judgment is unbiased on the one hand and whose zeal for the rights of the people is pronounced. It is true when Governor Pinchot says that Mr. Ford would be tax exempt on these dams because the dams belong to the Government and they are practically loaned to him for 100 years. It is true, as the governor says, that all other water-power companies are compelled to build their own dams at their own expense and if they are partially injured or completely destroyed they must repair or rebuild them at their own expense. If damages to property occur or if life is lost the operating company must pay the bills. Other companies must not only do all these things but they must pay taxes to the State on the taxable value of these dams. They have no Santa Claus.

To my mind this Ford offer unamended would represent one of the boldest and most brazen daylight robberies that has ever occurred in the history of this country. I do not blame Mr. Ford. He has made his offer in the open and if this Congress barters away the rights of the people in this high-handed fashion the condemnation will rest on the Congress and not on Mr. Ford.

I do not know what magnetic power this man possesses that he can so hypnotize a part of the membership of this House that they would add this priceless legacy to the already dangerously great wealth of this man who is twice a billionaire if common report be true. Remember, he got these billions from the pockets of his customers as profits in the sale of his automobiles and the necessary parts to keep them in repair. Remember, too, that this has all been accomplished in the short period of 20 years. If he is given Muscle Shoals with all this immense power donated, even the flighty imagination of man could not conceive the number of billions that he would extract by way of profits from the pockets of the people in the next 20 years. Therefore, let us be done with all of these exaggerated statements and misinformation and let us tell the people the truth about their own property and what Mr. Ford proposes to do with it if he gets it. Let us truthfully and frankly tell them that he only intends to use a small portion of this power in the manufacture of fertilizer, if indeed he can manufacture it at all.

Let us tell them that the reason he wants it is because he desires to use five or six, or perhaps seven or eight, hundred thousand hydroelectric horsepower as a gift from the people in the carrying on of a private enterprise for himself. Let us be frank and tell them that if this is done he can carry on this manufacturing project of his at this place and sell the manufactured product at any price that he may see fit. When you tell them this is a fertilizer project, tell them that only a small portion of it is fertilizer and that feature is exceedingly doubtful. If Mr. Ford can use 100,000 horsepower and manufacture 1,500,000 tons of fertilizer, if this is a fertilizer project, then let him use the remainder of this power for the same purpose and manufacture at least 10,000,000 more tons. If he could do this and sell this huge amount at a low price he would then be the farmers' real benefactor. But let us tell them that he has no such intention as this, and then, as the years roll by and Mr. Ford does not make them the expected cheap fertilizer, their disappointment will not be so keen.

In conclusion, let me again say that an acceptance of this offer would be a repudiation of the Federal water power act. This act throws safeguards around our natural resources throughout all time to come. It preserves these rights for all the people. The great investors in water-power rights have found its provisions to be wise. It was the pet theory of President Roosevelt. He devoted many years of his life to have it written upon the statute books of the Nation. He continued his efforts after his term as President of the United States had expired. This great work was carried on through Taft's administration, and these efforts were finally crowned with success during the Wilson administration. All of the great engineers of the country agree that the Federal water power act is the embodiment of wisdom and that no man should be allowed at this day to lay a violent hand upon its provisions.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

AMERICAN GROUP OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION—PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL MEETING.

The following is a stenographic report of the proceedings of the twentieth annual meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union:

The twentieth annual meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union was held in the caucus room, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., Saturday, February 24, 1923, at 10.20 o'clock a. m., Senator WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, president, presiding.

President MCKINLEY. Gentlemen, shall we come to order? The notice for this meeting sent out by the executive secretary contains the agenda, as follows:

NOTICE.

The twentieth annual meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union will be held in the caucus room, third floor, House Office Building, Saturday, February 24, at 10 o'clock a. m.

The program will include:

1. Reading of the minutes.
2. Announcements and communications.
3. President's report.
4. Treasurer's report.
5. Executive secretary's report.
6. The election of officers.
7. Unfinished business:
   (a) Report of delegates to the twentieth conference at Vienna, Austria, August, 1922.
8. New business:
   (a) Plans for the twenty-first conference of the Interparliamentary Union:
   —August next (?)
   —at Copenhagen, Denmark (?)
9. Adjournment.

You are receiving herewith the executive secretary's report of the conference in Vienna.

If your name does not appear on the list of members inclosed, you will wish, of course, to send to the executive secretary the card which is also inclosed.

Every member of the congress should be a member of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. If you are not a member, mail the application at once.

Surely you will agree that this is important.

Fraternally yours,

WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY,
President.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL,
Executive Secretary, 613 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

The first matter on the program is the reading of the minutes. I should suggest that, since the minutes of the last meeting have been printed and distributed, perhaps we may waive the reading.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I move, Mr. President, we dispense with the reading of the minutes.

(The motion was duly seconded and carried.)

President MCKINLEY. As to announcements, I might suggest that we have not yet been advised what place the conference will select for the next meeting. We understand it will probably be held in Denmark and probably about the middle of August.

There are two vacancies on the board, caused by the retirement from Congress of Representative RUCKER, of Missouri, and Representative STEENERSON, of Minnesota.

The next matter in order is the president's report, and, for the benefit of some of the gentlemen who have not examined our work, I respectfully submit the following:

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION.

"For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration, $4,000." This language is taken from the act making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923. The amount representing this year something of an increase over previous annual appropriations, has been paid annually by the United States Government for a number of years. The money, indicating something of the Government's interest, is turned over to the secretary general of the Interparliamentary Union at the office of the bureau, Geneva, Switzerland.

The secretary general is Dr. Christian L. Lange, recently honored by the Nobel committee.

BEGINNINGS.

The founder of the Interparliamentary Union was a member of the British House of Commons. The first idea of such a union seems to have been suggested to a member of the Austrian Parliament at the time of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. The settlement of the *Alabama* claims shortly afterwards and the spread of interest in arbitration throughout the world paved the way. The Interparliamentary Union began in Paris October 31, 1888, in the interest of arbitration treaties between the United States, France, and Great Britain. Its twentieth conference was held in Vienna, Austria, August 28, 29, 30 last, in the interest of European reconstruction. To William Randal Cremer, of the British Parliament, assisted by Frédéric Passy, of the French Chamber of Deputies, is due all the credit for organizing the union. Because of their energy the organization grew rapidly. As a result Cremer received from the President of France the decoration of the Legion of Honor, from the King of England a knighthood, and in 1903 from the Nobel Committee the peace prize of about $45,000. A labor member of the British Parliament, a carpenter by trade, and a poor man, he forthwith gave all of this money to the cause of peace.

OBJECTS.

The Interparliamentary Union is composed of representatives of various parliaments. The object of the organization is to develop the principle of arbitration in general and to promote intelligent and peaceful relations between peoples. Its first labors were in the interest of treaties of arbitration between France and the United States and between Great Britain and the United States. At what is officially known as the First Interparliamentary Conference, held during the World Fair in Paris in 1889, nine parliaments represented, it was resolved: "The conduct of governments tending to become more and more the expression only of ideas and sentiments voiced by the body of citizens, it is for the electors to lead the policy of the country in the direction of justice, of right, and of the brotherhood of nations."

ANOTHER CONFERENCE IN AMERICA.

In 1914 the United States Government invited the union to hold the Twentieth Interparliamentary Conference in the city of Washington, and an appropriation of $50,000 was carried in the diplomatic appropriation act for the expenses of the gathering. The war naturally interfered, but there are many in and out of Congress, recalling the successful conference at St. Louis in 1904, who hope that the invitation of 1914 may soon be renewed.

CONFERENCES HERETOFORE.

Conferences of the union have been held as follows: Four times at Brussels (1895, 1897, 1905, and 1910); twice in each of the following: Paris (1889 and 1900), London (1890 and 1906), The Hague (1894 and 1913), Vienna (1903 and 1922); once in each of the following: Rome (1891), Berne (1892), Budapest (1896), Christiana (1899), Berlin (1908), Geneva (1912), Stockholm (1921), St. Louis (1904).

ADVANTAGES.

The advantages of such an organization readily suggest themselves. Freed from the domination of any government, it represents a universal and democratic aspiration. Nothing in it savors of particular interest or privilege. Composed of officials, holding its conferences in houses of parliaments, it is itself only semiofficial. Perhaps its main service is its opportunity for parliamentarians from all parts of the world to meet, to confer, to educate one another. At the meeting this summer in Vienna 24 nations, the largest number ever participating at any conference of the Interparliamentary Union, were represented by delegates. The governments represented were: Germany, America, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Spain, Esthonia, Finland, France, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Dutch Indies, Italy, Japan, Norway, the Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, Sweden, and Turkey. For parliamentarians from so many different countries just to meet, officially or unofficially, at conference, at table, at social gatherings, is in itself not without benefit.

Speaking before the conference in St. Louis in 1904, the then Assistant Secretary of State, the Hon. Francis B. Loomis, said to the assembled delegates: "You have aroused, directed, and educated public sentiment in favor of arbitration throughout the civilized world." Mr. Loomis also said: "The Interparliamentary Union deserves credit for practically forecasting five years in advance what proved to be the most salient work of the peace conference at The Hague." There is no doubt that the first Hague conference was called because of the work of the Interparliamentary Union. There is no doubt that its labors made possible the establishment of the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague. Upon its initiative President Roosevelt initiated the second Hague conference.

OUR OFFICERS.

The present officers of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union are Senator WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, president; vice presidents: Representative ANDREW J. MONTAGUE (Virginia), Representative HALVOR STEENERSON (Minnesota), Representative WILLIAM A. OLDFIELD (Arkansas); Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH (Illinois), treasurer; Representative H. GARLAND DUPRÉ (Louisiana), secretary; Arthur Deerin Call, executive secretary. Executive Committee: Representative FRED BRITTEN (Illinois), Representative THEODORE BURTON (Ohio), Representative HENRY ALLEN COOPER (Wisconsin), Representative WILLIAM W. RUCKER (Missouri), Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON (Arkansas), Senator THOMAS STERLING (South Dakota), Representative HENRY W. TEMPLE (Pennsylvania), Representative JAMES C. MCLAUGHLIN (Michigan), Representative MERRILL MOORES (Indiana).

OUR OFFICIAL STATEMENT.

On May 24, 1921, the American group sent to the council of the Interparliamentary Union the following self-explanatory communication:

To the Council of the Interparliamentary Union, 14 Rue de l'Ecole Medicine, Geneva, Switzerland.

SIRS: Please accept greetings from your fellow members of the American group, all of whom are pleased to know of the plans of our council for the nineteenth interparliamentary conference at Stockholm August 17–19 of the current year. The gracious invitation of the Swedish group, combined with the generous cooperation of the Swedish Government, leads us to feel that the resumption of our conferences will take place under circumstances as happy and propitious as could well be possible.

We have examined the "agenda of the conference" submitted under date of April 20, 1921, and we hasten to express our earnest hope and perfect confidence that our brethren will come again to a meeting of minds with reference to questions peculiarly within the historic province of the union, questions relating principally to international law. The time we believe has not arrived when our union can profitably discuss, much less decide upon, political or even economic questions which may give rise to disputes between States. The peaceful and judicial settlement of international controversies, so wisely and constructively discussed and advanced in the first and second Hague conferences, remains still the supreme opportunity of the Interparliamentary Union; so much so, indeed, that we of the American group urge upon our coworkers of other nations—

1. The calling of a third Hague conference.

2. The extension of the principle of international conciliation, as set forth in the score and more of treaties negotiated between the United States and other powers in 1913, commonly known as the "Bryan treaties."

3. The creation of a judicial union of the nations, under which such questions as the interpretation of treaties or of international law, the breach of international obligations, the determination of reparations, and the interpretation of prior decisions passed by the court of the union may all be decided by the court according to principles of accepted law and known equity.

4. The continuation of the conference of the Interparliamentary Union, not only for these high purposes herein set forth but for the additional and by no means insignificant reasons, namely, that lawmakers of the world may become more generally acquainted, more intelligently informed of each other's tasks, and more sympathetically alive to the possibilities awaiting them in the realm of practical international achievement.

We of the American group have not lost interest in such questions as the limitation of armaments, the reduction of the cruelties of war, the establishment of a prize court, the rules relating to neutrality, and the like; but we feel that these matters are dependent upon, and that they are not anterior to, the mode of international conference, the method of conciliation, and the means of judicial settlement, to which we have taken the liberty here to advert.

We believe that the Interparliamentary Union has in its traditional adherence to substantially these high matters amply proved its reason for being, and that nothing has happened since our last meeting in 1913 to warrant any change in its independent action, in its fundamental aims, or in its methods.

A CONCLUDING REMARK.

It is not without significance that in this day of divergent interests, points of view, and policies there exists in the world this organization of parliamentarians, each trying as best he may to understand the other fellow's job. [Applause.]

The treasurer's report is next in order.

[Treasurer A. J. Sabath presented his report, as follows:]

Treasurer's report—A. J. Sabath.

AMERICAN GROUP, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 24, 1923.*

	Receipts.	Disbursements.
On hand December 13, 1921	$383.87	
February 10, 1922—Arthur D. Call		$21.45
February 27, 1922—Arthur D. Call		7.79
February 27, 1922—Judd & Detweiler (printing)		8.25
April 4, 1922—Douglas O. Morgan (reporting)		18.90
April 12, 1922—D. H. Elkins (duplicating)		10.60
June 1, 1922—American Peace Society		29.00
April 23, 1922—Arthur D. Call, American Peace Society (printing minutes); Doctor Lange (cable)		41.41
	383.87	137.40
Disbursements	137.40	
On hand February 24, 1923	246.47	

President MCKINLEY. A very worthy report. We are glad to receive it.

The next is the report of the executive secretary.

[Executive Secretary Arthur D. Call presented his report, as follows:]

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT.

The last annual meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union was held February 24, 1922, in the caucus room of the House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10.30 o'clock. A stenographic copy of the proceedings of that meeting was printed and distributed to every Member of the House and of the Senate.

Since the last annual meeting certain things in connection with the work of our group have happened worthy of record. They may be briefly enumerated.

EVIDENCES OF INTEREST.

During the year there have been two evidences of a growing interest in the labors of the group. Upon the initiative of Senator SPENCER the Interparliamentary Union and the list of the officers of the American group are listed in the Congressional Directory under the heading "Joint Commissions and Committees." This is the first time that our union has been thus officially recognized. Furthermore, the Congress has seen fit to increase its appropriation to the Interparliamentary Union from $2,000 to $4,000. The practical unanimity with which this action was taken both in the Senate and in the House is encouraging.

There have been a variety of meetings of your executive committee, usually taking the form of a luncheon, supper, or dinner at the gracious invitation of the president of our group, Senator WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY.

NEXT INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.

No little attention has been given to the question whether or not our American group should invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its twenty-first international congress in the United States during the current year. After conferring with the Executive department your committee decided that it would be wise to defer inviting the Union to meet in America at least until 1925. Thereupon the following cablegram was sent to Secretary Lange, under date of January 29, 1923:

INTERPARLEMENT, *Genéve:*

Mature deliberation convinces us would be unwise to invite union meeting America this year. No diminution of interest. Just matter of expediency.

CALL.

Replying to this telegram, under date of February 1, Secretary Lange has written:

DEAR MR. CALL: I need not tell you that I was very sorry indeed to receive your wire of the 29th, which I found here on my return from a short vacation in the mountains. Of course, we have to bow to your decision, taken after mature deliberation, but I can not but think that it would have been a very great boon to our interparliamentary work if you had seen your way to receiving us this year. I know pertinently that especially in France an American invitation would have been accepted with great favor, and I need not point out how important it would be just now under the present circumstances to draw French parliamentarians into our circle. You will know that Canada was quite ready to support an invitation from America and to take part in the reception. It may be difficult to find for some years an opportunity which will suit both groups as well as would have been the case in 1923.

I am very glad that you add expressly that there is no diminution of interest, but that your attitude is due only to considerations of expediency. I shall take care to let this be known as widely as possible.

We shall then have to fall back on the Danish invitation, and, as far as organization and a thorough preparation of the conference go, we could hardly be in better hands than in Denmark. The secretary of the group, whom you met at Vienna, is a very capable man in all that pertains to organization, and I am quite sure that all members of the forthcoming conference will have great pleasure and find special interest in taking part in this meeting. I suppose it will take place in August, probably about the middle of the month, and I trust that at any rate we can count on a numerous and representative American delegation. You know there are direct and very good steamers from New York to Copenhagen. * * *

Will there be any special subject which an American would like to try out before the conference? I suppose that we shall send around a circular to the groups after the meeting of the executive, containing a draft agenda for the conference. It would be a matter for satisfaction if this year, too, we could have an American to submit a report, as Mr. BURTON did last year. What about Mr. MONTAGUE presenting a resolution in favor of international arbitration or America's entering the international court? It would be necessary to be informed as to this some time before the meeting of the council, which, I presume, will take place at the beginning of April.

With best wishes, yours very sincerely,

CHR. L. LANGE.

VISIT FROM SECRETARY OF CANADIAN GROUP.

Your executive secretary wishes to record that on February 6, 1923, he was visited by Senator C. P. Beaubien, secretary of the Canadian group of the Interparliamentary Union.

TWO EVENTS.

There remain two other outstanding events of the year:

(1) The attendance by our American delegation upon the twentieth conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Vienna, Austria, during the last days of August, 1922. The delegation from this group to the conference in Vienna was as follows: Senator William B. McKinley, of Illinois, president of the American group; Senator Selden P. Spencer, of Missouri; Senator E. F. Ladd, of North Dakota; Senator T. H. Caraway, of Arkansas; Senator W. J. Harris, of Georgia; Representative Andrew J. Montague, of Virginia, president of the American Peace Society; Representative Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, former president of the American Peace Society; Representative Henry W. Temple, of Pennsylvania; Representative William A. Oldfield, of Arkansas; and Arthur D. Call, executive secretary of the group. Other members of the party were: H. M. Pindell and J. W. Stipes, of Illinois; Mrs. Harris and daughter; Mrs. Montague and her daughter, Mrs. Moore; Senator McKinley's niece, Miss Julia Mattis, and her friends, Mrs. W. H. Smith and Mrs. Edward Clifford, wife of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and Mrs. Call.

Your executive secretary had printed and sent to each Member of the Congress a report of the conference, showing that there were 24 nations represented at the conference. In the report there was a record of the officers, of the work of the conferees, and a copy of the resolutions passed. There is also a brief account of the trip to Budapest and to Belgrade. The report includes some 10 pages of "Notes on the Setting in Austria."

(2) Another important event was a supper given to the executive committee by President McKinley at his home, 1736 Massachusetts Avenue, Sunday evening, February 18. During the evening addresses were given by Representatives THEODORE E. BURTON and HENRY W. TEMPLE, by Senators JOSEPH T. ROBINSON and SELDEN P. SPENCER, and by Dr. James Brown Scott. While these addresses were extemporaneous, every effort is being made to persuade each of the gentlemen to write out his remarks for purposes of publication; this with the thought that in the form of a brochure they can be made of service not only at home but abroad.

AN APPRECIATION.

Your executive secretary craves the privilege of recording his deep appreciation of the unfailing courtesy not only of the officers and members of our executive committee, but of all Members of the Congress whom it has been his duty to approach in matters relating to the work of the Interparliamentary Union. [Applause.]

President MCKINLEY. The next in order is the election of officers. Please permit me to say that I deem it a great honor to have been elected three times as president of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, but I really think the office should be passed around, and I shall be glad indeed if some one be named in my stead as president.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, for years we have had the same president, and I never could quite bring myself to believe that rotation was the best method for securing efficiency or the proper presentation here and elsewhere of the aims of the local group; and I am going to make a motion that the present officers, excepting Messrs. Steenerson and Rucker, who withdraw, be reelected—that is, for president, Senator William B. McKinley; for vice presidents, Messrs. Andrew J. Montague and William A. Oldfield, and in place of Mr. Steenerson, Mr. Henry W. Temple, of Pennsylvania; for treasurer, Mr. A. J. Sabath; for secretary, Mr. H. Garland Dupré; and for executive secretary, Mr. Arthur D. Call. And I move that the rules be suspended and that the executive secretary be directed to cast the unanimous vote of the group for the members nominated. Are there any other nominations? [After a pause.] If not, I will take the liberty of putting the motion, if it is seconded.

(The motion was duly seconded and unanimously carried.)

Mr. BURTON. There are three vacancies on the executive committee; Mr. Rucker, who retires; Mr. Steenerson, who retires; and Mr. Temple, who has just been elected a vice president, and that makes him ex officio a member of the executive committee.

President MCKINLEY. That is right.

Mr. BURTON. I move that the rules be suspended and that the executive secretary be directed to cast the unanimous vote for the reelection of the following-named gentlemen as members of the executive committee: Mr. Fred Britten, Mr. Theodore Burton, Mr. Henry Allen Cooper, Senator Joseph T. Robinson, Senator Thomas Sterling, Mr. James C. McLaughlin, and Mr. Merrill Moores; and to fill the vacancies caused by the retirement of Mr. Rucker and Mr. Steenerson, Senator Seldon P. Spencer, and Mr. John T. Raker.

President MCKINLEY. Are there any other nominations?

Mr. BURTON. If not, Mr. President, the motion is that the executive secretary be directed to cast the unanimous vote for the reelection of the present members of the executive committee, and that there be added thereto the names of Senator SPENCER and Mr. RAKER.

(The motion was duly seconded and unanimously carried.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. President, I do not know whether I am in order or not; but it seems to me this is not the most available date or time in the year, rather, to hold the annual meeting and the annual election. A few days before Congress adjourns we are invariably very busy, and everyone is trying to get away and is attending committee meetings, etc. I wonder whether we could not hold the next election early in January, when nearly everyone is here and when they are not so engaged. If that could be brought about, I think it would secure a much larger attendance and more interest in the organization.

Mr. BURTON. Let me make this suggestion: The place of meeting and some other things are usually determined after January. The place of meeting this coming year would not have been determined in January. I think there is a good deal of substance in what Mr. SABATH says, and the question is whether the executive committee should not have the right to call a meeting at an earlier date, especially during the short session of Congress, when everybody is absorbed in the work of the session.

Mr. SABATH. I have spoken to some of the members who would have been pleased to be here, but they are busy and it is impossible for them to come.

President MCKINLEY. Perhaps you will make a motion, Mr. SABATH.

Mr. SABATH. I think we should leave it with the President.

President MCKINLEY. Perhaps you will make a motion to give the executive committee power.

Mr. SABATH. I move the executive committee be given power to call the next annual meeting at the most advantageous date after January 1.

(The motion was duly seconded.)

Executive Secretary CALL. Mr. President, may I call attention to the fact that article 6 of the by-laws of our American Group of the Interparliamentary Union reads as follows:

"The annual meeting of the American group shall be held February 24, except when that date falls on Sunday, when it shall be held on the next subsequent day."

Mr. SABATH. Then I move to amend the by-laws, unless we can do so only at some meeting called for that purpose.

President MCKINLEY. Would we have a right to amend the by-laws at this regular meeting?

Executive Secretary CALL. No.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I move that we give this matter consideration between now and the next meeting.

Mr. BURTON. Then the resolution should be that the executive committee be requested to consider the desirability of changing the date for the annual meeting and make a report thereon at a later meeting of the union.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I accept that amendment.

(The motion was duly seconded and unanimously carried.)

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. President, a matter has occurred to me that might be of some interest. What success attended your efforts when you extended your great hospitality for a meeting at the Metropolitan last spring to induce attendance at the Interparliamentary Union? Has any result followed that effort?

President MCKINLEY. Mr. Call can answer that.

Executive Secretary CALL. There are two definite results following that meeting: One is that a number of the ministers and ambassadors who were present have been taking the matter up with their respective governments. In other words, action is being taken. A second result is this: That for the first time in the history of the Interparliamentary Union a South American government was represented at the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union this summer. That Government was Chile.

Mr. MOORES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. The other day the suggestion was made that we extend to the Interparliamentary Union an invitation to meet here in 1924. I remember the first meeting of the Interparliamentary Union I ever had the pleasure of attending was at St. Louis during the Louisiana Purchase Exposition; and it occurred to me that there will be a fair and exposition in Philadelphia in 1926, and that it might be exceedingly appropriate to invite the Interparliamentary Union to meet in this country and at Philadelphia in 1926 at some time during the exposition. That is the suggestion that I have to make. We would probably have a larger attendance and be able to do better work during that year at the exposition.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I think the suggestion made by Mr. MOORES should have serious consideration. The delegates from the foreign countries would like very much to come here during an international exposition. But I do not think we can decide that question now. The European officers and members are very anxious to meet on this side of the water just as soon as they can. Conditions might arise that would make it very desirable for them to meet here in 1925. The sooner the better. I really think we should not decide that now.

President MCKINLEY. I did not think Mr. MOORES made that as a motion.

Mr. MOORES. I made it merely as a suggestion.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think we should now decide to invite the Interparliamentary Union to meet at Philadelphia during that exposition. There seem to be differences of opinion as to whether that exposition will be held. Conditions might change in a year. I think we had better wait.

President MCKINLEY. Is there any other business?

Mr. OLDFIELD. I move we adjourn, Mr. President.

(The motion was duly seconded and carried, and thereupon, at 11 o'clock a. m., the group adjourned.)

Mr. ASWELL and Mr. JAMES asked unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama have leave to extend his remarks made awhile ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the remarks of the gentlemen making the request if they are their own remarks.

The extensions of remarks referred to are here printed in full as follows:

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I present, in 8-point type, the two following letters and one resolution on agricultural extension work:

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Baton Rouge, La., February 26, 1923.

Mr. J. B. ASWELL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ASWELL: I have read in full your speech as given in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 20 regarding the States Relations Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. You certainly gave them the plain, unvarnished truth about a situation in the department that ought to be very severely condemned. I most heartily commend you for your straightforward, clear-cut presentation of the facts. I had known of most of the things that you enumerated, and I expect you will find some additional facts that may follow your splendid opening of these questions that are also to be heartily condemned by right-thinking people.

With best wishes, I am,
Very respectfully,

W. R. DODSON,
Dean and Director.

—

EASTERN FEDERATION OF FEED MERCHANTS,
Bullville, N. Y., February 28, 1923.

Hon. JAMES B. ASWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ASWELL: Your speech of January 20 before the House of Representatives was called to the attention of the members of the Eastern Federation of Feed Merchants, in convention assembled at Binghamton, N. Y., February 8–9, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 20.

I am pleased to hand you herewith copy of a resolution that was later adopted, which I think very fitly expresses the opinion of the members present. The writer knows something of the information you gave to Congress and has had numerous occasions to criticize.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am
Very truly yours,

FRANK C. JONES, *Secretary.*

Whereas the Hon. JAMES B. ASWELL, a Member of the House of Representatives from Louisiana, has seen fit to give to Congress and the country some facts with relation to the extension work of the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas he has shown that the extension work of the department is being operated in a very partial manner; and

Whereas it has long been the belief of the members of the Eastern Federation of Feed Merchants and others that the extension bureau was being operated in such a way as to be not in the best interest of the Nation's agriculture, and therefore not in the best interest of the country at large; and

Whereas it seems to be the object of some of those having direction of its affairs to build up an organization that would create lucrative positions rather than to advance the interest of the people of the Nation; and

Whereas it appears that this operation tends to favor one class of citizens over other classes and some sections of the country over other sections; and

Whereas this tends to weaken the efficiency of the work and defeats the purpose for which Congress established the bureau and provided a fund to defray the expenses of it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Eastern Federation of Feed Merchants in convention assembled at Binghamton, N. Y., February 8, 1923, indorse the efforts of the Congressman from Louisiana to have the extension service conducted in such a way that it will serve the best interests of the Nation and to remove it from partisan politics and from the domination of any man or men for their personal advantage; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary be authorized to send to the Hon. JAMES B. ASWELL a copy of this resolution.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, an opponent of the Ford offer recently stated that "the paid propagandist has had his opportunity to shower upon the public a hazy mass of unfounded statements about this offer. Many of these men who are paid to do this sort of thing have thrown truth to the winds and have drawn entirely upon their imaginations." I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that those who are obliged to draw upon their imaginations for their arguments are not the advocates of the Ford offer but its opponents. Its advocates have only to refer to the signed proposal which speaks for itself. What may or may not have been said in the testimony prior to the submission of Mr. Ford's final offer of May 31, 1922, has nothing to do with the case. What counts is the final proposal which Mr. Ford signed. That is the only offer of Mr. Ford's which is before Congress, and when it is accepted its terms will control the operations at Muscle Shoals.

I wish to take emphatic exception to the statement that hired propagandists have been paid to write newspaper and magazine articles and circulars on the subject of the Ford offer. It is true that there has been a certain amount of speculation in lands at Muscle Shoals, but I have it directly from Mr. Ford's representatives that neither he nor his representatives have purchased a single foot of land at Muscle Shoals, nor anywhere in that country, nor taken options on any; and no one responsibly connected with Mr. Ford or his advisers has prepared any newspaper or magazine articles whatever.

Neither is it true that the advocates of the Ford proposal have attempted to make people believe that Henry Ford is a superman, nor that he should be exempted from the law's restrictions, but those who support his proposal do believe that Henry Ford is a master organizer, a man who has successfully solved the problems of labor and production in the large way which eminently qualifies him to undertake to work out the problems of Muscle Shoals.

As for exempting Henry Ford from legal restrictions, there has been no effort, so far as I can learn, to exempt Mr. Ford from any legal restrictions applying to such a case.

It is true that his offer specifies terms not in accordance with certain provisions of the Federal water power act, but it is also true that the Muscle Shoals project is so far different from an ordinary water-power project that the Federal water power act does not apply to it at all. On the other hand, Mr. Ford's restrictions, regulations, and obligations under the terms of his offer far exceed those of any licensee under the Federal water power act; and if he should substitute its terms for the terms of his offer there would be no gain to the country, but, on the contrary, a great loss.

The purposes of public control of water power are best realized when the maximum amount of water power is developed and the power, or the products of the power, are made available to the public at least cost.

The Federal water power act does not serve these purposes. The Federal Power Commission can no more regulate the rates of public-service utilities than can a private individual. The making of those rates is a function of the States in which the power is generated and used; and the States have provided public-utility commissions which make the rates and are wholly independent of the Federal water power act. When Mr. Ford distributes power in Alabama he automatically comes under the jurisdiction of the Alabama Public Utilities Commission; and if he should sell power from Muscle Shoals, in Tennessee, then it becomes the joint duty of the State public-service commissions of Tennessee and Alabama to determine a rate.

Mr. Ford in distributing power could not avoid regulation like that of any other power distributer if he should desire to avoid it, and I have never heard it intimated that he had any such desire or purpose.

Mr. Ford, however, goes far beyond the water power act when he voluntarily agrees to limit his profit on his principal article of manufacture, for it has been shown by the testimony of officers of the Ordnance Department and the United States engineers that the manufacture of fertilizer, which he has obligated himself or his company to make on demand, will require the greater part of the useful power available at Muscle Shoals.

The Federal Power Commission makes no effort to regulate the profit on any product of a private manufacturing operation which obtains its power from a water-power development licensed under the water power act. It has no constitutional right to do so; but there is nothing in the Constitution which will prohibit an individual from voluntarily placing a limit upon his profits from such a private manufacturing operation, and it is this limitation combined with the definite obligation to produce the equivalent of 250,000 tons of Chilean nitrate of soda annually and the maintenance of the nitrate plants in modernized condition, ready for immediate use in a national emergency, which constitute the chief considerations in the Ford offer. These are the principal benefits which the country, as a whole, receives from the operations at Muscle Shoals under the

Ford proposal; and in comparison the $5,000,000 which he offers for the Government's nitrate plants is merely a cash payment to bind the transaction. It should be remembered that one of these plants is admittedly unsuccessful, and all are agreed that the other plant uses a process which is obsolete for the purpose of making high-grade fertilizer at low cost.

To substitute the provisions of the water power act for those of the Ford proposal would be to eliminate the Muscle Shoals development as a great fertilizer project with possibilities of benefits to the farmers running into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and to substitute in its place a mere water-power development which all will agree is of local and not of national interest and importance.

The contention of the supporters of the Ford proposal that it is not his violation of the provisions of the water power act which troubles the opposition was evident last week when the Federal Power Commission granted a license to this same Henry Ford for a large power development on the Mississippi River at the Twin City Government dam at St. Paul, Minn. The consideration was approximately 4 per cent on the Government's investment at the dam, yet no one declared that it was outrageously inadequate. There was no provision that Mr. Ford should pay any part of the maintenance and operation of the dam and navigation locks, but no one complained. There was no provision that in case the dam should be washed out or destroyed by an earthquake, or blasted out by an enemy, that Mr. Ford should replace the structure at his own expense, yet he was not declared to be a robber. There was no requirement that Mr. Ford should distribute a single kilowatt of this power to the surrounding communities—and, according to his own statement, he proposes to use all of this power in his own operations—yet no one objected. There was no regulation whatever on the profit which Mr. Ford should make on any product of his own manufacture in which this power shall be used. There was no provision for a sinking fund to return to the Government its investment at the end of the lease period. Every single provision for the lease of the power dams at Muscle Shoals which has been pointed to as a violation of the rights of the American people was also violated in this license under the Federal water power act with one single exception. The lease of the Twin City dam is for 50 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, we find that this terrible transgression of the rights of the people is right and fair and just if it is for 50 years, and it only becomes an outrageous robbery when the lease is for 100 years. It is right to do wrong for 50 years, but it is terribly wrong to do wrong for 100 years.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that the welfare of the people is safeguarded far more in the Ford offer than it is in the Federal water power act; and if Mr. Ford finds that he must have 100 years in order that the cost of the power and the products made by its use shall not be excessive—for it is well known that a 4 per cent amortization fund is eight times as costly over a 50-year period as over a 100-year period—then I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we must have a better reason for rejecting his offer than this clamor of the opposition about the sacredness of the Federal water power act.

If this Congress desires to protect the rights of the people in their water powers, let them protect these rights under the public welfare clause of the Constitution, rather than upon the questionable basis of the commerce clause, for, Mr. Speaker, the great water powers of the United States are not upon navigable streams; they are upon the nonnavigable streams. And the interests which have opposed the 100-year license to Henry Ford at Muscle Shoals have rights on these nonnavigable streams, which are not limited to 50 years nor to 100 years, but are perpetual.

Take the Aluminum Co. of America, for example, who own outright practically the entire watershed of the Little Tennessee River in eastern Tennessee and western North Carolina. Here, unrestricted by any regulation and unlimited as to their tenure, they are utilizing some 72,000 horsepower for their own private use in the manufacture of aluminum, and have planned to install 475,000 horsepower in the future as their needs require. The water of the Little Tennessee River flows down to Hales Bar, where the United States has granted the Chattanooga & Tennessee River Power Co. a license for 99 years on an installation of 56,000 horsepower. But when these same waters come to Muscle Shoals, where the problem of cheaper fertilizer for the farmer of the United States is yet to be worked out, then we say that 50 years is as long a lease as should be granted. The situation is absurd. It is no more right for the Aluminum Co. to enjoy perpetual rights for the use of the waters of the Tennessee River and then deny that right to Mr. Ford than it would be right to do so if the position of these parties were reversed.

Under the Federal water power act a licensee of a Government dam does not agree to maintain the dam at his own expense. Mr. Ford was not required to assume this obligation at the St. Paul dam; why should he do so at Muscle Shoals, when it is not required of any other licensee? Should we penalize Mr. Ford at Muscle Shoals because he has money and a disposition to use it in the interest of the farmer?

Suppose, for example, that a great office building is leased for a period of years and during that time is destroyed, we will say, by an earthquake. Does the lessee assume the responsibility for its rebuilding? Of course not. Neither does the lessee of any Government dam assume the responsibility for its rebuilding in case of destruction, and no licensee under the Federal water power act, whether he leases a Government dam or builds a dam of his own, assumes the responsibility of guaranteeing the replacement of that structure at his own expense if it should be washed out or otherwise destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, this effort on the part of the opposition to single out Mr. Ford and make him the target for this unfair and unjust criticism is evidence to any fair-minded man that this opposition is not sincere. It is not the dear public which they propose to protect and whose interests so deeply concern them, but it is the undeniable fact that Mr. Ford has made a better offer than they are willing to make. He is taking chances and assuming risks which they are unwilling to assume. They have no good reason, Mr. Speaker, to fear that Mr. Ford will fail, but, like the rest of us, they know that such masterly organizing ability, backed with practically unlimited capital, can and will do the things at Muscle Shoals which they say can not be done. What they fear is not that Mr. Ford will fail to produce fertilizers but that on the contrary he will cut the cost in half, and perhaps more than half; that he will set up a competition that will strike the control of the American nitrate trade from the grasp of the British and destroy the monopoly control of our supply of such a useful metal as aluminum in this country and reduce the cost of both these and other products to the consumer.

Since this country can secure a guaranteed production of the equivalent of 250,000 tons of nitrate of soda by disposing of war-built plants, formerly costing $85,000,000, for $5,000,000, then I say that this country is fortunate to have such an opportunity. Only two years ago we proposed to scrap these same plants and to get no value from them except what little they might bring as junk, and here comes a man agreeing to produce as much nitrate as all American agriculture together with imports from Chile in normal years, and backing his offer with the assets of an estate worth hundreds of millions of dollars. Under the Ford offer we get this great production annually and at the same time are assured of a national nitrogen industry which will maintain this Nation in the leading position which we ought to hold among the nations in a matter so important to both national defense and permanent agriculture.

The opponents of the Ford offer have little regard for truth in their effort to set up reasons why this offer should not be accepted. One of them says that Mr. Ford "agrees to pay nothing for the great reservoirs that the Government must build to hold the water that is backed away from Dam No. 3."

The United States engineers have testified (Senate hearings, page 35) that there is no storage reservoir back of Dam No. 3. There is a lake there, to be sure, and Mr. Ford pays 4 per cent interest on the cost of the lands and overflow rights required in the creation of this lake; but as for storage reservoirs of value to increase the power at Muscle Shoals, these must be built, not back of Dam No. 3 but on the upper tributaries of the Tennessee River where the sites are available, and Mr. Ford's representatives have testified that he proposes to build these dams at his own expense. This is a purely business proposition, Mr. Speaker, for there is only 241,300 horsepower that can be depended upon all the year round at both these dams combined, even when both steam-power plants are used to their full capacity to supplement the water power. Upward of 500,000 horsepower of generating equipment is without any reliable supply of water for its operation and must stand practically idle until these regulating dams are built. Mr. Ford, however, has agreed to pay the Government 4 per cent interest on its cost, whether he can operate this equipment or not, so that he pays a large annual cash penalty until these dams are built.

As to the Gorgas plant, if the contentions of the representatives of the Alabama Power Co. are correct, that they have a legal right to exercise an option to purchase the Government's Gorgas power plant, then that right is theirs whether the Ford offer is accepted or not, for Mr. Ford specifically provides in section 12 of his offer, dealing with the Gorgas plant, that "nothing in this paragraph shall be held to affect any question of the

validity of any provision of said contract"—between the Government and the Alabama Power Co. If the Government has no right to sell the Gorgas plant to Mr. Ford, as these power interests maintain, then under the terms of the Ford offer they get the Gorgas plant and he does not.

And so, Mr. President, summing up the situation, we find that the Government asked for bids on the Muscle Shoals project; that it secured only one bid which the committees of Congress were willing to recommend, and this was the bid from Henry Ford. We have only to review the record to see that, instead of requiring Congress to sign on the dotted line, Mr. Ford has made every effort to comply with the wishes of our committee with whom he was dealing. No less than 27 changes in the language of the Ford offer have been made since it was originally presented on July 8, 1921. In the face of a torrent of criticism and abuses Mr. Ford has remained silent, patiently awaiting the answer to which he is entitled at the hands of this Congress. His offer has been attacked from every angle, but the attackers are those who would play the dog in the manger and prevent Mr. Ford from doing that which they themselves declined to do when they were offered the opportunity under conditions even more favorable than those of the Ford proposal.

Aside from these few selfish interests, Mr. Speaker, there is a nation-wide demand that Henry Ford, the one man with the courage and the money to solve the problem at Muscle Shoals, be given the chance to do it. We may delay and argue and evade the issue, but the longer we postpone our decision the more insistent will be the demand throughout the country that the Congress of the United States shall play fair with Henry Ford.

Mr. HILL, Mr. APPLEBY, Mr. TINCHER, Mr. STRONG, Mr. STEENERSON, and Mr. TILSON asked unanimous consent to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The extensions of remarks referred to are here printed in full as follows:

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 28, 1923, a Member of this House made a speech at a Sunday afternoon mass meeting in Baltimore arranged by the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland.

This Member saw fit to attack me as inconsistent upon the question of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act. The Baltomore Sun, on Monday morning, January 29, reported this Member as having said of me that in Washington I advocated enforcement of the Volstead Act as a State proposition, while in Baltimore I opposed a State enforcement law. It is true that I opposed, and I am proud of having opposed, the fastening upon the State of Maryland of a law similar to the so-called Volstead Act, which is based upon fundamental untruth and injustice.

It is true that I stand, and have consistently stood, for the proper balance of State rights and State obligations under the Constitution. As long as the Federal Government maintains upon its statute books the Volstead Act, I am entirely opposed to the State of Maryland putting a similar act upon its statutes and thus creating two sets of laws covering the same subject matter, under which a citizen of Maryland could be tried and convicted in a State court and sent to the Baltimore City jail, and could afterwards be tried in a Federal court and sent to the Atlanta penitentiary for buying from one bootlegger at one time in one place one pint of pure grain alcohol to be used to rub a sick baby.

Our colleague who made this recent speech in Baltimore followed closely the line of thought and action of the Anti-Saloon League of America. A short time previous to his remarks the executive committee of the Anti-Saloon League of America unanimously adopted a resolution of which the following is a portion:

> When a daily paper like the Chicago Tribune and a college president like the president of Columbia University advocate nullification of the Constitution by those persons and communities which do not approve of any particular amendment to that document, it is time that the friends of orderly government should enter a united protest against such unpatriotic and individualistic doctrine. The acceptance of this annulment doctrine would result in the flouting of the Constitution in any community where any considerable number of the people, for any reason whatsoever, do not favor its enforcement. As long as this is an inseparable Union, nullification of the Constitution by any State or community is treason, and those who advocate it are fomenters of treason.

The Anti-Saloon League of America obviously forgets that they passed the eighteenth amendment by the use of votes of Members of this House who were sitting in direct nullification of the fourteenth amendment. We do not, however, hear them calling themselves "traitors" and "anarchists" for this reason. To me this is the best example of the warped and fanatical viewpoint of the professional prohibitionist, who sees nothing in the Constitution of the United States except the eighteenth amendment.

The same resolution adopted unanimously by the executive committee of the Anti-Saloon League of America contained the following illustration of this warped viewpoint:

> In view of the many and increasing violations of the prohibition law by aliens, we hereby urge the adoption of a bill by the United States Senate, which has already passed the House by a vote of 222 to 73, to deport such aliens after a hearing has been had before the Secretary of Labor and such aliens have been declared undesirable citizens. (If "aliens," how can they be "citizens"?)

I am delighted to say to you that the Senate has not passed this absurd bill which I fought, and I only refer to it as an illustration that the Anti-Saloon League thinks nothing of other provisions of the Constitution, but would apply the penalty of banishment to aliens who violate a law connected with prohibition, which seems to be the only important thing in the Constitution to those who call some of us traitors because we desire to repeal the Volstead Act.

Because I oppose and have consistently opposed the Volstead Act, and because I oppose the constitutional principle, or lack of principle, embalmed in the eighteenth amendment, this same Member in Baltimore and his colleagues of the Anti-Saloon League refer to me as an "anarchist."

In view of this fact, I will present to this House the following observations on the tenth amendment and the fourteenth amendment as related to the eighteenth amendment. On March 7 I expect to participate in a joint debate with Mr. Wheeler, the general counsel of the Anti-Saloon League; our colleague, Representative KELLY of Pennsylvania; and Mr. Hudson Maxim, of New Jersey, on the subject "The eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act—are they reasonable and tenable?"

Availing myself of the unanimous consent of this House, I present to you the following general outline of my proposed remarks before the Economic Club of Providence, R. I., at the Biltmore Hotel:

Is the eighteenth amendment reasonable? Is the Volstead Act reasonable? Is the eighteenth amendment tenable? Is the Volstead Act tenable? These are the four questions for consideration to-night. To all four of these questions my opponents in this discussion, Representative KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. Wheeler, the general counsel of the Anti-Saloon League, will undoubtedly give an unqualified "yes." To me, the eighteenth amendment is not reasonable, and the Volstead Act is neither reasonable nor tenable. Whether the amendment is tenable depends on one's definition of "tenable."

THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT WAS ADOPTED BY NULLIFICATIONISTS OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.

The eighteenth amendment was passed in the House of Representatives by the votes of Members whose very presence in Congress shows that the fourteenth amendment is not "tenable." The Volstead Act was passed in the House by votes of Members who sat as the result of the nullification of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment, which provides that when the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is denied to any of the male—now also female—citizens or in any way abridged "the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such citizens shall bear to the whole number of citizens 21 years of age in such State."

If the South had not nullified the fourteenth amendment there would to-day be no eighteenth amendment, yet willfully closing their eyes to this fact, the Anti-Saloon League, whose views Mr. KELLY and Mr. Wheeler represent, call me a nullificationist because I oppose the retention in the Constitution of "stolen goods," which the eighteenth amendment most certainly is.

The fourteenth amendment remains as a scrap of paper, a part of the Constitution, but it has been nullified by almost unanimous consent. When Representative TINKHAM, of Massachusetts, tried even to inquire into its nullification, the Anti-Saloon-League-dominated House in the Sixty-seventh Congress voted down his resolution. If "tenable" means to hold a place in the Constitution as the fourteenth amendment holds its place, then the eighteenth amendment is "tenable," but if "tenable" means vital and enforceable, then I say that the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act alike are neither reasonable nor tenable.

IS THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT REASONABLE?

Is the eighteenth amendment reasonable? The answer to this question depends on one's conception of the fundamental theory of American government.

One of your local prohibitionists recently said, "Three classes of people make up the opposition to the prohibition program—first, those who want to make money out of the liquor traffic; second, those whose craving for alcohol is stronger than

their love for the fundamental law of their country; and, third, those who worship at the shrine of the pagan god, 'personal liberty.'"

I do not, nor have I ever, nor has any of my family "made money out of the liquor traffic." When in 1795 my great-grandfather, for 64 years the established minister of a Puritan church in New England, dedicated the second meeting house, the selectmen paid for "entertainment for the ministers." After the morning service they were regaled by a "hospitable mug of cider," and after the afternoon service "an exhilarating draft of hot toddy." My grandfather succeeded him in the ministry of the church thus dedicated; and if the present meeting house is ever abandoned for church purposes, by the deed of gift it reverts to me; yet I do not fall into that second class—those whose craving for alcohol is stronger than their love of country. Therefore I, and perhaps some of you, must be class 3, designated by Mr. KELLY and Mr. WHEELER'S friend as worshipers at the shrine of the pagan god, "personal liberty."

THE PAGAN GOD, PERSONAL LIBERTY.

Are those who say that the eighteenth amendment is unreasonable worshipers at the shrine of a pagan god? Is advocacy of "personal liberty" a pagan thing? I think not, and I call to my support the fundamental theory of government of Rhode Island.

PROVIDENCE FOUNDED ON THE WORSHIP OF PERSONAL LIBERTY.

The reverend and learned Cotton Mather, D. D., writing in 1696, relates that about the year 1630 there arrived in New England "one Mr. Roger Williams." He then relates the events which led to the banishment of Mr. Williams from Massachusetts and narrates that—

upon the sentence of the court, Mr. Williams and his party going abroad (as one says) to seek their providences, removed into the southern part of New England, where he, with a few of his own sect, settled a place called Providence.

That Providence is the same Providence in which we meet to-night. Although Roger Williams might not recognize some of the physical changes that have occurred, he would find the same worship here of "personal liberty" upon whose faith he founded this city, for Doctor Mather continues the story of Williams and his followers, describing the founding of Providence thusly:

Whereupon they dissolved themselves and became that sort of sect which we term "Seekers," keeping to that one principle that every man should have the liberty to worship God according to the light of his own conscience.

For myself I prefer to follow the Rev. Roger Williams than the Rev. Mr. Tarbell. I worship "personal liberty" as Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Carroll worshipped it in the days of the Revolution; and we have the authority of Roger Williams that when we do worship "personal liberty" we bow at the shrine of the true God and that we do not worship at the shrine of a pagan god. It is the Anti-Saloon Leaguers that worship at the shrine of the pagan god of the Arabs of the Sahara, not we.

THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT IS CONSTITUTIONALLY UNREASONABLE.

The eighteenth amendment is constitutionally unreasonable judged by the fundamental theory of American government upon which the Union was formed, upon which Rhode Island entered the Union, and upon which the Constitution remained until the adoption of the eighteenth amendment in 1919.

The tenth amendment, adopted before Rhode Island consented to enter the Union, provides:

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.

THE EIGHTEENTH NULLIFIES THE TENTH AMENDMENT.

The eighteenth amendment is a direct nullification of the express guaranty of the tenth amendment, upon the faith of which Rhode Island became one of the United States. The theory of the founders was that general matters were for the Federal Government, local matters for the States. The tenth amendment was a basic guaranty adopted with the Constitution itself.

The local views of the descendants of those who banished Roger Williams, under this tenth amendment, could be retained in Massachusetts, but the local views of Williams and his people could equally be retained by their descendants in Rhode Island. If Massachusetts wanted to believe in witchcraft it was permitted to do so, but it could not force Rhode Island to burn old women for riding astral broomsticks at night.

Under this theory of the basic law, Rhode Island might and did prohibit murder and arson and rape, but that was never considered the function of the Federal Government. Under the basic theory of our Government, Maine had entire right to pass a law prohibiting the use of alcoholic beverages, just as Massachusetts had a right to maintain the Puritan churches by taxes levied on Baptists and Episcopalians. All these were local powers of the States. The reason for the existence of Article X was that many men of many minds might all live together under a Federal Government of limited powers without rending the Constitution by forcing local views on other localities. Kansas might lie down with Rhode Island, and the Constitution be the guardian of them both.

State prohibition is constitutionally reasonable, but national prohibition of any kind of beverage is no more reasonable than would be national prohibition of dancing or card playing, which are denounced by the discipline of the Methodist Church as two of the trilogy of iniquity of which alcoholic beverage is the first.

THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT IS NOT "TENABLE."

If the fourteenth amendment is "tenable," then is also the eighteenth, as I have before pointed out. The same combination of prohibition States that passed, may hold the eighteenth amendment in the Constitution, but constitutions, like laws made in pursuance of them, are no stronger than the sentiment of the people of the various States. The New England ministers in 1795 cheered themselves with mugs of cider and warmed themselves with hot toddies of New England rum after preaching in fireless churches. If the prototypes of the Anti-Saloon Leaguers had abused them as they abuse me and some of you to-day, the ministers might have quoted to them the words of our Lord in Matthew, Chapter XI, verses 18 and 19:

For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil.

The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! * * *

James Madison stated that in all ages in all places "some exciting substance has been sought for as a relief from the languor of idleness or the fatigues of labor." He added that in the progress of refinement "beverages of less intoxicating but still of an exhilarating quality have been more or less common."

The superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland declares, when seeking the rural vote, that any man who owns an apple tree can use his apples for cider, can let it stand and get hard and can give it to guests in his home. The Secretary of Agriculture says that hard cider averages 6 per cent of alcohol. All we farmers—for I own a share in a New England orchard—know that if we put a barrel of cider outside the door in a New England winter, let it freeze and throw away the ice, we get something over 30 per cent of alcohol.

Since prohibition, 60,000 illicit stills have been seized by the Federal Government. The apple tree still bears its fruit, the winter winds still freeze, and the moonshiner's still is easily made in the mountains and in city cellars. The eighteenth amendment, except as a general declaration of a State, not a Federal, principle, is untenable by the laws of nature itself.

THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT.

The eighteenth amendment will be difficult to remove from the Constitution and therefore the above discussion is more or less academic. It is important, however, to consider the true fundamentals of the Constitution, because the same well-meaning people who backed the eighteenth amendment are proposing further amendments to the Constitution to provide for the extension of the Federal power further into the sphere of the local State power by assumption by the United States Government of the laws of marriage and divorce and of the regulation of hours of labor for children and women. I helped pass the child-labor laws of Maryland, and I am for proper laws on domestic relations, just as I am for proper laws regulating the speed of motors or the flights of migratory birds, but they are matters for the individual States and not for the Federal Government.

IS THE VOLSTEAD ACT REASONABLE?

Is the Volstead Act reasonable? How shall we deal with the eighteenth amendment while it remains a part of the Constitution?

Mr. Chief Justice White said, in the case of Rhode Island versus Palmer, of the eighteenth amendment:

* * * as the prohibition did not define the intoxicating beverages which it prohibited, in the absence of anything to the contrary it clearly, from the very fact of its adoption, cast upon Congress the duty not only of defining the prohibited beverages but also of enacting such regulations and sanctions as were essential to make them operative when defined. * * *

The Volstead Act is one of many possible efforts at enforcement, but the Volstead Act is in two essentials utterly unreasonable.

ONE-HALF OF 1 PER CENT IS NOT INTOXICATING IN FACT.

It is unreasonable, first, because it sets up a false standard of what is prohibited by the eighteenth amendment. The presence of one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol in a beverage does not make that beverage "intoxicating." When, therefore, the Volstead Act, posing as an enforcement act, sets up a false standard which is contrary to fact, it seeks to enforce a falsehood.

I do not ask you to accept my statement on this. I shall give you the testimony of Mr. VOLSTEAD himself, of Federal Prohibition Commissioner Haynes, and of the superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland that one-half of 1 per cent is not intoxicating, and that therefore the fundamental basis of the Volstead Act is false.

On Friday, June 10, 1921, before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, discussing cider and homemade wine, Representative CANTRILL asked Representative VOLSTEAD the following question:

According to your construction, it was not the intent of Congress that it would be a violation of law if wine was made at home containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol?

To this Representative VOLSTEAD replied:

No; my contention is this, that it might contain 1 or 2 or possibly 3 per cent without being intoxicating.

On May 2, 1922, Federal Prohibition Commissioner Haynes wrote me officially that under the provisions of section 29, Title II, of the Volstead Act, nonintoxicating cider and fruit juices manufactured exclusively for use in the home of the maker are not necessarily limited to "less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol, but must be intoxicating in fact to be in violation of the Volstead Act." He also stated that "no specific alcoholic limit had been fixed," and that "as at present advised his office was not disposed to take action against the manufacture for use in the home of the maker of cider or other fruit juices containing not more than 2.75 per cent of alcohol by volume."

I at once, on June 12, 1922, asked him to fix the "specific alcoholic limit" of cider and homemade wine. On June 20, 1922, he declined to do so, and gave as a reason "that Congress has not done so, and the courts have not as yet definitely settled the question."

After some more correspondence, on July 3, 1922, Mr. Haynes wrote me that his statement of May 2 was a "misapprehension." Finally I got the Secretary of the Treasury to ask the Attorney General for a ruling as to what "nonintoxicating" meant in section 29, Title II, of the Volstead Act. The Attorney General has not yet rendered an opinion, but these proceedings show that even the Government itself agrees to the falsity of the fundamental one-half of 1 per cent declaration of the Volstead Act.

I have already quoted to you what the superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland said as to the permissibility of hard cider under the Volstead Act. We therefore have Mr. VOLSTEAD, the Federal prohibition commissioner, and the superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland agreeing that the fundamental statement of the Volstead Act that beverages containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol are "intoxicating" is not true.

THE VOLSTEAD ACT CONTAINS IN ITSELF A DOUBLE STANDARD OF MORALITY.

The Volstead Act in itself contains a double standard of morality. Section 29, Title II, of the act provides that none of the penalties imposed in the Volstead Act shall apply to "nonintoxicating" cider and fruit juices made for use in the home. I have already said that the Member of Congress, after whom the Volstead Act is named, Mr. VOLSTEAD, has said that under this section a beverage might contain as much as 3 per cent of alcohol without being "intoxicating." This section applies a standard of truth to the determination of what is or is not "intoxicating," but the remaining portion of the Volstead Act applies a standard of falsehood to the determination of what is or is not intoxicating, when it states that one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol contained in beer or other beverages makes that beverage intoxicating. It is impossible to have proper respect for a law which bears on its face these utterly inconsistent and unreasonable provisions. If one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol plus malt and hop juices is intoxicating, why is not the same amount of alcohol plus apple juice intoxicating? If 3 per cent of alcohol plus apple juice or fruit juice is not intoxicating, why should 3 per cent of alcohol plus the juices of hops and malt be legally declared to be intoxicating?

Mr. Chief Justice White has very clearly stated that the eighteenth amendment does not define the "intoxicating" beverages which it prohibits. It is therefore the duty of Congress to make such a definition or to permit the States to do so under the concurrent power. The definition contained in Title II, section 29, of the Volstead Act prohibits what is actually intoxicating, but the prohibition of all other beverages containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol makes the Volstead Act totally unreasonable.

THE VOLSTEAD ACT IS NOT ONLY UNREASONABLE BUT UNTENABLE.

Congress has not honestly carried out its duty as set forth by Mr. Chief Justice White under the eighteenth amendment, since it has not honestly defined "intoxicating beverages." No law based on a legislative lie can endure.

Dr. Ernest H. Cherrington, in an address delivered at the International Convention of the World League Against Alcoholism, recently held in Toronto, said:

The reason for prohibition of the beverage liquor traffic must rest absolutely upon fundamental truth.

He then quoted "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." There may be some honest ground for difference of opinion as to whether or not claret and the ordinary white wines are in fact intoxicating, but there can be no sincere contention that beer containing 2.75 per cent of alcohol is intoxicating, when VOLSTEAD himself says that cider and fruit juices containing 3 per cent of alcohol are not intoxicating. Doctor Cherrington is right when he says that the Volstead Act must stand or fall on the basis of truth. It is not based on truth, and therefore I hold that it is not tenable.

THE VOLSTEAD ACT HINDERS TEMPERANCE.

The Volstead Act is hindering the movement toward temperance which was so successfully under way when the eighteenth amendment was adopted. A recent study of statistics shows the evil effects of prohibition in Rhode Island. From 1920 until 1922 there has been a retrogression of temperance in this State. In 1920 there were 12 deaths in Rhode Island from alcoholism, while in 1922 there were 35 deaths attributed to this cause. In 1920 there were 14 insanity cases due to alcoholism admitted to your State institutions. There were 41 in 1922. In 1920 there were 153 cases of intemperate parents responsible for their children being brought under the supervision of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. In 1922 there were 1,036 of such cases. In 1920 there were 620 men sheltered and fed in the municipal lodge. This number in 1922 had increased to 3,266. In 1920 there were 4,118 arrests for drunkenness in your State's six cities; in 1922 this number had grown to 6,912. In 1920 there were 11,995 arrests for all such causes in the six cities, while in 1922 there were 15,692 such arrests.

The same sort of facts are reported all through the country. In Georgia, the home of so-called prohibition, R. Q. Merrick, chief of the prohibition forces, reports that his force of 20 men in the past eight months had captured approximately 40,000 quarts of all brands of imported and domestic whiskies, in addition to more than 100 automobiles and auto trucks transporting intoxicating beverages. He also reports that in Georgia, the State which Representative UPSHAW holds up as a model for the prohibition world, in the same eight months about 1,110 liquor stills and 700,000 gallons of beer mash were destroyed.

I do not believe the Volstead Act is tenable, and I am one of those optimists who believe that it will be modified by the 68th Congress.

POSSIBLE SUBSTITUTES FOR THE VOLSTEAD ACT.

If the false standard set up by the Volstead Act is swept away, what will take its place? It may be that for one-half of 1 per cent, 3 per cent will be substituted. It may be that the test applied by Title II, section 29, will be adopted throughout the Volstead Act, and only those beverages will be prohibited which are "intoxicating in fact," such determination to be left to the individual cases. It may be that a greater than 3 per cent of alcoholic content will be permitted. Some change, however, will, in my opinion, be made.

The question which appeals most strongly to me, however, is how can we possibly reconcile the eighteenth amendment with the tenth amendment of the Constitution and restore the rights of the States without the kind of nullification of the eighteenth amendment which has already been applied to the fourteenth amendment? I suggest, therefore, for your consideration, the following substitute for the Volstead Act:

MY SUBSTITUTE FOR THE VOLSTEAD ACT.

Repeal the Volstead Act and enact the following:

SECTION 1. Each State shall for itself define the meaning of the words "intoxicating liquors" as used in section 1 of Article XVIII of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and each State shall itself enforce within its own limits its own laws on this subject.

SEC. 2. Any person who transports or causes to be transported into any State any beverage prohibited by such State as being an "intoxi-

cating liquor" shall be punished by the United States by imprisonment for not more than 10 years or by a fine of not less than $10,000 nor more than $100,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The first section of this proposed enforcement act is based on the theory of local option; the second section is based on the Webb-Kenyon Act, by which the United States guarantees the States from outside interference. The proposed substitute, taken as a whole, permits concurrent action each in their own sphere by the United States and by the individual States to carry out the provisions of the eighteenth amendment.

LOCAL OPTION AND STATE'S RIGHTS.

In 1907 the Anti-Saloon League approved my declaration for local option, made as a candidate for the Maryland Legislature. In 1914 I advised the American Express Co. that the Webb-Kenyon Act was constitutional, and that they should not ship liquor into West Virginia.

The Supreme Court sustained my view, and Mr. Wheeler successfully argued that view in the Supreme Court in the appeal in the cases of Clark Distilling Co. against Western Maryland Railway Co. and the State of West Virginia, and Clark Distilling Co. against my client, the American Express Co., and the State of West Virginia, which cases were decided in 1917.

The Volstead Act, being based on a misstatement of fact, should be repealed, and a true standard applied to decide what are intoxicating beverages. Under the law I suggest, the States could not say constitutionally that 49 per cent whisky is not "intoxicating," but they could say that 2.75 per cent beer, or beer and light wines of a higher alcoholic content are not "intoxicating," and the Supreme Court would say, as it did of the one-half of 1 per cent declaration of Congress, that a State's declaration to this effect is not improper.

THE PAGAN GOD OF UNTRUTH.

The President, on December 8, 1922, in his message to Congress, referred to "men who are rending the moral fiber of the Republic through easy contempt for the prohibition laws." There is unquestionably throughout this Nation "easy contempt" for the Volstead Act. As I view this act, based on an untrue standard, and containing also one standard for the people of the city and another for the people of the rural communities, I am not surprised at this contempt, but the pitiful thing, and I say this as one who was formerly a United States district attorney, is that this contempt spreads to other laws. The sooner, therefore, we abolish the Volstead Act, the sooner shall we bring back that old respect for Federal law which was so strong in the United States. The sooner we do away with the immoral Volstead Act, the sooner shall we cease to worship "at the shrine of the pagan god," the pagan god of Mahomedan untruth, masquerading in the guise of moral law.

Mr. APPLEBY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of the House to Senate bill 3968, introduced by Senator FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, passed by the Senate September 1, 1922, and now on the House Calendar, to improve the navigability of waters of the United States by preventing oil pollution thereof. This bill is exactly the same as H. R. 10956, which I introduced in the House on March 18, 1922.

Numerous hearings were given by the Rivers and Harbors Committee on H. R. 10956, before whom the bill was pending. Testimony was submitted both orally and in the form of briefs by steamship owners, harbor masters, fishermen, bathing-beach owners, fire underwriters, chambers of commerce, and other interested individuals and organizations. The consensus of this testimony was to the effect that the evil of oil pollution as now practiced was a very serious menace to the fishing, bathing, harbor, property, and other interests adjacent to ocean and ocean inlets on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Hearings were also given before the Senate Committee on Commerce on the Senate bill. The measure was passed by the Senate and came to our Rivers and Harbors Committee. This committee, after many weeks of deliberation, reported the bill to the House. The bill as reported amends the Senate bill by more clearly defining navigable waters.

At all of the hearings representatives from the various oil companies were present and agreed that the nuisance should be abolished by appropriate legislation.

Since the bill has been placed on the House Calendar I have made repeated efforts to get it before the House for consideration. Many Members on each side of the House have expressed themselves as anxious to vote upon this important legislation. My friends in this body, as well as Senator FRELINGHUYSEN'S friends and colleagues in the Senate, have urged upon the Speaker pro tempore that the proposed legislation should be enacted into law, but all of the requests and arguments have fallen upon deaf ears. As a result of the Speaker pro tempore's opposition and refusal to accede to the wishes of his colleagues, both in the House and the Senate, no domestic oil pollution bill can be enacted at this session. You will probably recall that the House joint resolution which I introduced in the last session authorizing and requesting the President to call a conference of maritime nations with a view to adopting effective means for the prevention of the pollution of navigable waters, passed both Houses and was signed by the President. This resolution deals only with oil pollution in navigable waters beyond the 3-mile limit.

The oil interests have been most diligent in their efforts to prevent a vote being taken upon the proposed domestic legislation. In my mind there is no question that had the House been allowed to vote upon this important measure the bill could have been passed by a large majority. However, the seed has been sown, a great deal of valuable data on the subject has been developed, and a large amount of information has been printed by the Rivers and Harbors Committee which will be of service in the next Congress when the measure is reintroduced.

In making these statements for the information of the House and the benefit of my constituents who are so vitally interested I desire to clearly indicate where the responsibility rests. I have labored long and earnestly to secure the enactment of this much-needed legislation, and the responsibility for the fact that the Members of this body were prevented from voting on the measure rests not upon my shoulders.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave given to extend I am inserting speech of Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, of Ohio, delivered before the Kansas Day Club at Topeka, Kans., on January 29, 1923.

The speech is as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, OF OHIO, BEFORE KANSAS DAY CLUB, TOPEKA, KANS., JANUARY 29, 1923.

I am here to speak to you as a Republican to Republicans. I am here not to apologize or explain but rather to boast of the record of my party, not only of what it has done in the remote past but what it has done since the beginning of the present administration and is doing now.

I come from a State which gave to the Nation the great man whose birthday we are honoring to-night, one of the most beloved of all Presidents of the United States, William McKinley; a State which has but recently given to the Nation a President equally beloved, Warren G. Harding. We Republicans of Ohio are proud of our party and we are proud of its leader. We indicated that in no uncertain way last fall. It is true that a Democrat was elected governor—and it is upon that fact that our opponents base their charge that Ohio in the last election did not support the President. In the campaign for governor, however, national issues were not even remotely considered. The issues which determined that election were purely of a local nature. But when it came to national questions, where the question of support of the national administration was concerned, there the people spoke in no uncertain tones, for they gave to the Republican candidates for Congress a net majority of more than 140,000, one of the largest ever recorded in Ohio in a nonpresidential year.

Far from apologizing for the record of my party in and out of Congress I affirm that no party in the history of the Nation has ever within the same period accomplished so much progressive and constructive legislation, gone so far in the redemption of its platform pledges, done so much for the preservation of the peace of the world as has the Republican Party since the inauguration of President Harding.

We came into power when there was financial chaos at home as well as abroad, when we were still in a state of war—technically at least—with the Central Powers, because a Democratic President had persistently refused to ratify any treaty of peace which did not contain as a vital and integral part that wholly un-American and vicious provision known as article 10 of the League of Nations, which the American people had repudiated a few months before by a majority of more than 7,000,000 votes. We found that the national debt, which had been something less than $1,000,000,000 when the Democratic Party had last assumed the reins of Government had risen to the appalling and crushing total of more than $25,000,000,000, and that the expenses of government, which in 1913 were in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,000 a year, had risen to the staggering sum of more than $5,500,000,000 a year.

We at once set about putting our house in order, and how well it has been done is indicated by the fact that the national debt has been reduced by more than $2,000,000,000 and the national annual expenditures by nearly $2,500,000,000.

That debt when we took hold was composed of two principal items, about $14,000,000,000 made up mainly of war ex-

penditures and $11,000,000,000 of loans to our allies in the late war.

No arrangements whatever had been made for the collection or funding of this foreign debt. In fact, it had been contracted in a manner wholly outside the law. The first Liberty bond act, under which for the first time a foreign loan was authorized, provided that all loans should be secured by the bonds of foreign governments similar in terms to the bonds issued by the United States to provide the necessary funds.

The various other bond acts had a similar provision. Did the last administration follow this plain provision of the law? On the contrary, for not one cent's worth of the $11,000,000,000 actually loaned was a cent's worth of security given. All that we received as security was an informal I O U signed by the ambassador or commissioner of the debtor country who happened to be in Washington at the time. As a consequence we have not received a dollar either on account or by way of interest from that day to this from any country except Great Britain, and it has only been in the past few months that Great Britain has made some payments, aggregating, I believe, about $100,000,000. We think that that debt was honestly and honorably contracted and ought to be paid. Some well-intentioned people have thought we ought to forget about it. We take the position that while it is possible that some countries may never be in a financial condition to repay the loan in full, that, nevertheless, we do not intend to officially forgive it. On the contrary, we have passed legislation providing for a commission, which the President has appointed, to take up with the various nations plans for the refunding of the loans. That commission has already met with a similar commission from Great Britain, and we understand that they are very close together on a proposal to fund the entire British debt into long-term bonds and provide for the immediate payment of interest.

The remaining $14,000,000,000 of the national debt is a direct inheritance from a Democratic administration notable for its careless, injudicious, and extravagant methods of administering the country's financial affairs. No such riotous expenditure of the people's money has ever been known in history. Favored contractors literally wallowed in huge profits; the effect of the cost-plus contract system upon the cost of living was immediately felt, because under that system the greater the cost for materials of every sort the greater the profits to the contractor. Billions of dollars were wasted in construction of plants and the acquisition of war materials which were never used.

More than a billion dollars was expended in the building of airplanes, and not one fighting plane was ever delivered to our troops at the front. Several billions of dollars were expended in the manufacture of guns, and less than a hundred cannon were ever delivered to our troops in France. Hundreds of millions were expended in the building of plants to produce nitrates and similar war materials, and not a pound of nitrates was ever produced. Of that $14,000,000,000 it is safe to say that somewhere between a third and a half was an absolutely useless expenditure and represents nothing but waste, extravagance, and worse.

Most of it is gone forever, but a part we hope may be recoverable, and this administration is bending every effort to save something from the wreck. Civil suits have already been instituted for the recovery of hundreds of millions, and I am informed by the Department of Justice that within the next 90 days suits will be filed for the recovery of more than $300,000,000 additional. We are going to see this thing through to a finish. We want to see that all innocent persons are absolved, but we intend that guilty persons shall be brought to justice.

The most difficult and vital problem that we faced at the outset was to restore the running expenses of the Government to something like a reasonable basis. We promised economy and we have given you economy to an extent almost unbelievable. We found the cost of government in the last year of the Wilson administration, three years after the war was over, still remaining at the appalling total of more than $5,500,000,000. The following year it was reduced to less than $4,000,000,000, representing a saving of something over $1,600,000,000. The next year it was reduced to $3,500,000,000, and for the fiscal year of 1924, for which all the appropriations have been acted on by the House, including the deficit for the Postal Service but not including that part of the Postal Service which is self-sustaining, it will amount to only a trifle over $3,000,000,000. When you take from this the nearly $2,000,000,000 of fixed charges—that is to say, interest on the public debt, expenses of the Veterans' Bureau, the sinking fund, and the increases in pensions—the fixed charge for the conduct of every department of the Government is only about $1,080,000,000 aside from the self-sustaining portion of the Postal Service, so that we are now back practically to the pre-war basis.

I say to you, my fellow citizens, that if the Republican Party had done nothing else its record for strict practical economy deserves the gratitude of the people because this colossal and unexampled saving of the public money was accomplished without any undue weakening of the two defensive arms of the Government—the Army and the Navy—or the crippling of any of its civil branches.

Such an unprecedented record could have been accomplished only by a party which has at all times acted with an eye single to the redemption of its pledge to reduce the cost of government.

This retrenchment of expenses and expenditures made possible a very substantial reduction of the tax burden and leaves the way open for a further substantial reduction, I hope, in the near future. One of the major enactments of the last Congress was an amendment of the existing revenue law. It repealed the excess-profits tax—a tax which, if justifiable in time of war, is not justifiable in time of peace, because it is the most damaging of all taxes to ordinary business, and particularly to little business as compared with big business. It reduced the high surtaxes from 65 per cent to 50 per cent, for it had become apparent that the very high taxes were driving wealth from useful investment into investments where it could not be taxed at all. It repealed all taxes on transportation; it repealed the taxes on clothes, musical instruments, athletic goods, soda-water fountains, and many other so-called nuisance taxes. It increased the exemptions in the income tax law applying to heads of families with a salary or wage income of less than $5,000 a year, a provision which will favorably affect more than 90 per cent of the taxpayers. The total amount of reduction in taxes brought about by these reforms amounts to something like $850,000,000 a year—a reduction which seemed absolutely impossible at the outset and could only have been effected by the most rigid sort of economy.

Let me put before you in another way the financial situation as we met it and the manner in which it has been solved. The fiscal year 1922 began with a deficit of $759,000,000, but before the close of the year that deficit had been transposed into a surplus of $313,000,000. The fiscal year 1923, which began on the 1st of last July, opened with an apparent deficit between the income and the outgo of $698,000,000. So far this has been worked down to $272,000,000, and we hope that it will be wiped out before the 1st of next July. So far as we are able to calculate now there is an apparent surplus for 1924, for which the House has just finished making appropriations, of $181,000,000, so that even if the deficit of $272,000,000 for this year is not wiped out we will show for the first three years of the Harding administration an actual surplus of about $220,000,000.

In addition to this we have, as I said before, made a reduction of $850,000,000 a year in taxes, which in three years will amount to $2,550,000,000. That means that we have transposed about $1,400,000,000 of deficits to a surplus of $220,000,000, which, including the $2,550,000,000 saved in taxes, makes a change of substantially $4,000,000,000 from the red-ink side of the national account to the credit side in the first three years of the Harding administration. Such an achievement as this has been accomplished by no other nation in the world, and I doubt whether any business institution could make anything like the same showing.

Full advantage was taken of the Budget system inaugurated in the first few months of this administration by the passage of a bill which had been vetoed by President Wilson, but much of the credit must go to the Committee on Appropriations of the House, of which your Congressman, DAN ANTHONY, is a most influential and valuable member. This year all previous records for speed in the passage of the necessary appropriation bills have gone by the board. A week ago last Saturday the House passed the last of the appropriation bills, 40 days in advance of the earliest time in which the appropriation bills have been passed by any Congress in the short session in the history of the country.

Another of the major enactments of the last Congress was the passage of a law which restored the time-honored American system of protection to American industries and to American labor, under which we have invariably thrived and without which we have invariably suffered. We found the gates of all our ports of entry wide open to the products of the world. We closed them, to the extent at least that fair competition might be had and a fair chance afforded to the American producer to sell in the Nation's market. Let me tell you this, my friends, and it is true as any postulate of Euclid: No Republican tariff

bill ever closed a factory, mortgaged a farm, or lost an American workingman his job. No Democratic tariff bill ever failed to do all three.

It was predicted by our opponents that the new tariff law would seriously damage our import trade and utterly ruin our export trade. What are the facts? Receipts from customs since the law went into effect have been larger than ever before in history. If the present average keeps on, they will amount possibly to $500,000,000, and even the most sanguine of us hardly dared to estimate that they would run as high as $400,000,000. For instance, the receipts from the 21st of last September to January 18 amounted to $165,000,000, as compared to $102,000,000 for the same period a year ago.

How about exports? In the face of the prediction of our opponents that our foreign trade would be ruined our exports for the last three months of last year, immediately after the tariff law had gone into effect, were for October $370,000,000 in round figures, as compared with $343,000,000 for October, 1921; for November $380,000,000, as compared with $294,000,000 for November, 1921; and for December $344,000,000, as compared with $296,000,000 in December, 1921.

It is not necessary to remind the people of Kansas of agricultural conditions when the Republican Party took hold on March 4, 1921. Never before, perhaps, had agriculture in all its branches been suffering a depression so severe. It amounted practically to disaster. The farmer had no market for his products and he had practically no means of obtaining credit to tide the situation over. Wool and grain, frozen meat, and all sorts of agricultural products were pouring into the United States from countries where they were being produced under conditions with which no American farmer could possibly compete. We at once passed the emergency tariff law, and from that moment the situation began to improve; and we supplemented that with the agricultural credits bill, the Capper-Tincher bill, and various other measures designed for the economic relief of the agricultural industry, and further improvement in the situation became at once manifest. Other measures of a similar nature are on their way and will be enacted into law without doubt before this Congress adjourns. But even now I say without fear of dispute that during no administration since the Government was founded has so much salutary and constructive legislation been enacted for the direct benefit of American agriculture as has been during the administration of President Harding.

In addition to the farming class of the community there was another class which was suffering almost equally. On the 4th of March, 1921, there were more than 5,000,000 American laboring men without jobs. Show me an able-bodied American citizen to-day who wants work who can not get it. The word "unemployment" in America to-day is practically obsolete. Indeed, the appeal comes to Congress from employers in many cities to let down the bars against immigration in order that they may get more and cheaper labor.

This, my fellow citizens, we resolutely decline to do. When the Republican Party came into power we found the gates of all our ports wide open to the unrestricted entry of the riffraff of the world. We proceeded to close those gates to all whose presence here would be plainly undesirable or dangerous to the maintenance of American institutions. We propose to keep them closed; if anything, tighter. For my own part, if I could have my way, I would go even further, for I would see to it that the anarchists and the trouble makers and the Bolshevists now here should be deported on the first available ships to the countries where they belong.

What was the condition of the credit of the United States Government when the Republican Party took hold? Our bonds were selling at 85 cents on the dollar. Every American citizen who had loaned money to his Government in time of need had lost 15 cents on every dollar that he had advanced. There is not a Government bond to-day which is not selling at around par or better. The credit of the United States Government has been fully reestablished.

Our course in foreign affairs has been wisely steered by the President and by his great Secretary of State, Charles E. Hughes. The state of war existing between this country and Germany and other powers was promptly terminated on terms satisfactory to all, and almost immediately the Executive took steps to bring about a conference of all the principal nations to further establish a guaranty of peace of the world. This conference, presided over by the Secretary of State, did more in a few months to bring about a firm and enduring peace than had ever been accomplished in history. Best of all, it was done without involving this Government in any one of the quarrels between other nations about matters which are of no direct interest to us, or committing us in advance to take orders from any supergovernment or any other than the Government of the United States of America.

We Republicans, whether we live in Kansas or in Ohio, have no reason to be ashamed of our party. We have no good reason, I think, to be dissatisfied with its present leadership, and we have no good reason to do otherwise than boast of its record in the past 22 months. Let me again sum up the situation as it existed on the 4th of March, 1921, when the Democrats went out of power, and as it exists to-day:

Then there was unemployment involving more than 5,000,000 American citizens. That is what they did. To-day there is no such thing as unemployment throughout the land. That is what we did. Then agriculture was flat on its back. That is what they did. To-day it is standing on both feet. That is what we did. Then the credit of the Government was 15 per cent below par. That is what they did. To-day it is above par. That is what we did. Then the bars of America were open to the riffraff of the world. That is what they did. To-day they are closed agajnst all whose presence here would menace our prosperity and our institutions. That is what we did. Then the ports of America were open to the products, agricultural and manufactured, of the world, produced under conditions which we of America would not permit here. That is what they did. To-day they are closed to the extent at least that our products, whether raised on the farm or produced in the factory, have at least a fair chance of competing in our own and in foreign markets. That is what we did. Then we were at war with other nations and there was complete uncertainty as to our future position in the world's affairs. That is what they did. To-day we are at peace with every country and our position and the extent of our participation in the affairs of the world is assured. That is what we did.

I repeat, my friends, that we ought to have no feeling but pride in our party and in its record.

I wish that we would all pull together to make it bigger and better. This can only be done by cooperation. Otherwise disintegration is inevitable. Of course, it is only natural that in a country so big and great and varied, both racially and climatically, as this there should be conflict of interests and sharp clashes of opinion, but I know of no divisions so great among those who believe in the bedrock principles of Republicanism that they could not be compromised by friendly discussion and friendly cooperation. It is a sign of the times that party ties possess less binding force than formerly. To an extent this is quite natural because of late problems which have come upon us entirely unprecedented and upon which public opinion has not yet become firmly crystallized. To an extent also it seems to me regrettable, because it is through parties alone under our form of government, parties well organized and well knit together that the public will can be made effective. Surely those of us who have been elected to high positions on account of our affiliation with the Republican Party should cooperate to the fullest extent possible. Teamwork is necessary to produce results, whether it be in private affairs or in the public business. If our party is not progressive enough, let us make it so. We can do that by pulling together, not by playing with the fellows who oppose us.

The main theater of political activity in the next two years, I think it is conceded, will be the House of Representatives. Whether it be good or bad the majority there can do the things it wants to do. We shall have a Republican majority there of but 15. With the assistance of any 8 men upon our side the opposition party acting as a unit can do what it pleases.

Under these conditions it is apparent that teamwork will be vital if we are to present anything like a solid front to the attack of the opposition.

Another disadvantage under which we shall labor as compared with the present Congress is that we have lost a large number of our best fighting men. James R. Mann, the peer of them all, will not be with us, nor will MONDELL or FESS or PHIL CAMPBELL or WALSH or STAFFORD or GREENE or KELLEY or REAVIS. These were the men who stood up and bore the brunt of every battle, and their places will be difficult if not impossible to fill. On the other hand, our opponents have lost none of their fighting force and have a number of additions of great strength. We as a party will have our work cut out for us if we are to emerge from the parliamentary battles of the next two years with credit to ourselves and to the country, and it can not be done without cooperation and teamwork.

The leadership of the majority under these conditions will be a position of peculiar importance, responsibility, and difficulty. It is a position which ought not to be sought for the sake of the gratification of any personal ambition. It should go to the man best fitted under all the circumstances to discharge its duties. Some of my friends, including my good

friend TINCHER here, believe that I have superior qualifications for the majority leadership. If they are right, and this position comes to me, I assure you that I will undertake it with feelings far less of jubilation than with a stern sense of the seriousness of the responsibility which it will involve. I should not want it under any circumstances if I did not feel that it came to me backed by the confidence of a substantial majority of my colleagues.

I have not asked and shall not ask for support from anyone as a personal favor, and I have not the slightest personal ill feeling against anyone who thinks another better qualified. I should want, if I were elected, in the party councils equally men who opposed me and supported me. I should want to be in close touch with men of all shades of opinion and from all geographical divisions of the country. With that end in view, I would ask each Republican delegation to name a man who could constantly advise with me upon matters of legislation in which that State was interested.

I should also be glad to see an enlargement of that committee which under our present system determines in the main the legislative program from day to day. I think that its enlargement from its present membership of seven by two members, making it nine, would give full representation of all geographical divisions and schools of thought.

In the final determination of our legislative program no one would go further than I to compromise honest differences of opinion in the interest of party harmony and party solidarity. My only limit would be the infraction of the principles upon which my party was founded, as interpreted by its leaders and ratified by the people in the administrations of Lincoln and Grant and McKinley and Roosevelt and Harding.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission given me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to make a statement of the accomplishments of the Republican Congress and President Harding's administration.

In 1918 a Republican Congress was elected and President Wilson was compelled to call it into session in May, 1919, to enact the seven great supply bills which his Congress had failed to pass. Carrying out the wishes of the people for economy these bills were reduced $940,000,000 below the sums they carried when approved by the committees of the former Democratic Congress.

The country was at that time technically and officially at war. Foreign trade agreements were impossible. The railroads were still being operated by the Government at a loss to the taxpayers of nearly $2,000,000 a day, with high rates and poor service. The telegraph and telephone systems of the country were still under public control. The war laws were still upon the statute books. The gross debt of the Nation on August 31, 1919, was $26,594,267,878. No industry nor enterprise anywhere was functioning normally. The deflation policy of the Federal Reserve Board appointed by President Wilson was being carried out. Money was scarce and rates of interest high. Agriculture was being ruined, while the obnoxious war taxes were still in force.

THE SAVINGS MADE AND LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

It repealed the so-called daylight saving law and passed the same over the President's veto.

It passed the Budget bill, which was killed by President Wilson's veto.

It passed the Army reorganization bill, rejecting the demand for a large Army and universal compulsory military training favored by the Wilson administration.

It returned the railroads, telegraph, and telephone systems to their owners.

It passed the Volstead Act for the enforcement of national prohibition over President Wilson's veto.

It passed the water power bill and the coal, oil, and gas leasing bill.

It passed the uniform cold storage bill.

It passed the act reviving the War Finance Corporation to finance the marketing and exportation of agricultural products over the veto of President Wilson.

It liberalized the Federal reserve act and the farm loan act in the interest of the farmer.

It passed the bill incorporating the American Legion and enacted liberal provisions for vocational training and rehabilitation of our wounded soldiers and sailors and made generous appropriation for the same.

It amended the war risk insurance act to increase the efficiency of the bureau and liberalize the provisions in the payment of compensation to ex-service men.

It passed the act providing for the return of the bodies of our dead heroes from France.

It passed the Fuller bill providing for the increase of Civil War pensions.

It passed the Sell bill providing for increased pension for Spanish War veterans.

It passed the employees' retirement act and the minimum wage law.

It created a woman's bureau in the Department of Labor.

It made possible the adoption of the woman suffrage amendment.

It raised the wages of all Government employees, including the immense Postal Service system.

It passed the Fess bill providing for Federal aid and cooperation with the States in the vocational training and rehabilitation of those injured in industry, agriculture, and transportation.

It made a total saving to the taxpayers of the Nation, through reducing the appropriations asked for by President Wilson's administration, of $2,414,115,144.13.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS UNDER PRESIDENT HARDING'S ADMINISTRATION.

The Sixty-seventh Congress established a record by holding four sessions, working 624 days, passing 931 laws, practically an average of one and a half a day, besides passing 144 measures which failed in the Senate.

It promptly passed the farmers' emergency tariff act, which stopped the importations of wheat, milk, and cheese from Canada, corn and beef from Argentina, wool and mutton from Australia, eggs from China, and butter from Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, which were being shipped into this country under the free-trade provisions of the Underwood Democratic tariff.

It authorized the use of a billion dollars by the War Finance Corporation to finance the orderly marketing and exportation of agricultural products.

It reduced the Army to 125,000 and the Navy to 86,000 men.

It passed the peace resolution with Germany and brought about a limitation of armament through an international conference.

It passed the Budget bill, vetoed by President Wilson, and put the same into operation.

It discharged 100,000 useless Government employees.

It reduced the expenses of the Government through economy and good business management, and was thus enabled to reduce the national debt from $26,594,267,878, on August 31, 1919, to $22,715,338,730 on February 28, 1923, and in addition has repealed the soda and ice cream, clothing, drug store, and freight and express taxes.

It was able to further reduce the burden on the taxpayer nearly $1,000,000,000 in the new revenue bill, leaving a 50 per cent tax on the large incomes and reducing the tax on all heads of families with an income below $5,000 a year by increasing the exemption from $2,000 to $2,500 and that allowed for children under 18 years from $200 to $400 each.

It combined the activities in behalf of the disabled and injured soldiers in the Veterans' Bureau, as desired by the ex-service man, and provided $500,000,000 annually for soldier-relief work.

It restricted foreign immigration to a 3 per cent basis.

It established a Foreign Debt Funding Commission, which has secured satisfactory settlement of the British debt and is negotiating the settlement of the amounts due us from the other nations.

It passed the maternity bill.

It passed a law regulating the grain exchanges and the packing houses.

It appropriated $38,000,000 to build hospitals for sick and disabled veterans.

It provided for the return of alien property not in excess of $10,000 to each person.

It provided for the organization of agricultural cooperative-marketing associations.

It passed the antinarcotic act.

It passed the bill prohibiting the sale of filled milk.

It provided for the monthly payment of Civil War pensions.

It made possible the independent citizenship for women.

It created the United States Coal Commission, and made possible the prosecutions now being conducted against the war profiteers and grafters.

It passed a permanent tariff law, protecting agricultural products and reviving the operation of our industries, to the end that the 5,000,000 idle men have found employment.

It enacted the Capper-Lenroot-Anderson-Strong bill, establishing a system of rural credits.

Four years of a Republican Congress and two years of President Harding's administration has settled our foreign affairs, protected the products of our farmers and laboring men, given employment to the idle, reestablished business confidence, reduced expenses of Government, paid over $3,000,000,000 on the public debt, lightened the burden of taxation, reduced interest rates, and brought Liberty bonds to par.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about postal legislation. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has considered and favorably reported a great many bills during the present session of Congress, but owing to the pressure of appropriation bills, which have occupied nearly all of the time, we have been denied the privilege of submitting any of them to the House. After consultation with the Speaker and the leader [Mr. MONDELL] I consolidated five of the most important measures into one. This omnibus bill was promised consideration under a special rule, but although the Rules Committee granted it, the rule was never presented to the House.

The first section of the omnibus bill relates to postal savings. It leaves the maximum deposit by one person at $3,000 and increases the rate of interest to depositors from 2 to 3 per cent. Under existing law interest is paid only on deposits which are not withdrawn within one year; otherwise the interest is lost. Thirty per cent of the deposits are withdrawn before the year has expired, so that the average interest paid on the money left on deposit is only 1.4 per cent. The depositors as a rule are people of small means who prefer to leave their hard-earned savings with the Government because they have more faith therein than in banks. We could well afford to encourage them by raising the interest to 3 per cent. The only opposition came from the American Bankers' Association, whose representatives occupied half of the time at the hearings. Among other things they showed that most banks maintained savings departments and paid interest of from 3 to 5 per cent on deposits, and there are a number of banks that pay as high as 5½ per cent. This money is then loaned, mostly on real-estate mortgages for building dwellings, upon which the interest rate is 6 and sometimes 7 and 8 per cent. The bill not only received the unanimous support of the committee but was strongly urged by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon, whose letter I will ask to have printed here in 8-point type:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 23, 1923.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I received your letter of January 15, 1923, in which you ask my views in regard t· H. R. 8334, to amend the laws relating to the Postal Savings System, as reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

This bill provides in section 1 that the minimum age limit of 10 years, at present placed on depositors of postal savings, shall be abolished and that joint and trust accounts shall be authorized. Under the present law a child under 10 years of age can buy postal savings stamps but can not open an account, nor can a trust account be opened for him. The result has been to discourage thrift among children, whereas every encouragement should be given to promote the saving habit as early as possible. The proposed amendment will remedy this condition. The Treasury has found that trust and joint accounts have operated to advantage in connection with war savings stamps and Treasury savings certificates, and it would seem that these provisions are equally well adapted to postal savings deposits.

Section 2, as amended by the committee, proposes to limit the amount to be allowed as a balance to the credit of any person in a postal savings depository, exclusive of accumulated interest, to $5,000, instead of $3,000, as provided by the bill, or to $2,500, as in the present law. I believe that the maximum amount of $3,000, fixed by the bill, is preferable to the larger sum provided in the amendment. The Postal Savings System, as you know, is operated primarily for the purpose of promoting thrift and encouraging the sound investment of funds that would otherwise be lost through fraud, speculation, or carelessness. It is particularly effective in meeting the needs of wage earners having comparatively small amounts to invest each week and of foreign-born citizens who will trust their savings only to a Government institution. There is no intention on the part of the Government that postal savings should be operated in competition with savings banks or that the Government should be put into the banking business. Statistics show that the average savings account in this country is much less than $3,000, and that depositors who have saved this amount not only should enter the investment class but do so by putting their money in securities or homes. I believe, therefore, that to increase the maximum deposit above $3,000 would serve no useful purpose and might unnecessarily arouse a feeling on the part of the banks that the Postal Savings System is attempting to invade their field of operation.

Section 3 of the bill increases the rate of interest to be paid depositors from 2 to 3 per cent per annum. I am thoroughly in favor of this increase in the amount of interest allowed on postal savings. As stated above, the Postal Savings System is not operated for profit but for the purpose of promoting thrift and providing a safe and acceptable depository for funds which would not otherwise find their way into any other institution. The deposits come from small wage earners and others who, while primarily needing security, need also the utmost return possible on their savings. The Government can not afford to be less than honest with these people or to give them anything less than a fair return for the use of their money. The expense of administration should not be more than one-fourth per cent. The depositors, therefore, are entitled to the 3 per cent rate, which can be paid by charging not less than 3¼ per cent per annum on postal savings funds deposited in banks, as provided by section 4, or by investing in Government securities.

Section 5 terminates the practice of permitting depositors to surrender postal savings deposits and to receive in lieu thereof United States coupon or registered postal savings bonds, paying 2½ per cent per annum. The necessity for this amendment is apparent when it is remembered that the parity of these bonds has been maintained only by the standing offer of the board of trustees of the Postal Savings System to buy them from the holders at par and accrued interest, and that, if this offer is withdrawn, the bonds will depreciate to considerably below par. But, more important still, if the rate of interest on deposits is increased, the trustees would not be able to buy these bonds at par on account of the necessity of paying 3 per cent on deposits; nor would there be any demand for converting a 3 per cent deposit into a 2½ per cent bond.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. HALVOR STEENERSON,
Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

If the House had been given an opportunity to consider it, this bill would undoubtedly have passed. It is the belief of those who have studied this question that the enactment of this measure into law would have brought out hundreds of millions of dollars that are now hoarded and would have encouraged the saving habit among the young generally. It would have also increased postal revenues.

Section 2 provided for the establishment of motor-vehicle routes between 50 and 86 miles, which can not now be established, and which would enable the department to serve a large number of patrons who are now denied service.

Section 3 is to encourage commercial aviation. It authorizes the Postmaster General to contract with private parties for air-mail service. It provides for increased postage on first-class mail carried by air to not less than 8 cents per ounce and authorizes the payment of 2 mills per pound-mile for transportation of such mail, and that other first-class mail not provided with extra postage can be carried at the rate of one-half a mill per pound-mile, or one-fourth the rate of air mail paid matter. After careful computation as to the average length of the probable haul it was believed that this air-mail service would not only be self-sustaining but would return a large profit to the Government and would have enabled the department to do away with the present Government owned and operated lines, which operate without revenue and which cost $2,000,000 a year to the Government.

Section 4 provided for insurance and collect on delivery privileges to third-class matter, for which there is a considerable demand. The department believes that the enactment of this provision would result in a considerable increase in revenue.

Section 5 provided for a new basis of computation for overtime of clerks and other employees in post offices. Under existing law the overtime service of these employees is computed on the basis of 365 days of 8 hours each, or 2,920 hours, which is 16.2 per cent less than the pay for regular service. It was the opinion of the committee and the department that the compensation for overtime service should be the same as for regular service and that the rate should be computed on the basis of 306 days of 8 hours each, or 2,448 hours.

There was no opposition to sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the bill, but being in this way tied up to the postal savings section they all failed of consideration.

As soon as it became evident that the measure could not be reached on the regular call of the calendar, and that the only chance for consideration would be either by motion to suspend the rules or under special rule from the Committee on Rules, I applied to the Speaker for recognition, but without success, and to the Rules Committee for a special rule which was in fact granted, but pocketed by the chairman and never presented to the House. The bulletin issued by the Republican floor leader, posted Monday, February 19, included the omnibus postal bill as one of the bills to be considered that week, but later, upon inquiry, I learned that the steering committee had changed the program. It is enough to say—I got no rule, nor did I get recognition from the Speaker for a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. This would have required a two-thirds vote, but I was confident it would have carried. In this way the will of the majority to enact important and needed legislation was thwarted. I will criticize no one. I will simply say "these are the facts." "Let the public draw its own conclusions."

THE BUDGET SYSTEM.

This leads me also to add a few words about the lessons taught us by the two years' experience we have had with the Budget system. The concentration of all power of appropriation in one committee was urged as a necessary part of that system, because it was urged only by such concentration could economy in public expenditure be secured. Never was there a greater fallacy. I go further and assert that such concentration is not only unnecessary to its successful operation, but a source of weakness, which will ultimately lead to grave abuses of power. The friends of that system should join in remedying this at once. It is true that the Budget, which throws the responsibility for estimates directly on the President, has simplified the work of Congress in making appropriations, but the concentration of power of appropriation in one committee in no way tends to economy, but has given the Appropriations Committee such a dominating power over all legislation in the House that there is no one left to criticize or oppose.

The arguments put forward at the time of the adoption of the Budget for the concentration of power over appropriation in one committee were mainly, first, that it would tend to economy and prevent duplication, and, second, that the practice of including legislative provisions or "riders" in appropriation bills was in all cases an evil and would be abolished by concentration. The answer to the first is that extravagance or duplication in estimates must now originate with the President, who alone is responsible, and to the second that a rider when inserted by a committee having legislative, as well as appropriating, power is often the best and most expeditious way of legislating. Nearly all of our most important postal legislation was enacted in that form, as witness Rural Free Delivery, postal savings, parcel post, the space plan for railway mail pay, and so forth. None of these measures could ever have been enacted when they were if they had not been riding on the annual appropriation bills which had to be enacted promptly or the wheels of Government would have stopped. The Budget system has not, however, done away with riders. If anything, the practice has become more objectionable than it ever was for the reason that now riders are submitted to the House in the shape of Senate amendments without any opportunity for any legislative committee to consider them, and riders now come from a committee without legislative jurisdiction or experience. The House must vote them up or down without any information, and in most cases they are voted up, for to do otherwise would mean the defeat of the necessary appropriation bill.

This all has a tendency to atrophy the authority and activity of regular legislative committees, and the result will be that legislation and appropriation will be more concentrated than it ever was and the evil sought to be avoided will be increased. Besides, the Executive power, which has been greatly augmented by the Budget system, when it has only one committee to deal with, will be prone to "swap favors" with those on that committee, and not be held to the strict account they would be if there were seven or eight other committees with appropriating power to deal with. Seven or eight critics will be more efficient than one, and eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty but of the control by the people, through their Representatives, of the purse strings of the Nation, and therefore over the power of taxation. The Appropriations Committee of the House, through its affiliation with the Steering Committee, has dominated the legislation during this session. It has actually wasted and frittered away time in order to prevent consideration of bills they objected to from other committees, and which they were afraid to trust to a vote here. And, mind you, this is only the beginning. If it be permitted to develop to its logical result, the individual Member, no matter how able or energetic or how important a cause he may advocate, will amount to nothing as against this powerful combination of Members representing only a small fraction of the people of the country.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is astonishing at times to find how many good citizens of the United States there are who understand so imperfectly the system of government under which they live. Some of our best people, otherwise well informed, would probably be puzzled whether to start toward the city hall, the State capitol, or Washington if they wished to have a law passed to remedy some real or fancied ill. During my own experience in Congress educated men and women and associations made up of such have appealed to me to secure action by Congress affecting matters as to which, if anything whatever could be done, it would have to be done by the board of aldermen or by the legislature at Hartford. Such lack of understanding on the part of so many in regard to things so important has led me to make what may be called an elementary talk on the Constitution of the United States.

We think of ourselves as Americans and are rightfully proud of the title. Bearing this title means that we owe our allegiance and loyalty to the United States over and above any and all other countries in the world, and that we stand ready to defend our country even to the extent of our lives against all enemies, foreign and domestic. All understand this and, fortunately, very few ever fail to live up to it, as was shown during the World War. On the other hand, it is not always so well remembered that each of us owes a double allegiance. A good citizen is equally loyal to his State and to the Union. Each of these is supreme and sovereign within its own sphere. The Constitution as it came from the hands of our forefathers was framed so that there should be no conflict between the two but that instead each might support and strengthen the other.

There was good reason at the time our Constitution was framed why such a government should be established. Before the war for independence what later became States were called Colonies. They were entirely separate and independent of each other. After the Declaration of Independence had been made good by the Revolutionary War a confederation of States was formed. The bond of union thus formed to hold the States together was so weak that any State could at its pleasure fail or refuse to keep its agreement with the other States, and there was no way to compel it to do its part. It was soon proved that such a union of the States was too weak and imperfect to form the basis of a great and strong nation. Our wise old forefathers foresaw the benefits that would come to them and to their posterity from the founding of such a nation, so they conferred together and, after much labor, finally agreed to ordain and establish the Constitution, which they said was "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

In the Colonies, and later in the States, the people had been learning how to govern themselves, and they had learned the lesson quite well. In New England the town meeting came to be the method of local government, and it proved to be a system well adapted to the purpose. The people of all the States were justly proud of what they had accomplished in working out self-government and they were most wisely unwilling to give up anything essential that they had gained in this direction. They were not willing that some great outside government, made up of all the States, with its capital located at some distant place then unknown, should regulate and exercise control over their local affairs.

The men who framed the Constitution held the same views as to local government as did the other people of the States from which they came, and yet they realized that it was necessary to yield something in order to secure the advantages and greater benefit that could come only from a more strongly united common country. Upon this sound basis of compromise the great Constitution was wrought out and established; but in order to understand it correctly, it must be borne in mind that all rights and powers originally belonged to the States or to the people. The Union formed by the Constitution had and can now have only such rights and powers as have been granted to it.

The Government as established was divided into three branches, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, and to each was delegated certain powers.

The judicial power was vested in the Supreme Court and such other courts as may be established by law. These courts are called Federal courts, to distinguish them from the courts of the States. It is the duty of the courts to declare the law in cases submitted to them.

The President is the Chief Executive, and, with the officers appointed by him, exercises the executive powers conferred by the Constitution. The appointing power of the President is probably the greatest power now exercised by any executive or ruler in the world.

The legislative branch of the Government is the Congress, which is divided into two Houses called the Senate and the House of Representatives, each of which has certain limited powers; but in order to pass any law or appropriate any money out of the Treasury it is necessary for both Houses of Congress to come to an agreement and pass it.

The three branches of the Government are distinct and independent of each other in the exercise of their proper powers; but in certain cases joint action is required. For instance, the President has power to veto an act passed by Congress, and if he does it can not become a law unless two-thirds of both Houses pass it over his veto. The judges and important officers of the Government are appointed by the President, but must be confirmed by the Senate. Treaties with other nations are made by the President, but must be ratified by the Senate. Only the House of Representatives can impeach a judge or executive officer and the Senate sits as a court to try the case. It requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate in an impeachment case to convict the accused and remove him from office.

The powers originally delegated to Congress are contained in 18 clauses of the Constitution:

1. The power to lay and collect taxes.

This is one of the most important powers granted, for without money to pay its running expenses no government can live. The lack of this power was the fatal weakness in the government established by the articles of confederation and the one which more than any other caused that government to fail.

2. The borrowing power.

The power to borrow money on the credit of the United States was necessary to make the new Government strong and to insure it against breaking down in case of a great emergency like a war.

3. The power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

This is one of the greatest and most important of the powers granted. It would have been a constant source of trouble and irritation if the several States had been left free to regulate commerce with foreign countries or among the States themselves. Anyone who has traveled in the small countries of Europe and found himself held up every few hours at the boundary between two countries will appreciate the practical wisdom of the fathers in putting in the commerce clause.

4. The power to establish naturalization and bankruptcy laws.

While this power does not rank with the first three enumerated, it is not without importance, especially the clause concerning naturalization.

5. The power to coin money, to regulate its value, and to fix the standard of weights and measures.

The coinage of money is a proper and necessary function of a national government, while the fixing of a uniform standard of weights and measures is one of convenience for the people in trade.

6. The power to punish counterfeiting.

This is necessary for the protection of the coins and securities of the Government.

7. The power to establish post offices and post roads.

This needs no explanation.

8. The power to grant patents and copyrights.

This has proved a most beneficial power in encouraging useful inventions, literature, and are by securing to inventors and authors for a term of years the benefits flowing from their toil and genius.

9. The power to constitute United States courts other than the Supreme Court.

10. The power to define and punish piracy and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.

The next six powers enumerated may be called the powers for making war and maintaining the national defense. They are necessary for the very existence of a nation among the other nations of the world. They are the powers—

11. To declare war;

12. To raise and support armies;

13. To provide and maintain a navy;

14. To make rules for the land and naval forces;

15. To provide for calling forth the militia;

16. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia and for governing such part of them as may be called into the Federal service.

17. The power over what is now the District of Columbia and over other Federal territory.

18. The power to make laws necessary to carry out the powers granted.

There are other powers, more or less important, named in later clauses, such as the power to admit new States and to make rules and regulations concerning a number of things not necessary to include here; but the 18 clauses just enumerated contain the principal legislative powers conferred by the Constitution and the ones upon which the National Government was founded.

There are in the Constitution a number of limitations and restrictions upon what the United States and upon what the States may do, but for the purposes of this talk they need not be referred to here. The limitations and restrictions upon the powers of the United States for the most part only make clear and emphasize the point that powers not granted are not to be exercised.

There have been 19 amendments added to the Constitution. The first 10 were added at one time in pursuance of what was practically agreed upon before the Constitution itself was adopted and in effect may be regarded as a part of the original document. They add no new powers. In fact, their purpose was to restrict as well as to make certain the powers already granted. They contain some very important provisions and are sometimes called the Bill of Rights.

The eleventh amendment made it clear that the United States courts have no power over suits against a State brought by a citizen of another State or of a foreign nation.

The twelfth amendment changed the manner of electing the President and Vice President, and was adopted because in the election of 1800 the old method did not work well.

The thirteenth amendment abolished slavery.

The fourteenth amendment attempted to confer civil rights on the former slaves and to restrict the power of the States in certain other matters.

The fifteenth amendment sought to give the former slaves the right to vote.

The sixteenth amendment gives power to the United States to lay income taxes without fixing the amount to be collected from each State in proportion to the population.

The seventeenth amendment changed the manner of electing United States Senators, so that they are now elected by popular vote instead of by the legislatures of the States as was originally provided.

The eighteenth amendment prohibits the manufacture and the sale of intoxicating liquors and gives to Congress, as well as to the States, the power to pass laws to enforce the amendment.

The nineteenth amendment takes away from the States the right to keep women from voting.

All the power that can be exercised by Congress or by any other branch of the Government must be found within the limits of the original Constitution or one of the 19 amendments. If a law is passed for which there is no authority in the Constitution, the Supreme Court will declare the law to be void and of no effect. Those who desire good laws, before trying to have a law passed, should first be sure that the lawmaking body has the power to pass it and, second, that the law, if passed, will not make matters worse instead of better.

It should be ever kept in mind that the Government at Washington is one of limited powers. Many are prone to forget this and to proceed upon the theory that Congress ought to pass laws regulating everything that they think needs regulation. If bread, or milk, or ice, or coal, or house rent, or any other necessity of life seems high in price, there are those who would have Congress straightway pass a law to bring the price down. Of course Congress has no power to pass such a law; but even if it had the power, it would probably find an equally strong demand from the owners of the articles named for a law to raise the prices even higher. Power to lower a price means also the power to raise it. Also, the power to lower the price of an article means the power to take it without paying for it at all; but the Constitution itself forbids taking property without paying for it.

Our honored forefathers showed their great wisdom by limiting the things upon which Congress might act to those necessary for carrying on the Central Government, while reserving all else for the State and local governments. Even the thirteen original States occupied a long stretch of territory whose people had different customs, different local laws, and different notions of government. It would have been unwise and dangerous at that time to have lodged power in a central government to make the laws most closely relating to the daily lives of people residing in widely separated communities.

With the growth of the Nation the wide range of difference between the widely separated parts of the Nation has become

still wider and the difficulty of making laws in Congress that will best serve all the remote parts of the country has become all the greater. In spite of this there is a growing tendency to leave untried our State and local governments and hie away to Washington for all kinds of legislation. And when the law on the desired subject is enacted, if it fits Kansas rather than Connecticut, there is no just ground for complaint. The basis of the trouble is in the National Government attempting to enact and enforce such laws at all.

Our dual form of government has worked well for a century and a third. It has made us strong as a Nation, and yet has left the people free to work out their local problems in their own way. It is important to the welfare of this Nation that this principle of government be preserved. It will be lost if the people insist upon carrying to Washington the problems that should be solved at home.

The labor of love that it has cost to bring forth this little talk will be more than repaid if one additional person is thereby induced to study the Constitution more diligently than he has heretofore done. The recompense will be so much the greater if thereby some may come to better understand what are the proper spheres of the State and National Governments and where to go for needed legislation, whether to Washington or to Hartford, Albany, or Harrisburg.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, since long before I came to Congress I have regarded the immigration problem as one of the most perplexing and important questions confronting the country. There are few matters that deserve the attention of this House more than the enactment of a permanent, constructive restriction law. I am bitterly disappointed that this Congress is to close without the performance of platform pledges and the satisfaction of public expectations, as well as the specific promises given time and again during the past two years by those in charge of immigration bills and by leaders of the party in power controlling the legislative program of Congress that a permanent, constructive, restrictive measure would be enacted into law.

I followed the hearings conducted two years ago by both the House and Senate Committees on Immigration with hopeful anticipation of the needed legislation. I believed the assurance repeatedly made, for instance, by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, such as that found on page 6 of the 713-page volume of hearings published by that committee two years ago, to the effect that a "permanent" "constructive" law would be proposed and passed "after a thorough investigation of the whole matter in view of world conditions."

I have no particular fault to find with the House committee for it has been industriously active, and after months of hearings both in Washington and throughout the country, reported to this House several weeks ago, as an amendment to or substitute for Senate bill 4092, a comprehensive measure that would go far toward meeting the serious immigration situation confronting the country and toward satisfying immigration officials and expert students of the problem.

There have been assurances on the part of those high in authority that the House committee bill would be put through the House and either concurred in by the Senate or sent to conference; but the days have gradually slipped by without action, and here in the last 24 hours of this Congress we find the splendid measure so glowingly eulogized by the House committee report (No. 1621), forty-odd pages in length, abandoned, and that a new bill, House Joint Resolution 494, not even considered or reported by the House committee, is proposed to-day to be thrust upon us, under suspension of rules, and therefore not open to amendment, but to be voted up or down, just as some one Member introduced it.

There seems to be a disposition to legislate in this field for foreigners and to let America and Americans "shift for themselves." I can not permit such an attitude to go unnoticed and uncriticized.

The meritorious restriction bill that has been on the House Calendar since February 15, and which this House would pass as decisively as any other bill that has been voted on, would, as the House committee declares in its 43-page report recommending it to pass, "prevent the arrival of unfortunates at our gates," permit the legitimate "near relatives of persons here to come," thus preventing the separation of families, "minimize hardships" that exist under the existing "temporary emergency quota law," enacted two years ago, provide a practical plan of registering aliens as urged by the President and favored by the people of this country, cure the "wide open doorway" defect existing at present by which loathsome, contagiously and dangerously diseased, and other objectionable aliens get into the counry as seamen by the thousands, and exclude from the country aliens ineligible to citizenship.

I believe our first duty to be to our own. I am for America first. I do not approve the Senate bill that came to us proposing to repeal existing restrictions and admit thousands upon thousands of one particular race of refugees, the expense of bringing here each one of whom would cost far more money than it would take to feed and clothe 10 over there almost indefinitely. I can not join those who would further import poverty for the sake of further exercising and overloading our benevolence.

I have read the statements and arguments of certain generous, charitable churchmen who want us to open our gates to the poverty stricken, homeless victims of the various wars and massacres now going on and likely to go on for years in southeastern Europe and western Asia, but the more practical and sensible solution is to do what the bill reported to this House on February 15 proposed, namely, admit merely those very near relatives of foreign born here who are naturalized or who intend to become citizens and who are able and willing to care for those destitute near relatives; and then through organized charities like the Red Cross and the Near East Relief take care of the rest of the millions of starving and naked somewhere over there.

We have our almshouse, our asylums and even our jails bulging with foreigners already. As I understand the charts now on display in this House that were prepared by the House Committee on Immigration, after a two years' intensive study of State public institutions, foreign-stock inmates of those institutions, in spite of our immigration laws excluding all such dependents, delinquents, and defectives, cost some States as much as 30 per cent of all taxes collected. It is a matter of history that various foreign countries for decades shipped their public charges, their degenerates, to this country and simply unloaded their objectionable public charges and defectives upon us. We exclude defective seeds, defective cattle and horses, and even will not permit shrubbery and other inanimate life to be imported. Can it be that this and future generations of Americans are less important? America is worthy of the best and none but those clean of limb, clear of eye, and free from taint and disease! Only those at most should be allowed to come, and very few of those until we can Americanize and civilize the great mass of foreign born and children of foreign born now among us. Only yesterday the Secretary of Labor, Hon. James J. Davis, an immigrant himself, called public attention to the fact that there are in this country nearly 15,000,000 foreign born, half of whom have not even taken out naturalization papers. The melting pot is full to overflowing and its contents should be refined before more are added.

The heart of every generous person goes out to the refugees, but his heart must also go out, if he is a real American, to Americans—our kith and kin—as well as to our institutions, to our standards, to our ideals, and to this civilization of ours which has made us great, prosperous, and free. The American llama has its load of foreignism and alienism, foreign poverty and pauperism and other isms and asms, and until we can set our house in order very few more aliens should be admitted, regardless of how many go back to their native land.

The war awoke the public to the situation as never before, and opinion seems to me stronger to-day than ever before in favor of rigid, restrictive immigration laws. No more patriotic group of men could be associated together than the boys who fought the country's fight in France. The American Legion demands that the doors be absolutely closed for a period of years, and those boys' demand is entitled to go a long, long way in determining the action of Congress and the attitude of the President on this important public question, in which only the racial, the employing, and the transportation groups have a selfish mercenary interest.

I am aware of the demand of some manufacturing and employing and labor-importing interests that alien labor be imported to man their industries, fill their ships, and stock their labor pens, but this very month the United States Department of Labor reports there are over 250,000 idle miners and over a million and a half unemployed workingmen. Cable dispatches state there are millions of unemployed in Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, and other north European countries, and yet those countries are not sending here their full 3 per cent quotas. The Secretary of Labor, in his annual report for 1922, states that even with existing restriction laws the United States is still the greatest immigrant-receiving nation on earth. With this in view can it be true that we have to import foreigners to mine our coal, harvest our cotton and grain, till our fields, run our trains, dig our ditches, and man our industries? I do

not believe it. The real issue, it seems to me, is well put by that great American national weekly, the Saturday Evening Post, in its timely issue of February 24, 1923, only last week, in a leading editorial entitled "Do we want coolie labor?" as follows:

Early in the year the representatives of various interests appeared before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives and cried a loud cry in favor of letting in more immigrants. They stated with singular unanimity of thought and language that there was a scarcity of labor in America, and that the scarcity could be met only by more immigrants. They further stated that the existing immigration law is not giving to the United States the number of immigrants to which the country is legally entitled, and for this reason:

America is entitled to 40,000 Italians, for example, by the terms of the immigration law; 40,000 Italians therefore entered America last year. But in the same period 53,000 Italians left America and went back to Italy. Consequently America has received no net immigration at all from Italy—has received, in fact, 13,000 less than none of them. Therefore she should have been permitted to receive not only her 40,000 legal immigrants but also 53,000 more to replace the 53,000 that went back to Italy.

These are the things that different interests say; but theirs is a purely superficial view. If there was a careful analysis of conditions, we should find that there is really no labor shortage in this country, and that in order to get the labor that these men want they would have to pay a little more money for it than they like to pay. What is really wanted is a supply of the cheapest and most easily controlled laborers in Europe—coolie labor—for the sole purpose of fattening incomes and swelling the already overswollen production of this country.

Now, in all the arguments advanced by these interests there is a singular lack of foresight and of desire to further the well-being of the Nation. The uttermost range of their vision seems to be limited by their bank accounts as they will appear in three months' time.

One of the organizations that called for more immigrants during the recent uproar was an association of farmers. One of the legislative agents of this organization (the American Farm Bureau Federation) appeared before the Immigration Committee and made a strong plea for the admission of more immigrants.

Chairman JOHNSON, of the committee, asked the agent whether his organization believed that there had been overproduction of farm products during the past year. The agent, of course, could not do otherwise than reply that it did so believe.

"And they need more laborers just the same?" asked the chairman.

"Yes, sir," replied the agent; "they want to produce crops cheaper."

Here is an excellent sample of fuddled reasoning. The farmer has been assailing high heaven with his passionate demands for additional markets in which to dispose of his goods. He has even asked that the United States hold an economic conference with European nations in order to provide a market for the produce that he could not sell in this country. And now, according to one of this organization's agents, he thinks he can cure himself of overproduction by producing more cheaply, and he therefore asks that thousands upon thousands of the lowest forms of laboring life be admitted to this country from Europe to assist in that cheap production. Even a child could tell him that the sane, sound, and infallible way in which to cure overproduction is to stop overproducing.

Again, before the House Immigration Committee, the counsel for an association of manufacturers demanded more immigration on behalf of the organization that he represented. After a great deal of wordy testimony he threatened darkly that if this country doesn't soon get more immigrants "we'll have to slow down industry." The chairman of the committee at once asked, "Is it better to enlarge our problem by bringing in immigrants or is it better to slow down industry?"

There is no reason at all why the manufacturers of the United States and the legislators of the United States and the consumers and producers of the United States shouldn't ask themselves this question and the other questions that are allied with it.

The population of the United States, including Alaska, is somewhere in the neighborhood of 115,000,000 people. Starting with this as a basis, the people of the country ought to ask themselves a few simple questions. What, for example, will be the population of the Nation 77 years from now, in the year 2000, even without the addition of another immigrant? It will be at least 200,000,000 unless some great catastrophe rips the country to pieces. If within the lifetime of many persons now living the population of the country will reach such an enormous figure, why should its present population be so anxious to utilize every square foot of its land, and to do it by importing the poorest races of Europe? Why should every resource of the country be developed immediately, and why should millions of southeastern Europeans be admitted for the purpose? What reason can possibly exist for this country to drag in the dullest and dumbest people in Europe in order that the United States may raise more farm produce and manufacture more goods than the world can absorb? Why should there be all this hot haste to import coolies by the million in order that every ton of coal may be wrenched from the earth immediately? Why, with the action of Esau held up before all men as a horrible example, should this Nation or any other nation sell its birthright for a mess of pottage? Why shouldn't the American people be working partly for the 200,000,000 American of 77 years from now, instead of entirely for alien peoples of the present day? Why should anyone babble of an existing labor shortage when there is no shortage, but merely a failure on the part of employers to effect a proper distribution of labor? Why should anyone yammer about our net immigration being too small when there are 14,000,000 foreign born in the United States, and more than 7,000,000 who can neither speak nor read our language? And why should a request for more immigrants on the part of any representative of any association or organization be heard with any patience by our legislators when the immigrants who came to America last year from the countries of northern Europe—Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Germany, Holland, and Denmark—were less than half the number of those who could legally have come if the incentive had been sufficiently great?

Selfish interests may be able to answer these questions to their own satisfaction, but they can not answer them to the satisfaction of 90 per cent of America's citizens.

And although coolie labor may sometimes be a solution for labor shortage, it is doubtful whether the people of America are ready to admit that the time is ripe for the admission of Europe's cheapest coolie laborers, the maintenance of these laborers as coolies during their stay in America, and their shipment back to Europe as coolies—and that is the only way that coolie labor can properly be handled.

In fact, probably the only thing that the people of America could be made to admit, after having their attention called to the manufacturers' claims, is that those among them who howl for more low-grade immigrants are wasting a great deal of valuable time that might better be devoted to working out plans for labor distribution, labor-saving machinery, and a wage scale that will attract American labor and decent immigration from northern Europe as the demand becomes greater.

I do not wish to be understood as picturing all large employers as back of this propaganda to feather their nests by importing servile, slavish, cheap foreign labor, but this is to be noted, that those that howl the loudest for free trade in foreign pauper labor are the first to shout themselves hoarse for a high protective tariff on the products of their plants, and they declare they want the high protective tariff in order to protect the American workingman from the baneful effects of foreign pauper labor, when they employ it and object vociferously to any real direct protection to American workers which would keep them from importing the foreign coolie labor itself.

Outstanding Americans like the president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Mr. Daniel Willard, who himself rose from the ranks of labor and who sees beyond the company's own immediate financial gain and patriotically considers the country, her institutions, standards, and ideals, represents, I hope, and "may his tribe increase," the majority of large employers of labor. Mr. Willard took issue with the National Manufacturers' Association in its drive to repeal existing temporary restrictions, stating, according to the House hearings:

I am in favor of a broad policy of selective immigration, but I am not quite able to harmonize such a policy with the latter part of the statement wherein you say that the National Association of Manufacturers is in favor of letting down the bars sufficiently to give our industries and our agriculture the immigrant labor it previously has had to draw from. Previously in our country there was little in our immigration policy of a selective nature. The bars were so thoroughly let down as to permit everybody to come in, the good, bad, and indifferent, and I should regret very much to see that policy resumed. * * * I would much prefer to see the supply of such labor held at a point less than the actual requirements, if necessary, rather than to remove or lower the proper standard of admission.

Here is also what Mr. William J. Faux, president of the Logan Coal Co., said in reply to letters urging him to join in the drive for the modification of existing restrictions. Mr. Faux's company is located in West Virginia, where recently again foreign cheap labor has turned on its employers and where conditions resulting therefrom led Mr. Faux to state:

My preference is that the immigration law should be more drastic than at present. I do not believe it necessary for the United States to make all the goods in the world, and we are certainly producing our share when we produce two-thirds. We have got enough of the immigrants of southern Europe to last for the next 50 years, if we are to maintain our Americanism.

I firmly believe that Mr. Willard and Mr. Faux more nearly represent sentiment even among large employers than do some captains of industry who appeared before the House committee and stated that they wanted to import adult males, without their wives, for a period, under conditions amounting to slavery and peonage, and "quite abhorrent," as the House committee's report well says, "to the institutions of the United States." I have here an excellent article by Mr. E. V. Wilcox, entitled "Immigration goulash," that appeared in the Country Gentleman February 24, 1923, not only covering the attitude of and demand for labor among employers but also going into the whole question in a most enlightening and entertaining way, and which reads as follows:

Do you feel flattered that apparently the whole world wants to come to the United States?

Italy has a million or more which we are assured could well be spared largely because they do not harmonize with the Italian Government and cause too much trouble. The Turks would also like to purify their national structure and have a big spring house cleaning by sending us C. O. D. another million of assorted Armenians and Greeks which they don't need. The war-hatched Balkan States are perfectly willing to lend us their malcontents and trouble makers for 99 years or longer.

Every nation in Europe would gladly send us most of their Hebrew citizens. The Japanese wish Roosevelt had never thought of such a thing as the gentlemen's agreement. The Chinese look upon America as far more celestial than Cathay. The political broth brewers of India would prefer to change their address to San Francisco or Chicago. Russia is simply aching to donate us a few more certified bomb throwers and soviet incubators. And since the 3 per cent restriction doesn't let all these hordes in at once, they are coming as fast as boats will carry them to Cuba, Mexico, Central and South America, and even to Canada, with the intention of getting into the United States later by the under-the-fence method if necessary.

A WAR-TAUGHT LESSON.

Europe is simply carrying out the lesson learned during the war that every race has its own desires, ideals, aspirations, traditions, and methods of thinking; that every race is passionately devoted to its own institutions and future development and resists to the last breath assimilation or absorption by another race. In a desperate attempt to prevent the recurrence of racial wars Europe drew a new map of itself, with national boundaries so far as possible along racial lines. In putting together this jigsaw puzzle map of Europe there were found to be millions of people who didn't fit in very well. And, since America is supposed to be the asylum or melting pot or dumping ground or back yard of the world, these misfits are to be shipped here where,

we are told, a few more millions of heterogeneous elements won't make much difference in the ultimate brew!

What do our various kinds of citizens think of the prospect? Nearly all Americans who have recently visited Europe agree that unless we safeguard ourselves against the further influx of undesirables there will no longer be an America for the Americans. But if foreign-language newspapers may be taken as reflecting the sentiments of the foreign born within our gates our non-Anglo-Saxon citizens are far more interested in forcing their own customs and institutions upon us than in helping us build a superstructure to fit the foundation upon which America rests. An Italian journal published in New York City recently said editorially: "We not only need organization but also a rapid increase in births among Italians here." A Jersey City Polish newspaper exclaims: "We pride ourselves on having a Polish judge here and there." And a second Polish journal asserts that there is abundant work for another 100,000,000 aliens in the United States, and that anyhow Americans are too lazy to work. The son of a naturalized Jew at a recent congressional hearing on immigration made an appeal against the use of English as the official language of the United States, and urged that Yiddish should be placed on an equal footing.

If your imagination will bear stretching to that extent, just try to picture to yourself what would happen if in 1923 a million Americans should seek asylum and employment in Japan or Italy or Russia or Germany. They are all glad to see Americans come with well-lined purses, but they expect us to cable home for more money before we escape, not to gather any to send back to our uncles and aunts. And yet the Hungarians in the United States boast that in 1922 they sent $40,000,000 back to their relatives. Must we assume that Europe and Asia reserve the right to send over enough of their population to take from us the money which American tourists didn't happen to carry to foreign countries voluntarily Why must this rule continue to work only one way?

But for several decades immigration has been closely connected with industrial conditions and the demand for labor.

THE FACTS.

After a year or more of business depression and extreme unemployment things began to look up, until finally in December certain manufacturers started complaining of a shortage of labor. And one of our commerce journals, with the usual American propensity for immediately applying an onion poultice or a patent medicine to every bump, headache, or stomach trouble, promptly recommended an amendment of the immigration law so as to permit the entry of any and all workmen mentally and physically fit and willing to work.

What is the truth about the employment situation? In order to pick up at first hand the facts on this point I visited New York, Bridgeport, Providence, and Boston, calling upon labor organizations, chambers of commerce, and associations of builders, manufacturers, and merchants for such information as they had collected, and I also consulted with the State departments of agriculture and labor, as well as with Congressmen, Senators, bureau chiefs, and the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington.

On account of the big boom in building operations, I had a talk with C. G. Norman, chairman of the board of governors of the Building Trades Employers' Association of New York.

"In the building trades," said he, "common labor is abundant and has been during the past two years. The wages are $7 a day for hod carriers and $7.50 for plasterer's helpers. The common laborers in our lines of work are 60 to 70 per cent Italians, a few Irish, and a sprinkling of other races, including Poles. We employ about 15,000 common laborers in the building trades, but the demand is falling off by reason of the slowing down of building operations, partly seasonal, of course. Commercial building is going on about as usual, but the housing boom has passed its peak, having been somewhat overdone by speculative builders.

"Yes; our common labor is quite satisfactory," Norman added. "The Italians are physically capable of doing the hard work. Many of them started in with railroad work and rose to employment in the building business. Newcomers find work in the excavation operations and work up to hod carriers or become plasterers. The pick-and-shovel men get $4.80 a day. There are between 3,500 and 4,000 plasterers in New York City, 50 per cent of whom are Italians. All labor in the building trades is organized.

"For the past two years we have been constantly threatened with an artificial shortage of skilled labor. The unions restrict the number of men in each group or trade. There are too few plasterers and they have an artificial wage scale. The Greeks tried to limit the number of mosaic workers to 85 for the whole city of New York. So long as the labor unions keep closed books there is, of course, no satisfactory apprenticeship possible. Some of the union leaders have been indicted for their attempt to limit the output or work, and in order to escape conviction it is likely that they will accept a consent decree requiring them to open their books to additional members and permit apprenticeship.

RACIAL CHANGES IN LABOR.

"There has been here and there," Norman replied in answer to a question, "a slight shortage of labor in the manufacturing trades because they didn't pay enough. The steel and cement industries first reduced wages and then had to advance them again. No; the wage is not too high in comparison with living costs. There is always considerable lost time in the building trades on account of weather and change of location. But the best grade of our labor is already engaged for the first six months of 1923, rather longer in advance than usual. We have had to accommodate ourselves to many racial changes in labor. In the early days nearly every plasterer and stonecutter in New York was English or Scotch. Now they are Italian. Our carpenters were first Germans, then Swedes, and now Jews. The Jewish fraternal organizations, without consent of the carpenters' unions, boosted wages by resolution from $9 to $12 a day. But rents will have to fall soon and builders will not be able to pay so much."

In further investigation in New York I learned that clothing makers are in a bad way, not on account of a scarcity of labor but because the tailors' unions prevent the discharge of a man after he has worked two weeks. Everywhere I was told that the efficiency of common labor is up to the pre-war level but that the efficiency of skilled labor depends entirely on the supply and demand. The more you have to pay the less service you get. The whole United States and Canada seem to be short of plasterers for the simple reason that the unions have not allowed others to join, thus making it necessary for builders to hire them at extra wages for overtime—$26 a day, for example, in Pittsburgh.

INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAYMEN.

But according to the census, there are only 38,000 plasterers in the whole country. And because this little bunch of men has limited the output there are men who would let down the immigration bars and flood the country with more millions of aliens rather than do the obvious thing and admit into the plasterers' unions some of the thousands who want to join. By contrast with this little group of 38,000 dictators who tell us what our plastering will cost, there are about 11,000,000 wage earners on farms. Suppose they should form a union of only 3,000,000, force the others to quit farming, declare an eight-hour day, and charge double for eggs and potatoes gathered after 4 o'clock. Then there would be some honest-to-goodness excitement which would totally eclipse the little tempest in a teapot caused by the impudence of a small group of industrial highwaymen. The outstanding, conscientious industry and loyalty of the farm population show by contrast the peanut-headedness and pettiness of some union leaders.

In Boston I spent some time in the State veterans' bureau. They were receiving about 300 applications a week for jobs and were having great difficulty in finding employment for the men. Young, fine-looking, able-bodied men came to see if there were any chance at a job. And the best job on the list was only a bit of temporary work for four or five days. These veterans were coming back day after day looking for employment without finding it. I couldn't see any argument in that situation in favor of letting in more millions of aliens.

I called on L. E. Archibald, statistician of the Massachusetts department of labor and industries. "There is no shortage of either skilled or unskilled labor in this State," said he. "Building operations were greater in 1922 than in 1921, but November showed the regular seasonal decline from October. According to returns from 1,061 unions, with a membership of 216,000, about 20 per cent of their members are idle. Reports from 214 manufacturing establishments show 79 per cent working full time and 21 per cent only part time. Our industries are approaching the normal point, but are still a little below. Even the demand for tailors fell off in November and December, as compared with October, and 13 per cent of our garment workers are now unemployed."

In a talk with C. D. Woods, of the Massachusetts department of agriculture, I learned that there is no trouble in securing all the farm labor needed, mostly Americans. "Poles are raising onions on their own account," said he, "and the Portuguese go in for poultry, strawberries, and truck crops. Otherwise foreigners are not interested in our farms. Green farm labor gets $30 to $40 a month and board, and milkers $50 to $60. But for the most part city dwellers do not go on farms." Evidently Massachusetts doesn't need to have the Nation's gates pushed any further ajar.

But in New Haven the Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut reported a shortage of 3,500 laborers and complained that they had to pay 35 to 40 cents an hour, or $2.80 to $3.20 a day. I wonder what the general run of the American public thinks of such a complaint. Are they in favor of filling up the whole country with people who care to live on an income of less than $2.80 a day If not, there is only one thing for the Connecticut manufacturers to do—pay enough to attract better workmen.

The United States Department of Labor has just completed an employment survey of the whole country, finding labor conditions everywhere better than last year. But last year there were 4,000,000 or more unemployed. States affected by seasonal suspension of logging operations, farm work, or building construction are not so favorably supplied with jobs. But in all manufacturing centers there is active increase of employment for skilled workers. And if the demand should exceed the supply the unions have merely to enlarge their membership by a suitable apprentice system.

FARM-SHUNNING ALIENS.

But perhaps the farmer begins to wonder why he should worry about immigration troubles. He gets little help from immigrants. Almost none of the great flock of orientals in California work for American farmers. They rent farms of speculators and work for themselves. In fact, there are more white men working for Japanese farmers than Japanese working for American farmers. In Massachusetts, with 700,000 foreign-born wage earners, there are only 160 of them in orchard work, while over 700 are policemen. Of all foreign born gainfully employed in the United States only 12 per cent are in agriculture, and those mostly for themselves. In this as in many other respects the American farmer must practice self-reliance. Farmers don't have to come to us to find a job. They are wanted in their own countries.

Where do the immigrant aliens go after coming through our gates? Of the 805,000 admitted in 1921 more than 264,000 located in New York State and only 180 in the agricultural State of Arkansas. That doesn't make it look as if they were coming here to farm or to become a permanent part of us. Moreover, 432,000, or considerably more than half of the grand total, were Jews, Italians, Armenians, Greeks, Japanese, Chinese, and Finns, races which generation after generation maintain their own churches, customs, languages, schools, and social affiliations almost as intact as if they had remained in their native countries.

JUST IN THE NICK OF TIME.

And yet all these years we have heard much loose talk about the American melting pot, just as if the antagonistic and heterogeneous elements in our population had really fused or amalgamated, or as if the mongrel product would be an improvement over the pure races. History teaches us that there is a displacement or submergence but no amalgamation. Melting pot is not the right name for America. It is more nearly a dice box, yielding a different result every time you shake it. On the first throw the Jew may come out on top, on the next the Italian or Russian or Pole, or occasionally the American. That the stranger within our gates remains in big unassimilated groups is evident from the fact that more than half of the 14,000,000 foreign born in the country are located in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Illinois near manufacturing centers. In fact, New York State, with a total population of 10,385,000, has 2,825,000 foreign born as compared with 2,810,000 foreign born in the 45,731,000 population of the 30 States south of the Ohio and west of the Mississippi, excepting North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri.

When the House of Representatives picked its present Immigration Committee it selected for chairman ALBERT JOHNSON, a man who is interested in preserving the social and political texture of the United States as well as its permanent industrial position. I had a talk with Mr. JOHNSON about the recent immigration excitement. "The present 3 per cent admission on the basis of the 1910 census," said he, "is the first attempt of Congress to restrict immigration. It was passed just in

the nick of time. A veritable flood of destitute, restless wanderers and adventurers had an eye on the United States. The law kept out at least 2,000,000 who wanted to forget about worthless rubles, kopecks, kronen, and other imitation money and learn the feel of a real dollar. They would come in by millions if the bars were removed. The law has substantially checked the alien flood.

"We talk glibly about inspection of immigrants," JOHNSON added. "But how careful an inspection could be given when they poured in a million a year? Most of them come through Ellis Island. Even the experienced force at that station can not really examine 2,500 new aliens every one of the 365 days a year. That is over 300 an hour, or about 10 seconds to the alien. Can we really ascertain very much about the make-up, quality, and viewpoint of the aliens we admit if we run them through the inspection mill at that rate?

"The worst of it all is," JOHNSON continued, "that the northern races, the ones who alone amalgamate with us, do not send more than half as many as the law would admit, while all southern European nations exhaust their quotas and howl for more. In 1922 the Poles gave passports to America to more Jews than the Polish quota would allow, and induced the genuine Slavic Poles in America to return to their native land in such numbers as to more than counterbalance the Jews they sent us. Other countries in Europe have adopted the same plan. They are giving us the odds and ends, while they purify and homogenize their own racial composition.

"No; I am not greatly impressed by the cry for cheap labor," JOHNSON proceeded. "A great part of it is due to the fact that the wages of common labor have greatly advanced. But we can not Americanize aliens without paying them enough to maintain their self-respect. We surely can not afford to admit them so fast that they will be standing about by millions waiting for an occasional job. That procedure has already proved too expensive."

THE FARMER'S HEAVY LOSS.

All the populations of the world gravitate so automatically toward the United States as a universal asylum that we often fail to realize how stupendous, though noiseless, is the pressure of this immigration avalanche. By contrast the great noise made about the Zionist movement, for example, might lead one to think that a large Jewish migration to Palestine was in progress. But the records show that last year 58,524 Hebrew aliens came to the United States, while 18 left this country for Palestine, where there are only 50,000 Jews all told. And yet a New York rabbi recently asked, "If you object to the Jew in London and also in Jerusalem, where will the Jew go?" Of course, the answer is, "To New York." That is precisely the place for which all the world seems to be headed.

If, then, only 2 per cent or less of the inpouring aliens go to our farms, how does immigration affect the farmer? Well, he has lost billions of dollars as a result of strikes fomented by foreign-born leaders. Scarcely a month goes by without some alien-engineered disturbance which interferes with the marketing, distribution, and consumption of farm products. And the farmer is vitally concerned in having to pay taxes to care for other aliens who are not physically able to raise an industrial rumpus.

And is not it about time to have a showdown on the labor-shortage argument for unrestricted immigration? Not even at the peak of our activities was there a shortage of labor. In all shipyards, camps, munition plants, and essential industrial centers men were so plentiful that they stepped on one another's heels.

Perhaps we can look to our farms to preserve the original traditions, purposes, and blood lines of the founders of America. If so, the farmer will be able to speak the authoritative voice of the Nation. In the meantime we shall have to deny ourselves to millions of would-be visitors from foreign countries while we take an inventory of the human assets and liabilities within our borders; do a bit of house cleaning and set our domestic affairs in the better order. There are enough social and economic problems to study in connection with the 14,000,000 foreign born now in the United States. And in this study we shall do well to think of posterity and the permanence of our most cherished institutions, and not merely of industrial profits and labor surpluses.

Can any good American view the facts described in the article by Mr. Wilcox without alarm? The Commissioner General of Immigration says in his report for last year that 432,505 aliens were inspected, examined, and admitted to the United States, only "13,731 aliens were rejected" at our gates "for all causes," and in addition 973,804 alien seamen landed, making a grand total of 1,420,040. And yet this Congress will end without the personally promised and platform-pledged constructive permanent immigration law. The existing temporary quota, or so-called 3 per cent law, expires June 30, 1924. Congress will not meet again, probably, until next December, right on the eve of a presidential campaign, when the various hyphenated foreign blocs will be uppermost in the minds of certain master politicians, and when it behooves Americans to be on guard to guard the gates; for one may well say with Aldrich, the patriot poet:

O Liberty, white goddess, is it well
To leave the gates unguarded? On thy breast
Fold Sorrow's children, soothe the hurts of fate,
Lift the downtrodden, but with hand of steel
Stay those who to thy sacred portal come
To waste the gifts of freedom. Have a care
Lest from thy brow the clustered stars be torn
And trampled in the dust. For so of old
The thronging Goth and Vandal trampled Rome,
And where the temples of the Cæsars stood
The lean wolf unmolested made her lair.

CRITICISMS OF CODE BILL, MARCH 2, REVIEWED.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, on the 2d day of March, after 22 months of delay and 24 hours before the lawmaking body disperses, for the first time we get an idea from a reviewer, on March 2, of why that committee never held a meeting and never made a report upon H. R. 12. They have gotten together an array of petty details of suggestions from law clerks in the departments, disposed of by the revisers and the committee two or three years ago. They brought to the task an employee of the committee who was discharged because he wanted to change and improve the law instead of following the laws of Congress. As to those, we long since thrashed out and disposed of them, because the committee was determined to adhere to the laws made by Congress. Much of the material that he hurls at us at this last hour, while we have no time to go over it, he thinks, has already been fully presented to the House, as, for example, the law on ambassadors and ministers, on which I addressed the House January 26, 1923, presenting a letter from the Department of State, which demonstrated that the House committee was correct in its view. So far as I have been able to learn in three or four hours of investigation this afternoon, since I discovered this dying gasp of the distinguished gentleman, there is not a single, solitary objection they raised March 2 on which they have not been fully informed by the House committee, and not an objection which has not been thoroughly disposed of in the material we have presented to the House in the last week or so. It is just repetition of petty details of no importance and of suggestions impelled by a total lack of conception of the purpose of a code. He has made just one new suggestion, and that is when he calls attention to the decision in 253 U. S. 149, which on May 17, 1920, declared unconstitutional one of the laws which was in force March 4, 1919, and was necessarily included in the code bill.

In the few hours at my command I can not, of course, cover everything he presents in 14 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You will notice that the criticisms that he presents from the Interstate Commerce Commission were, as he admits, practically all withdrawn. As a matter of fact, out of 49, 1 suggestion was discovered to be correct and the bill should be so amended. There are 4 others of slight importance possibly open to debate and over 40 were withdrawn by the commission, and let me add that except the Department of the Navy, practically every criticism ever offered except a few, which we conceded to be correct and prepared for insertion in the bill, has long since been withdrawn and we follow herewith with the indorsements substituted for their criticisms.

THE CODE.

Webster's Dictionary says: "Code: A compilation of laws by public authority." The reviewer of March 2, 1923, says that this is not a code. The reason he says that is because he does not know any better. Webster states it correctly—and what difference does it make anyway what general appellation is applied. The suggestion is made that in 1874 they called the same book the Revised Statutes. As a matter of fact, the Constitution of the United States does not provide for any statutes. There is no such thing as a statute under our Constitution. They are all laws and so denominated by the Constitution, and therefore this book is properly called the code of the laws of the United States.

The reviewer says there are repetitions in this great book of nearly 2,000,000 words. Why the laws of the United States and the Statutes at Large are full of repetitions, and when we repeat the laws in this code we repeat the repetitions. Over and over repetitions appear, and in making a code particularly, this becomes essential. A general provision of law may necessarily be repeated in several sections in order to give the context the benefit of the neighborhood of the general proposition. A suggestion that it is repetition is so puerile that it is silly, and could only be presented by somebody who held a bill for 20 months without having a committee meeting and who employed to review the work a party discharged by the committee from making the work because he desired to constantly amend the law instead of getting it together. It is not surprising that this review of March 2 should be of no value and of no materiality when you remember that it is presented by a party who wanted to constantly amend the law.

3420 AND 3462.

The debater claims that our section 3420 is repealed by our section 3462. They are both items in appropriation bills and do not even mention each other, and there is not a line of repeal connected with this 3462 anywhere that would repeal anything. He is just dreaming.

Section 3420 refers to reapportioning space among departments now occupying the State, War, and Navy Department Building and laws governing that and the watchmen, and a law providing that no rooms vacated may be used for museum purposes.

Section 3462 does not repeal it at all. Instead of discussing the reassignment of the folks in the State, War, and Navy Building, it talks about controlling space in owned or leased Government buildings in the District, and gives it absolute control of the space in the several public buildings owned or leased in the District, with certain exceptions. It says nothing whatever about the repeal of the museum clause, which, of course, is still the law. It says nothing whatever about sev-

eral things mentioned in 3420. If 3420 were eliminated, considerable law would be gone. If there is some amendment partially of one by the other, the only way to do was to print them both in the same chapter and let the courts decide just what the effect was. There are many laws made by Congress which partially repeal other laws by implication, but it is absolutely essential to retain the old laws because of parts of them, and the only way a court can know what result is reached by making the new law is to print them both and let the courts pass on it. Anybody who understands the first principles of the rules of codification knows that one of the heaviest duties of the courts is to decide just what effect new laws have on old laws. One of the greatest misfortunes in our system of laws is that there is so much loose and confused repeal by implication and otherwise. Of course, there are in so big a book many instances in which the courts will be compelled to compare sections and interpret the effect of the later upon the earlier, and state just how much is left standing. It is difficult to analyze with patience the puny and presumptuous criticisms of men who do not know enough of the law to realize that fact.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Under the head of the Department of State a number of suggestions are made which have long since been met and disposed of.

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 mistake 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 House bill 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.

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.

The law provides for a chargé and consul general at Teheran and there has never been any change in it. Under the authority of the Constitution, but without any authority from Congress, the President has appointed a minister, and Congress pays him and the Senate has confirmed him, but the law as made by Congress is just as it has been for years. He says

that it is obsolete. There is no such thing as obsolete law; law desists when repealed or declared unconstitutional.

He says that the legation at Constantinople was a number of years ago raised to the rank of embassy. It was by the President, under the authority of the Constitution, but not by Congress, which has never made a law authorizing it. No Member of the House or Senate has any right to declare law unconstitutional, and the only law there is on the subject says just what this code says. He wants to change the word "legation" in the law to the word "embassy." The President has done so but the law does not do so. The Constitution probably authorizes the President to do it, and I think it would be well if we could arrange a publication including all the things that the President has authority to do under the Constitution but which are not a part of the statutes.

Everything under the Department of State is included in these answers, and the attitude of the department is shown by a letter from the Secretary, which follows:

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.

FOREIGN RELATIONS.

The laws of the United States provide that in many oriental countries the Government has extraterritorial powers. By a series of treaties and neglect the Government has abandoned those powers in many cases. The chairman of the Committee on Revision of Laws when he represented this country in Egypt exercised for this country those extraterritorial powers there and was quite familiar with those conditions. He found to his surprise that the Congress of the United States had never kept pace with the treaties and that all the laws were in effect still, so far as Congress could go. There is no man in this country has the right to say that those laws were not in effect March 4, 1919. No court had so decided, and Congress had never repealed them. All this alleged argument he has presented under foreign relations is based on the theory that the statutes made by Congress could be repealed by proclamation. One of the greatest difficulties in the laws of this country is that Congress has never kept the statutes and the treaties together, and it has been the hope of this committee that as soon as this bill presenting the laws made by Congress was enacted we could take up the treaties and present them in full and get them all in touch. The argument on this subject presented says that the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the United States in Egypt results from a treaty with the Ottoman Empire made in 1830 and not with Egypt as stated in the section. The extraterritorial powers in the Turkish Empire sprang originally from an ancient treaty with the Turkish Empire, which included Egypt. If you will turn to section 4803 of the Revised Statutes of 1878 you will find that it says:

To carry into full effect the provisions of the treaties of the United States with China, Japan, Siam, Egypt, and Madagascar, respectively, the ministers and consuls of the United States, duly appointed to reside in each of those countries, shall, in addition to other powers and duties imposed upon them, respectively, by the provisions of such treaties, respectively, be invested with the judicial authority herein described.

The gentleman did not know what he was talking about. All treaties that have effect in Egypt were long since ratified by Egypt and became treaties with Egypt, and there is no authority exercised there by any foreign officer, for the reasons stated in section 4803 of the Revised Statutes. They might have permitted the chairman of the revision committee to have had knowledge of that, because he exercised those powers himself. All this matter was thoroughly discussed long since with this department and long since disposed of, and you will see from the above letter from the Secretary of State, under date of January 27, 1923, that he advised Senator ERNST that his department at that time had no additional suggestions to offer. The gentleman should have read section 4803 of the Revised Statutes.

Referring to section 6295, the criticism of March 2 suggests, with regard to this section, that so much of this section as relates to arrest and imprisonment of officers or seamen deserting, or charged with desertion, and for the cooperation of the local authorities in effecting such arrest or imprisonment, is specifically repealed by the act of March 15, 1915 (38 S. 1184). Well, what does he tell us that for? If you turn to section 6295, you will find that it so says. The fact is that on May 31, 1921, the criticism which he has just stated above was made and was O. K'd by the committee on revision, and so appears in section 6295. What is he repeating it for? Section 6295 says:

If on the examination provided for in the preceding section it is made to appear that the person so arrested is a citizen of the United States, he shall be forthwith discharged from arrest and shall be left to the ordinary course of law.

Our section provided that this former law should not apply at all whenever it appeared that the person arrested was a citizen of the United States, and this gentleman got gravely up and said:

This Government has abrogated all treaty provisions which would permit arrest or imprisonment for desertion.

Why, that is what section 6295 provides—that an American citizen can not be arrested. The fact is that when they went to the State Department to ask for suggestions they simply handed them the old suggestions of May 31, 1921. The committee had long since followed every one of them that was correct, and the man who prepared this argument of March 2 had not the slightest idea of what he was talking about. He just blindly repeated the letter of May 31, 1921. Secretary Hughes has not said a word about this. This came from a former letter of 1921. The gentleman seems to have an idea that a treaty can repeal a law. A treaty may supersede a law, but the treaty can not take the words of Congress out of its mouth and strike them out of the statute books. The courts must decide what effect the laws and the treaties have upon each other. This gentleman should not have undertaken a review of a difficult and complicated matter which he does not understand. We took this up two years ago with the department and reached a mutual agreement about it. He has just simply swelled his aggregation of alleged criticisms by repeating something like a parrot.

The gentleman says that this Government has abrogated treaty provisions which would permit arrest or imprisonment for desertion. Our code says that the minute it appears that the man is an American citizen he shall be discharged from arrest forthwith. It is extremely astounding that anyone should venture into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and put himself in such a situation as this stuff puts the author of it.

THE JUDICIARY.

Some years ago the Committee on Revision of the Laws employed a gentleman to assist in preparing another revision, which he did at a cost of many thousands of dollars. In his earnest desire to improve the laws he made many changes. The committee of course realized that they could not get through a thousand amendments at one swoop and never even made any report of the bill, which cost thousands of dollars. When we began this work the gentleman offered his services without cost, but was employed at a regular salary and paid, but carefully instructed that he must make no changes whatever. He undertook to do the work on the judiciary and did, but the chairman discovered that he was making law of his own to improve the other law. After careful examination the chairman called in the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and called his attention to it, and he joined in the judgment that the gentleman was making law of his own and we were compelled to rewrite the entire judiciary end of this work and subsequently to discharge the gentleman because of his deter-

mination to insert his own views of the law. He has been employed over at the other end of the Capitol for $650 to review the work done by the committee in which he joined. I regret to say that after the gentleman had done considerable of this bill he proceeds to criticize his own work. I present herewith some correspondence between the reviewer employed at the other end of the Capitol and the chairman of the House committee, which explains the difference in their views of what the law should be:

On January 27, 1920, Mr. Lott, the reviewer of March 2, wrote me:

With respect to the Navy title and the 26 sections proposed you sent me I can only repeat there is so much left-handed, back-handed, over-the-shoulder legislation with respect to that title that the only way to make it intelligible is to begin at the beginning and rewrite it.

The committee on revision, however, was confined to repeating the work done by Congress and could not avail itself of Mr. Lott's desire to rewrite the law.

On February 7, 1920, the chairman wrote Mr. Lott as follows:

I am greatly puzzled that you should find the work more difficult. As a matter of fact, our method cuts the work you have been doing about in two and makes it much easier for you. As I have written you several times, the simple purpose of this bill is to present to Congress the general and permanent laws in force March 4, 1919, without a single, solitary change in them as far as can be avoided intelligently. We shall make no effort to "improve," but take it for granted that Congress knew what it wanted to say better than we do; and I must be able to say to Congress that we present the law just as it was. If we cut a long sentence into smaller sentences the question arises to the court at once as to whether the meaning is just the same. Furthermore, every critic in the House arises to insist upon a discussion of that section. If this bill should be read by sections and so discussed, it could not get through either House in two years and would be impossible. We must make no changes at all.

On October 9, 1919, Mr. Lott wrote:

In but few instances have I supplied a gap to which no person can object.

But the committee on revision did object, and therefore Mr. Lott is now the reviewer of March 2, telling why he thinks the gaps should have been supplied. In his letter of February 14, 1920, to the chairman the reviewer of March 2, 1923, says concerning section 1426:

This section, as finally corrected by me and returned to you, likewise contains new language.

This the committee decided it could not use. We did not employ the gentleman to furnish his language but to supply the language of Congress.

On July 26, 1919, before the gentleman had taken the trouble to read our instructions, he refers us back to his effort to establish a revised statutes some 15 years ago, and speaks of his chapter 5. The man simply wanted to rewrite the whole thing, and this was his continuous and steady attitude whenever he could get away from the instructions long enough to draw a deep breath, and now he glories in being able to explain why the laws should be varied from the laws made by Congress.

In February, 1920, it was discovered by the committee that he was making law himself, one particular section being produced that was purely original with him. The chairman of the committee then wrote him as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1920.

Hon. JOHN LOTT, *Tiffin, Ohio.*

MY DEAR LOTT: A telegram with regard to 1606–7 is at hand and I shall read your letter with interest. I have examined the sources from which this section of yours was made, and you have probably about stated the law, but you have changed its words and its order so it would require a court decision to decide whether the law was the same as it was before. You have so changed the words that anybody in the House who wanted to make an objection could raise the issue, and it would take quite a debate to demonstrate that the law was the same, even if it is. If I should undertake to amend these sections that way, a debate would be precipitated that would make it impossible to pass the law at all. I seem to have been unable to have secured your attention to the fact that the purpose of this book will be to reproduce the law just exactly as it is without any improvement.

This section, unless your letter states something that I don't now have in mind, fails to comply with this rule and will necessarily be eliminated from the book. I will assemble the sections in the law as they are and insert them, but, Mr. Lott, how many more are there like that in this judiciary? Are there so many that I must go through all this work and do it over again? If so, nothing has been done on the judiciary that is of any benefit to the work. In order to be useful, this copy must come here ready for the printer, just as it was before, except that it is consolidated, codified, and revised, without any amendment or change.

This is an admirable illustration of the danger of which I have been cautioning you against all the time, and which would wholly make impossible the accomplishment of our purpose. From 18— to 1873 a board of "experts" revised the statutes. Ben Butler's committee saw at a glance that it would be impossible to pass any such code, and hired a lawyer a year to work taking out the alleged "improvements" those experts put in. Then he secured the passage and gave the world the greatest law book it ever saw, the only work of the kind ever published in the United States for the United States, a book where a man could find the law and know it was the law. Let me hear from you as to whether or not there are many more sections like this.

Some time last September I returned to you your first copy, because of so many sections having taken too much liberty with existing law, and I marked on the margins of several of them where change had been made. I find it difficult to comprehend how such a section as 1106 could have crept into the work after my letter of last September, especially in view of all the instructions. We can't go on with this work unless our revisers adhere strictly to the methods I have arranged and which the committee very warmly indorses. It is absolutely necessary that from now on the rule be strictly adhered to. I will investigate the judiciary and decide as to whether any of it is outside the rule besides this section.

Very sincerely yours, E. C. LITTLE.

Under the head of the judiciary attention is called to the Knickerbocker case, found in United States 253, page 149, a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States made May 17, 1920, declaring a certain law unconstitutional. This bill undertakes to present the law in effect March 4, 1919. The bill does so present it. On May 17, 1920, a certain law that was in effect March 4, 1919, was declared unconstitutional and ceased to be in effect, but that does not void the fact that it was in effect March 4, 1919, and in the years to come the student who desires to know what law was in effect on March 4, 1919, would know just what the law was, and it is put right where it belongs and ought to stay and no man who was competent to work on such a bill would raise such a point.

He then devotes considerable space to the headlines of the sections. There is nothing the matter with any of the headlines that he mentions. They are just like they ought to be. They are just a matter of taste, anyway, and the able men who revised these laws for this committee think their headlines show better taste than the gentleman's might. This bill specifically provides that the headlines are no part of the law. This talk about the headlines, of course, is just an attempt to throw dirt in the faces of the examiners and to distract attention from the book.

The reviewer of March 2 calls particular attention to section 3705. He says:

Comment upon the foregoing section is hardly necessary. It is a most remarkable work in the art of statute making. It does not slight either the Revised Statutes or the Statutes at Large or the Code of the Laws of the United States.

This section is taken from the act of May 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 547). It deals with the immigration laws. The reviewer of March 2 criticizes the manner in which the section was written. I do not know who wrote this section; I did not. Ex-Senator Hardwick was chairman of the committee when it was passed. Former Senator Penrose, Senator Dillingham, Senator Sterling, and Senator Hiram Johnson were members of the committee at that time. I suggest that he take his criticism to them. Our committee can not omit or change the existing law. Congress authorized us to print the existing law as it is contained in the statute books. The reviewer of March 2 does not seem to understand that the purpose of this bill is to print the law as it was when Congress made it. He thinks the committee can omit or change the laws already passed at will.

He says:

It does not slight either the Revised Statutes or the Statutes at Large or the Code of the Laws of the United States.

I hope not; why should it? The aforesaid act in the Fortieth Statutes spoke of the provisions "of this act." "This act" then referred to the Fortieth Statutes, pages 542 to 548, inclusive. If he means that we should have let it remain as it was, the words "this act" would refer to the act to establish a code and would be stating a deliberate untruth. It became necessary to strike out the words "this act" and substitute something intelligent, which brings us to refer to the Fortieth Statutes, page 547, so that we did not slight the origin. Of that act, a major portion appears in section 3675 of the Code of the Laws of the United States, so that you find this act now either in section 3675 of this code or in the Fortieth Statutes aforesaid. He evidently does not understand the point, or perhaps his mind can not carry two statements of the same thing. We had in our employ at one time a reviser who could not catch that, and he made us a lot of trouble by forcing the chairman to go over his work and correct it. Evidently that gentleman is the reviewer that was employed to correct the work he was not allowed to fix to suit himself.

In many places in the old law reference is made to "this act," or some similar phrase. It becomes necessary to substitute for it the statement of what act it was, and anybody that has any serious appreciation of making a code would see that that is necessary. It is also convenient to locate the same law in the new code, and that we have generally been able to do. The section which he criticizes is one of the best examples of excellent codification that could be produced. I am glad he cited attention to it. You will notice that he does not pretend to say what his criticism is. He just indulges his satire. The Bible says that the laughter of fools is like the crackling of thorns under the pot. You will hear them crackle as you read that review constantly. There is not the slightest change in the

law in the section he criticizes. It is printed just as it was made, and there is not any earthly reason why it should be subjected to any suggestion of criticism.

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago while I was not in the Chamber several gentlemen took a kindly interest in the bill to establish a Code of the Laws of the United States, which passed the House two years and four days ago, and made inquiry as to what had become of it during the last two years. I can not now go into this in much detail, but I can perhaps answer a few of the questions that were asked at that time. Let me preface my remarks by saying a word in respect to the history of what was done before the bill left here. Twenty-two months of hard work were put on the bill before it came into the House. We had the assistance and encouragement of more than 100 Members of this House who came in to see us and personally observed just what was being done. We followed the plans of the old, original Revised Statutes, taking advantage of that experience, and, we hope, considerably improved the work that was done, especially as we had more time in which to do it.

HE WANTED TO LOAN ANOTHER BILLION.

The bill passed the House May 16, 1921, unanimously. As far as I know, no other man who ever tried a lawsuit has ever made any objection to the bill. We sent the bill to every department, and some of them helped us considerably. For example, the War Department made a very careful research of the bill as it affected laws respecting the Army. They found two mistakes, which we were very glad to correct. I was glad to be able to say that we found that in their array of military law there were 27 omissions which we had supplied and which they inserted. Other departments took different views. The then Secretary of the Treasury, for example, found a "terrific blunder of such serious character" that he stated the bill could not possibly be any good. It seems a law had been passed authorizing an issue of $1,000,000,000 of Liberty bonds. The law was executed. That gentleman was greatly distressed to find that it was not included. He said the $1,000,000,000 worth of bonds were out, and it would be very embarrassing if they did not have anything to stand behind them; he was not quite sure whether the bonds could ever be paid. I suggested that since the law had been executed and was not in effect any more it would certainly be very embarrassing if we reenacted it, as we would if we included it in this bill, because he could then issue another $1,000,000,000 worth of bonds. I said I did not believe that was the best thing to do. I asked him who his attorney was, and he said that it was not practical to say. Gentlemen can judge from this of the kind of some of the help that we received.

NAVY THROWS OUT 71 SECTIONS ON THE "BEST OF OUR INFORMATION AND BELIEF."

The Secretary of the Navy called our attention to the fact that the rear admirals, the General Staff, the war council, and some other great men had very carefully considered certain legislation enacted by Congress and had reached the conclusion that it could not be put into effect, and not being putable, so to speak, "it evidently was not in effect," and therefore it would be necessary for us to drop those laws out of the bill. Not being gifted with any special authority we did not feel that we could drop them out, and we declined to do so. Let me show you a little something else about that Navy Department. They called attention to 71 sections which "to the best of their information and belief" were not any longer the law.

Just exactly what would you do, gentlemen, if you were a judge and a fellow laid a brief before you in which he stated that to the best of his information and belief such and such was the law? That is the way they started. What it really meant was that there were certain sections of our law they had entirely overlooked and did not have. We looked the stuff over very carefully. And there was one thing we thought was open to debate, and I think we took their advice. We had the very liberal assistance of gentlemen who wanted to leave out the law which was about a matter of precedence.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. In a minute. There are certain sections they wanted to omit, because "to the best of their information and belief" they were not there. I think they are right about it, "to the best of their information and belief." [Laughter.] But I am referring to questions of precedence ordered omitted because the war council, the General Staff, and three or four rear admirals objected and ordered it not to be put in; high treason; ought to be court-martialed and shot. They called attention to the little headlines at the head of sections, which are no part of this law, specially provided, and we did not ask the gentlemen to do anything but take the law as it is now. Their taste did not approve our headlines, which are no part of the law, but satisfied the committee. So we did not change them. That introduced into this matter from the beginning a misunderstanding, very unfortunate, and we were compelled to overrule many suggestions, because we could not omit the law on their "information and belief." They became indignant and are so still. They demanded that we omit the law, change our section headlines, and omit 71 sections on their information and belief. We declined, and for that reason, and that alone, the Judge Advocate Generals and rear admirals of the second nine have kept up a continuous and baseless attack upon this bill, and you will see by their letters of May 25, 1920, and March 1, 1921, they demanded this omission because the General Staff and the rear admirals of the second nine had decided that your laws could not be put in effect, and they would therefore beat the bill, because we published the law as you made it, about who should go into dinner first, and hence these tears from the naval lawyers and rear admirals of the second nine.

Nevertheless, these very gentlemen, who know less of the law than any similar force in any department, have registered more alleged criticisms than probably all the rest put together. Hon. James R. Mann once remarked to me that there was more incompetence in the Department of the Navy than in any other in Washington. You wonder why such presumption should go with such ignorance, but I will show you. Perhaps the greatest difficulty that the revisers have had has been avoiding the malice of people who insisted that we should leave out the law or should put in something that had long since ceased to be the law. The most egregious and unpardonable offender has been the Department of the Navy.

When the Committee on Revision began this work and got it under way, they invited the assistance and cooperation of the legal staff of every department and bureau. Some of them were very prompt and helpful. The War Department made a thorough and careful examination of our work, comparing it with their aggregation of the laws of the Army. They found two mistakes, which we gladly corrected. They also found 27 sections of the military law that they did not have in their compilation and promptly utilized them, giving us credit for them. But witness the Department of the Navy. In response to the committee's letter the Secretary of the Navy at that time, on May 25, 1920, wrote the chairman of the committee that he had found many sections of the naval law of which he had never heard. He evidently had no intelligent compilation of the laws of his department with which to compare ours, but he promptly announced all the law he did not know was not there.

He said on May 25, 1920:

> The department has noted a large number of sections which to the best of its information and belief are no longer in force. * * *
> The following sections in said compilation have been noted as not in force March 4, 1919, and should be omitted therefrom: 2444, 2448, 2449, 2460, 2463, 2465, 2486, 2489, 2512, 2513, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2526, 2527, 2531, 2534, 2542, 2544, 2546, 2551, 2555, 2556, 2563, 2576, 2577, 2582, 2587, 2589, 2590, 2598, 2609, 2610, 2614, 2617, 2618, 2626, 2633, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2644, 2653, 2654, 2659, 2660, 2663, 2664, 2679, 2718, 2719, 2721, 2743, 2744, 2749, 2758, 2759, 2760, 2764, 2767, 2772, 2773, 2775, 2784, 2815, 2899, 2900, 2915, 3019, and 3023.

You will note at once the difference between the intelligent law department the Army then had and the gentlemen who had never tried a lawsuit who purported to be lawyers for the Navy. They actually expect people to give consideration to the criticisms of men who undertake to write a law brief beginning "to the best of its information and belief" this is not the law. That there should be anybody in the world so supremely ignorant as to ask a committee to accept such a statement on information and belief as of any value is almost beyond imagination. We knew, of course, then that there was nobody down there who could be of any assistance to us, and we have never had any reason to change our minds since May 25, 1920.

NAVY SAYS CAN'T USE THE LAW CONGRESS MADE AND CODIFIER MUST OMIT IT.

But that was mild. Turn to the last page of the letter of May 25, 1920, which reads as follows:

> Section 2757 demotes rear admirals instead of promoting brigadier generals, as was intended by section 3 of the act of October 6, 1917. Further, so much of said act as provides that brigadier generals of the Army shall hereafter rank relatively with rear admirals of the lower half of the grade is defective and it has been impossible to put it into operation, for which reason the War and Navy Departments have requested its repeal. It is the opinion of the department, therefore, that all reference to relative rank between brigadier generals and rear admirals of the lower half of the grade should be omitted. The provision of section 1446, Revised Statutes, ranking commodores with brigadier generals is still in force and should be included in this section.

The gentleman gravely states that the law embodied in section 2757 "is defective and it has been impossible to put it into operation, for which reason the War and Navy Departments have requested its repeal. It is the opinion of the de-

partment, therefore, that all reference to relative rank between brigadier generals and rear admirals of the lower half of the grade should be omitted." We, of course, explained to them that we had no place in our plan that permitted us to omit any law. Of course you realize, gentlemen, that a man must be either extremely ignorant or wholly lacking in personal integrity to ask a committee to omit the law, but what shall we say of a man who, after being thoroughly informed of the situation, came back a year later on March 1, 1921, and repeated and again urged that we should omit that law, the letter reading as follows:

The clause in the act of October 6, 1917, was the subject of the fullest consideration by the experts in both the War and Navy Departments, including the General Staff and the war council, with the result that the two departments agreed that this provision could not be put into effect, and concurred in recommendations to Congress that it be repealed. Inasmuch as the said provision could not be put into effect, its repeal would serve no purpose other than to eliminate it from the statutes, thereby preventing confusion which it might cause in the minds of those not familiar with the subject; whether repealed or not, the fact would be that it was not in effect and could not be put into effect, and therefore could not be regarded as a provision of law which was in effect in 1919.

As a matter of fact, gentlemen, you see at a glance why it is that the Navy Department has accumulated more alleged errors than anybody else, or than all the rest, probably. They were determined that we should omit the law, and we incurred their rancor and vicious opposition from that moment till now because we would not omit the law.

NAVY INSISTS CAN'T ADMINISTER NAVY IF LAW ON SEATS AT DINNER BE PUBLISHED.

If it were a matter of any importance it would be easy to understand, but as you glance at the letter of May 25, 1920, you will see that it is nothing at all but a little matter of social prestige, of what they call "precedence"—a quarrel as to whether a brigadier general or a rear admiral of the lower grade shall go in to dinner first—and, gentlemen, as astounding as you may consider it, they actually tell us that "it has been impossible to put it into operation"; and later they tell us that they could not administer the Navy unless we leave it out.

Kitchener of Khartoum once told me that with a commissioner from France and one from Germany, he representing Great Britain, he took part in investigating some points on the African coast line, each having a ship of his own. They went ashore in one boat every day, and the other two gentlemen quarreled constantly over a point of precedence as to which of them should go ashore first, until finally one day one of them fell into the water during the quarrel; and afterwards they went in three boats. An immense percentage of the obstacles that have been so viciously thrust in the way of this great code has been because the Navy did not want a rear admiral of the second nine to go in to dinner alongside a brigadier general. I have too much respect for the Government of the United States to state in full my views of such conduct; but you will see at once, gentlemen, that anything coming from the Navy must be discounted at least 99 per cent.

When House bill 9389 passed the House in December, 1920, they went into spasms because we did not omit the law, rushed down and told the Senate committee that they could not administer the Navy if this code went into effect, and began piling up an array of infinitesimal and contemptible criticisms. For example, in their first essay of May 25, 1920, they criticized section 2437 of House bill 9389, which is now section 2438 of House bill 12. We were worrying a bit over that and had about decided to make a slight change, and were glad to have their correction and made it. The first section, of course, in the Navy had their exact approval, which was just the way they wanted it; but when they found we had not omitted the rest they began by starting in again with another criticism of that section. Either they were ignorant when they made the first one or they were malicious when they attacked it again, and they were both. Let us proceed another step in reviewing their letter of May 25, 1920, showing the basis of the work which is still hurling bricks at this committee.

NAVY REQUIRES HEADLINES IN CODE BILL BE CHANGED.

We asked the Department of the Navy, as we did the others, to compare our compilation of their laws with their own and to tell us what, if any, we had omitted and what dead law we had inserted. They evidently did not know that that was all they could do, and they proceeded to make 103 criticisms of the wording of the headlines to the various sections in the code. This bill especially provides that the headlines are no part of the law. They were simply matters of taste and were written by the chairman and the revisers and the committee. Naturally, we felt that our taste was sufficient, and we did not ask for their criticisms; but, instead of proceeding to look up the law, they stated that "to the best of their information and belief," and gave full rein to their literary tastes and interests, changing the heading of one section from "Dentists' qualifications" to "Qualifications for appointment to Dental Corps"; changing "Enlisted strength" to "Enlisted strength defined," and so on ad infinitum. The committee, with their strenuous and extensive duties, found themselves unable to give consideration to the literary tastes of gentlemen who knew no law. By the time they had read our disposition of their original criticisms, some of which were adopted, the alleged lawyers from the Navy were far beyond control, and since then, over and over again, they have multiplied and dignified every possibility to make a suggestion into some criticism. One of the greatest mistakes of this Government is having Judge Advocates General of the Navy who never studied law. No man who never studied law should be permitted to occupy such a position.

REAR ADMIRAL OF SECOND NINE'S DINNER SEAT AT STAKE.

The whole difficulty has been because some Judge Advocate General, like the present one, a rear admiral, is worried about where he will sit at dinner when a brigadier general comes in, and has kept the gentlemen doing the work on the jump to find more and more imaginary objections.

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy recently said in testifying before a Senate committee that they had three Judge Advocates General in St. Elizabeths Hospital. I am going to be perfectly frank and say that from the best of our observation of the Judge Advocates General during this great work, every one of them ought to be in St. Elizabeths, and we suggest that as an improvement in the Navy legal department.

A few months ago for the first time we finally got somebody in the Navy to give us the name of some lawyer that was working at it, and they did, two very pleasant gentlemen, neither of whom ever tried a lawsuit. The chairman, after a conference with them, found 41 things they suggested, most of which did not amount to anything, and conceded their being placed in the book as perfecting amendments and so wrote the chairman of the Senate committee and suggested that when he brought the bill in he might make those amendments. At that time they had brought with them about 90 others and it was absolutely agreed between the gentlemen and myself in my office that practically all of them were not worthy of consideration and should be eliminated from the question. After returning to the Judge Advocate General and rear admiral of the lower half of the grade, whose place at dinner was at stake, they repeated the 41 that we had already agreed to put in and turned up with 96 more alleged criticisms, most of which they had already conceded to be of no value. Gentlemen of the House, this was done simply because we would not let them compel us to omit the laws of the land from the code of its laws, and not one of those objections was made in good faith, all just a malicious effort to make trouble.

WHY AREN'T ALLEGED ERRORS CORRECTED, IF ANY?

The committee has been told by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Revision that the Navy had some objections. Well, why does he not state them like I have? Why does he not say they are right? He has received from the House committee a full and clear analysis of even these 96, most of which were supremely silly. His committee has been drawing $6,800 a year for revision of the laws. Why should he not sit down and go to work, and if 96 of them are right say so and amend the bill? That is what he is appointed for. The House committee gave 22 months to this work. Is there some society gentleman whose fingers must not be stained with a few minutes' honest toil? If there are some objections that are good, he ought to be just as able as the House committee to find them, and he is just as much at liberty to move their insertion. We will be glad to have the arguments in favor of why the Navy thinks the law should be omitted and why we should follow the "best of its information and belief." If there are no arguments in favor of that view, let us hear no more about it and let us take up something serious and finish this great bill, which has cost so much time and so much honest effort and which is so enthusiastically indorsed by members of the Cabinet, by solicitors of the departments, by United States judges, by great authors of the law, and by eminent attorneys.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my remarks with regard to the code, I depicted somewhat its history and condition up to date. We kept working on it in the House for 22 months. When it went over to the Senate it was just 22 months from that time until the close of this present session. In other words, the other people had the same time that we had. But they have had this great advantage that an immense amount of work had been done which would be wholly unnecessary to

do again, and they could put in their time on such parts as they desired. For that reason there never was any reason why it could not be done. Now, the question arises, why has it not been done, and why have they never had a meeting until yesterday? I think I stated before that after that bill left us everybody in the world who had a real objection to make in good faith had made it. I repeat that in my judgment any objections made after a year from May 16, 1921, were made from some motive other than a desire to make a good bill or to have one. I am going further to suggest that every suggestion since a year after it was passed here was made for some ulterior motive, unless they have done what the Senate did in 1874, and, as I have said, they have never made any objection I know of personally except one. Every department, I think, except one has withdrawn its criticisms. There are none that have not been gone over thoroughly and accepted if correct. In 1874 Roscoe Conkling was chairman of the revision of the laws committee of the Senate, and Matt Carpenter and some of the ablest lawyers who ever lived were members of that committee, and after spending a month or so looking at it Mr. Conkling took the floor and in 40 minutes procured a unanimous approval. They were asked if they did not think there might be some mistakes in it. Conkling and Carpenter replied in effect that they supposed there might be, but there could not be any mistakes in it half as important as not to have the bill, and so the bill was passed in 40 minutes. I take it these distinguished gentlemen have reached the conclusion they will do the same thing, and possibly for that reason have not devoted any time until yesterday, and have concluded they would adopt that policy.

I feel the more assured of this because of the fact that the chairman of the other committee had so often informed me and others that he had decided to report the bill favorably. He had told me that one Member was very much opposed to the bill and would fight it.

ERNST SAID WOULD REPORT CODE FAVORABLY.

When Congress was last in session, prior to the recent election, I met him, and he voluntarily informed me that he had smoothed out all the difficulties and he was now prepared to report the code bill favorably, and he would do so, and that it would pass, so informing others, too. In the Kansas City Kansan of September 28 last, United States Senator ARTHUR CAPPER said:

The code bill, of which LITTLE is the author, is virtually sure of passage at the next session. Senator ERNST, chairman of the Senate Revision Committee, told me just before I left Washington that he would make a favorable report on the measure, which he highly commended.

As far as I know, no department has now any criticisms to offer with regard to the bill, except the Navy Department, which will always object until we omit some of the law that they and the General Staff decided could not be enforced. If there are any remaining criticisms any lawyer with any qualifications whatever can, in a few days, prepare and insert in the bill the amendments necessary. All it needs is a little ordinary sense, some reasonable knowledge of the law, and some industry, of which there was plenty in the House for 22 months to the general knowledge of most of the House Members. Of course, it is quite possible that errors may still be discovered occasionally. More than 300 were discovered in the old Revised Statutes of 1874, after they had been in print for several years, including some that the bill (H. R. 12) people have discovered and corrected. The great point is to get an assembly of the laws so that people can use it. What if there are a few mistakes in 2,000,000 words? Conscientious men will endeavor to find them and finish the work. I think it best that I shall now take advantage of my leave to extend and present here a fairly full discussion of the attitude of the Navy Department toward this bill, and the reasons, and make some reference to the bill (H. R. 9389) which was the code bill that passed the Sixty-sixth Congress and received four months' careful review before it was introduced in the Sixty-seventh Congress as the bill H. R. 12.

On February 27, 1920, the committee chairman wrote the Secretary of the Navy that the committee had now the galley proofs of all the Navy part of the codification and would be glad to have his department look it over, the Secretary replying that they would be glad to do so, and on March 9, 1920, the Secretary was sent a preliminary copy of the bill, including the part with regard to the Navy. On May 12 the Secretary replied that it was received and had been referred to the office of the Judge Advocate General, adding:

I am advised, however, that the proper consideration of this matter is a very tedious and onerous task, requiring considerable time for its consummation.

On May 14 the chairman wrote that the War Department had received similar material about that department and had already compared it with their own collections of military and departmental law and returned it. (I may say right here that the War Department discovered two mistakes at that time.) The chairman said:

The task is greatly simplified as they simply take their collection and mine and ascertain what sections they have that I have not in the bill, and vice versa.

On May 25, 1920, the Secretary of the Navy returned his views and the views of his Judge Advocate General's Department, and said that—

The department has noted a large number of sections which, to the best of its information and belief, are no longer in force.

And added:

That lack of time and personnel qualified precludes the possibility of undertaking a further review at this time.

He further said:

The following sections have been noted as not in force on March 4, 1919, and should be omitted.

Then he just offhand points to 71 sections that he tells the committee have no place in the code. As the committee had been working, then, for nearly a year on it, it seemed better that he give in detail his reasons for omitting 71 sections, but he did not.

Then he proceeds to speak in some detail of 147 sections. He devotes a good deal of his time to suggesting changes in the titles of the sections. We had asked the Secretary to suggest any omissions or mistakes in the law. The section headings are no part of the law and nobody asked his views about those titles and nobody wanted his views. The committee felt quite competent to write its own headlines, and he could have been of some service if he had devoted his time to the matter that was submitted to him for his suggestions.

As to the rest of the views he presented, they are so juvenile in nature as to absolutely demonstrate the correctness of his statement in that letter that—

A lack of time and personnel qualified for the task, which could be detailed for such work, precludes the possibility of undertaking a further review at this time.

JOCK LOST ASHORE.

Let me add that after two years and seven months I am now prepared to state that his original statement to that effect was thoroughly well founded, and I shall now indorse it by saying a lack of lawyers who ever tried a lawsuit in his department has been so marked that he has never been of any serious assistance. The newspapers announced yesterday that Col. Theodore Roosevelt, jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy, in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, said that three of his judge advocates were now at St. Elizabeths. I will frankly say that the whole outfit of judge advocates in the Navy ought to be in St. Elizabeths, and I will cheerfully support a bill to appropriate money to take care of them till they can be returned to a normal mental condition.

The same paper stated that the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, Rear Admiral of the Second Nine Latimer, testified that a marine had died at Parris Island before finally accepted in the Marine Corps, and that the department could find no law or method of getting rid of the corpse. The Judge Advocate General of the Navy should be a lawyer, which he is not, and much of the difficulty that has been made by that department has been made by judge advocates who were neither lawyers in peace nor sailors in war and never served under fire. The law should provide that a judge advocate general should be a lawyer of long experience and ability, and these difficulties the committee has run into have made this entirely obvious.

For example, suggesting changes in little headings, which are of no legal importance and no part of their duty, they say that the title "Extension of term of enlisted men" should read "Extension of term of enlistment" and that the title "Limitation of total number of clerks' should read "Limitation of total number of pay clerks," and that the title "Inconsistent laws relating to Dental Corps repealed" should read "Prior inconsistent laws relating to Dental Corps repealed." The prodigious talents of the lawyers of the department conceived evidently the idea that the words "prior laws" should be inserted for fear that without that some subsequent legislation would be wrecked, ruined, repealed, and destroyed. While we have long since learned that the Navy Department knows no law, we did suppose that they could furnish us some common sense. And so they continue almost indefinitely with silly suggestions which require just as much time to be considered by the hard-working force of the committee as if they were drawn with ordinary intelligence.

The Judge Advocate General's Department, over the signature of the Secretary of the Navy, rose to the highest and loftiest flight in their final suggestions of May 25, 1920, when they said:

Section 2757 demotes rear admirals instead of promoting brigadier generals, as was intended by section 3 of the act of October 6, 1917; further, so much of said act as provides that brigadier generals of the Army shall hereafter rank relatively with rear admirals of the lower half of the grade is defective and it has been impossible to put it into operation, for which reason the departments have requested its repeal. It is the opinion of the department, therefore, that the reference to relative rank between brigadier generals and rear admirals in the lower half of the grade should be omitted.

LAW BY GENERAL STAFF.

In his letter of March 1, 1921, Secretary Daniels said:

The clause in the act of October 6, 1917, was the subject of the fullest consideration by the experts in both the War and Navy Departments, including the General Staff and the War Council, with the result that the two departments agreed that this provision could not be put into effect and concurred in recommendations to Congress that it be repealed. Inasmuch as the said provision could not be put into effect, its repeal would serve no purpose other than to eliminate it from the statutes, thereby preventing confusion which it might cause in the minds of those not familiar with the subject. Whether repealed or not, the fact would be that it was not in effect and could not be put into effect and therefore could not be regarded as a provision of law which was in effect in 1919.

Probably in the entire history of this country no member of the Cabinet before ever wrote such a remarkable and astounding letter. The Secretary sympathetically informs us that after a conference of "experts" from the War and Navy Departments, "including the General Staff and the War Council," actually held to decide whether the laws made by Congress should be enforced, they decided that they would not pay any attention to the law, and adds:

Inasmuch as the said provision could not be put into effect, its repeal would serve no purpose other than to eliminate it from the statutes, thereby preventing confusion * * *; whether repealed or not, the fact would be that it was not in effect and could not be put into effect and therefore could not be regarded as a provision of law which was in effect in 1919.

NULLIFICATION BY NAVY EXPERTS.

What was this that challenged the attention of both departments and all their experts? Just simply a question of how brigadier generals and rear admirals of the second nine should go into dinner. There was not another thing involved, but this distinguished gentleman had stepped into the breach and saved the country from ruin by carefully considering it and announcing that it was not necessary to repeal it, but that they would just drop it out. This was simply a nullification, and every man engaged in it should have been court-martialed and dismissed in disgrace, and the Secretary who encouraged it should have been impeached, and yet, because the committee declined to give any serious attention to such rot, for three years the work of the committee has been hamstrung, handicapped, and subjected to continual assaults by people who had no qualifications to criticize, but who time and time again after finishing up their criticisms began another series.

The committee undertook to assemble and codify the laws made by Congress without changing them. In his first letter the Secretary of the Navy demanded that we nullify and drop out the law as above shown, and gravely said that it was defective and must be left out. The committee, of course, pointed out that we were not endeavoring to repeal any laws or omit any laws, but we worked on the theory that Congress knew all the laws it wanted and all we were doing was to get them together. All the difficulties that have arisen since then about the Navy have sprung from the declination of the committee to change the laws Congress made in order to please the department.

H. R. 9389.

On December 20, 1920, the bill (H. R. 9389) to make a code of the laws unanimously passed the House of Representatives and went to the Senate, which adjourned on the following March 4. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Revision of the Laws was sick and called to Florida and was not able to get the bill before the Senate, though he frequently told me he would call it up and ask for its passage just as Senator Conkling and his committee did in 1874 with the Revised Statutes. A few days before the bill passed one of the force in the Navy Department that had been doing the work on it telephoned the House committee inquiring for a copy and said he wanted to see if we had followed his suggestions. As most of his suggestions were crude, puerile, and foolish, we had not followed all of them and he flew into a rage and immediately began a vicious assault upon the bill, which has been continuously maintained by his successors. He was mad because we did not drop out the law about the brigadier generals and rear admirals, which is a matter of no importance whatever, just a question of precedence as to who should go into dinner first. He then began to pour in every objection he could conceive or think of to the bill, sending it to the Senate committee, which referred it to the House committee, which gave it immediate and careful attention. Every suggestion which was worthy of serious consideration, that was worthy of being approved, was promptly approved, and the House committee sent to the Senate committee reams of matter, thoroughly explaining everything else, and the poor fellow dropped dead one day and others succeeded him. Before dying he had gone down to the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army and had induced another poor fellow down there to get up and send in a ridiculous set of criticisms without any foundation whatever, a man without any legal experience.

Attention was called to the absurdity of these, and Secretary Baker withdrew those objections and wrote the chairman of the House committee very highly indorsing the whole bill and urging its passage.

The Senate adjourned without getting time to take the matter up. When this gentleman and anybody he could stir up began his efforts to compel us to omit the law about who should go in to dinner first in the Army and Navy, the House committee began a four months' careful analysis of all the criticism that was made, and a very thorough one, and when the Sixty-seventh Congress convened the thoroughly revised revision was placed before the House after a review of four months, having the benefit of all the criticisms from all the departments that were offered. Some of them were very good and useful. Probably 90 per cent of them were of no force or value. I have yet to learn of any lawyer that ever tried a lawsuit that has made any real criticism of the bill, though there have been some very excellent suggestions.

WANTED $1,000,000,000 MORE.

The absurdity of them is indicated by a letter, for example, that the committee received from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Houston. The Secretary said that the bill H. R. 9389 had omitted certain authority for the issuance of certain Liberty bonds. He said sadly:

It is entirely omitted—

And added—

In view of the $2,000,000,000, or thereabouts, of outstanding bonds of the first Liberty loan, a repeal of the statutory authority under which they were issued would be unfortunate and embarrassing.

The committee wrote him that in view of the fact that all the bonds authorized by law had been issued, and that law had been fully executed, it would be very unfortunate and embarrassing if the law should be reenacted, which is what the code would do, because if it were the law on the date the code should go into effect, and it would be if reenacted, the Secretary of the Treasury could issue another $2,000,000,000 of bonds, which we declined to assist him in doing. Furthermore, it was suggested to him that even if the law were repealed that it was executed and that would not affect the validity of $2,000,000,000 of bonds. Of course, it is a suggestion that no lawyer could possibly make and that nobody with any sense would make, and of course that precipitated a few onslaughts from some people, and with such silly stuff as that we have had to contend for three years.

GEOLOGICAL LAW.

Another excellent illustration of the vicious and silly character of the criticisms which we had to examine carefully, just as if somebody fit to make suggestions had made them, came from the Geological Survey of the Interior Department. In the last days of the Wilson administration somebody in the department sent word around to see what flaws could be picked in the new code bill. The "brilliant and learned scholarly lawyer" at the head of the Geological Survey, who probably was never in a law office in his life, wrote that the geology laws seemed to be in, though not as well arranged as they would have been by his bureau, but that section 10742 did not meet with his approval and if permitted to stand would ruin the whole work. He said section 10742 changed the whole bill and made it a jumble of confused absurdities without form and void and simply a bundle of nonsense. He was informed that that section was prepared in 1874 by Luke Poland, Benjamin F. Butler, James Lawrence, of Ohio, George F. Hoar, and other great lawyers, and approved by Roscoe Conkling, Matt Carpenter, and other great lawyers; that it had stood unchallenged since 1874 as the governing section of the Revised Statutes, the greatest law book the world ever saw; and that our committee had copied it exactly on the theory that with such famous names authorizing it and its approval for nearly half a century, it would be all right. We thanked him for his scholarly advice and informed him but for his wise prudence and caution we would have been involved in what was evidently a total wreck, and that we had sons studying law and we would like to know

where he acquired his profound and erudite legal scholarship; but we have never had an answer. We asked Secretary Houston who was his legal adviser, but he said it was not practicable to say. In this statement I think he was correct.

On May 16, 1921, the bill went to the Senate committee, and 20 months have elapsed and it has never had a meeting. Of course, long since every man who in good faith had any criticisms to make has made them. On May 26, 1922, a year after the bill passed the House the last time, the chairman of the House committee wrote the chairman of the Senate committee:

All those who in good faith wish to make suggestions have long since had ample time in which to do so.

Since then nobody who in good faith wished to assist in making good laws has offered any criticism. The bill had then been before the country over a year as it now stands, and anything offered since that date was, of course, done just to annoy and necessarily was of a trivial nature and a matter of no importance.

ASKED OPINION OF ALL BUREAUS.

In the spring of 1922, nearly a year ago, the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, through its chairman, entered into conversation and correspondence with all the departments. Most of them had long since declined to offer any suggestions of correction. A few departments had some on file with the Senate committee, though not many. After the chairman of the House committee had conferred with the attorneys and solicitors of those departments an agreement was entered into as to just what changes, none of them important, should be made, and the department and the committee joined in suggesting to the Senate committee that those changes be made. A bill has just been introduced in the House to make the 66 perfecting amendments to the code on which the departments and the committee agreed, including finally those made by agreement with the Navy's attorneys, and there was no more work for the Senate committee to go over, everything being fully placed before them. Since that time the Navy presented what they call 137 criticisms, 41 of which were fully settled upon and agreed to by the Navy lawyers and the committee, and they are inserted in the corrections suggested to the Senate committee. Yet just for purposes evidently of confusion they include them in the 137. Of the remaining 96, it had been absolutely agreed between the committee and the representatives of the Navy that practically all should be discarded and not utilized because they were of no value, yet they come back repeating them. The balance were just an endeavor to create an array of pretended suggestions and criticisms in order to make the work seem more extended and difficult. The Navy Department is the only one that has permitted itself to stoop to such conduct. None of those criticisms made since May last is entitled to any consideration whatever, because they were not made in good faith, but simply to create an appearance of confusion and criticism. This bill went before the country in December, 1920, and again in May, 1921. Long since every man who was entitled to be heard has made what suggestions he has to make and there is no reason why anything made in recent months should be given any time whatever.

The Navy, I believe, has 96 criticisms of 96 sections which the other committee should examine. The House committee has 96 answers thereto. All that is needed is that the attacks and explanations and answers be read and a decision thereon be reached, and amendments be made if needed. That is what legislators on committees are for. Let them work a little, about 10 minutes; a total of 960 minutes will be enough to reach conclusions. If they make 96 amendments it will require about five minutes each to write out the amendments. Three days of good work will dispose of all the Navy has said, at the most. We worked 22 months.

INDORSEMENTS.

FEDERAL BENCH ADMIRES THE CODE.

Here is a letter I received from a judge in Arkansas:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE'S CHAMBERS,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS,
Little Rock, Ark., March 24, 1921.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE:

* * * * * * *

I am going over your act as I find time, but confining myself solely to the title of the judiciary. I can not express my admiration for this work. People, especially the bench and bar, owe you a debt of gratitude which can never be repaid. How you found time with your other congressional duties to do this work I am unable to understand. I have read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your remarks when you presented your report on the act, and also the remarks made by other Members of the House, which show that your work is being appreciated by the Members who have examined it. You are entirely too modest in claiming credit for your work.

I hope that some day in the near future I may have the pleasure of meeting you in person, that I may express to you my admiration for this work.

With very highest regards, I am,
Yours sincerely,

JACOB TRIEBER,
United States District Judge.

ATTORNEY GENERAL FINDS CODE PERFECT.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1921.

Hon. JOSIAH O. WOLCOTT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR:

* * * * * * *

In reply I beg to advise you that the only portions of this bill submitted to this department were section 965 to section 1612, relating to the judiciary, and section 503 to section 551, relating to the Department of Justice.

So far as such portion of the bill is concerned there is no criticism to offer on behalf of this department.

Respectfully,

A. MITCHELL PALMER,
Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1921.

Hon. E. C. LITTLE,
Chairman Committee on Revision of Laws,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 1, sending a copy of H. R. 12, to establish a code of laws of the United States, and asking me to look over it and advise you of any views I may have in regard to it.

The sections which seem to relate in any way to the criminal law or criminal procedure have been carefully examined, and, so far as it is possible to discover from such an examination, no errors or omissions have been noted.

* * * * * * *

Respectfully,

W. C. HERRON, *Attorney*
(For the Attorney General).

SECRETARY BAKER STRONGLY INDORSES CODE.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 21, 1921.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE: I have received your letter of January 19 and am delighted to have the marked copies of committee reports which you inclosed. Senator Carpenter's speech, to which you direct my attention, of course correctly states the answer to the difficulty always raised in the enactment of a great piece of codifying legislation. If we wait until perfection is achieved and the possibility of error removed, we never get the code. In the meantime practicing lawyers, judges, and district attorneys all over the United States are making vastly many more errors by reason of the fact that they have to rely upon an uncodified mass of legislative enactment, through which it is impossible, even with the greatest industry, to trace out the existing state of law.

Cordially yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER, *Secretary of War.*

SOLICITOR OF INTERIOR SAYS CODE SHOULD PASS WITHOUT AMENDMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, April 7, 1922.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE,
Committee on Revision of Laws,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE: I am in receipt of your letter of the 5th instant requesting my views in relation to H. R. 12. This proposed bill has been before the department for some time, and I think with very few exceptions no objection has been made thereto.

As I understand the proposed legislation, it is merely a compilation of the present existing laws and does not purport to contain new legislation. I have not gone over the matter with the idea of suggesting corrections for the reason that in my opinion it is very advisable that the present laws be consolidated and brought into some one volume where they will be easy of access. As it is at the present time, many enactments of Congress are contained in different volumes and, as you appreciate, may sometimes be very easily overlooked. I am of the opinion that if Congress will enact the proposed bill and thus get into a workable condition the present existing laws, that the future Congresses can then make such amendments as may be deemed proper in a much more satisfactory manner.

I trust you will pardon a few personal observations in relation to this character of legislation. It happened to be my privilege to be chairman of the legislative committee of Montana on two different occasions when the question of codification, consolidation, and revision of the then existing laws was before the legislative assembly. I found that it was impractical and almost impossible to undertake to make amendments and to get the legislative assembly to approve them, and in both instances our committee recommended, and the legislative assembly pursued, this course and adopted the report of the committee appointed to compile the existing laws without amendments, leaving to the succeeding legislative assemblies the corrections that might seem best. This method we found so satisfactory that at the last work of the assembly in compiling the laws of Montana we adopted the same course. For these reasons I am strongly of the opinion that H. R. 12 should be passed without any amendment other than those which the committee itself might report, and thus get into some practicable workable shape the present existing laws covering the several matters of public concern. Believing as I do, I am not making any suggestions of proposed amendments and hope and trust that this legislation will pass at an early date, as it will, in my judgment, be of incalculable value to all concerned.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN S. BOOTH, *Solicitor.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 18, 1922.

Hon. RICHARD P. ERNST,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR ERNST:

* * * * * * *

In a conference between Colonel LITTLE and the solicitor of the department yesterday the department's report to you of December 16 last was carefully gone over, resulting in Colonel LITTLE's concurrence in my suggestions with reference to the following sections of the bill: 837, 4866, 5055, 5051, 5061, 5249, 5258, 5282, 5299, 5300, 5320, 6677, 7187, 7323, 7326, 8868, 9489, 9497, 10326, and 3344.

I understand that Colonel LITTLE will take up with you the necessary action to effect the changes in the above-stated sections suggested by the department.

The remaining sections of the bill upon which I reported to you may stand as they appear in the bill.

The department realizes very keenly the enormous task involved in the preparation of this bill, and the only wonder is that it is so generally free from errors and omissions. It is also realized, as Colonel LITTLE suggests, that it is practically impossible to enact a bill of this kind which will be perfect in every respect. That result seems never to have been accomplished in any revision of the laws which has ever yet been undertaken. It seems to me that it is better to have a consolidation of the laws with a few errors which can be corrected by supplemental legislation when discovered than to delay the consolidation indefinitely, striving for perfection which it is more than probable never could be attained.

Very respectfully,

HENRY C. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

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 Revisions 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.

WIGMORE ON EVIDENCE FINDS CODE ENTIRELY SATISFACTORY.

JANUARY 15, 1923.

Hon. RICHARD P. ERNST,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been very hopeful that the Senate would proceed to the prompt enactment of the new United States Code, passed by the House a year ago last April. During the past year I have used the copy of it in preparing a new edition of my Treatise on Evidence, and have been through every page of the work and find it entirely satisfactory.

For 20 months it has lain in the hands of your committee. Is there any reason that you care to give explaining the delay?

Very truly yours,

(Signed) JOHN H. WIGMORE.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, December 18, 1922.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE, M. C.,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE:

* * * * * * *

In the report of this office of December 12, 1922, to the Secretary of Labor in re H. R. 12, this office has stated to the Secretary that Senator ERNST may be advised that all the changes suggested by the report of this office of April 1, 1921, in re H. R. 9389 have been taken care of in H. R. 12, with the exception of a few, and as to these you have in a conference with a representative of this office recently stated that you would offer an amendement to the present bill to take care of these suggested changes, and that, therefore, there are no suggestions as to changes in H. R. 12 to be made to Senator ERNST.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE G. RISLEY, *Solicitor.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, April 12, 1922.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Recept is acknowledged of your letter of April 5, 1922, addressed to the Solicitor of Internal Revenue, requesting any suggestions which he may have to offer with respect to H. R. 12, which passed the House of Representatives on May 16, 1921.

The solicitor has been requested to review the codification in a detailed manner in order that you may have the benefit of any suggestions or criticisms which may be offered. You will understand that the revenue act of 1921, which was enacted subsequent to the passage by the House of Representatives of the bill to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws of the United States in force March 4, 1919, made some very material changes in the assessment, collection, and refunding of taxes for prior years and the bringing of suits or other proceedings by or against taxpayers. In fact, the changes are so vital and far-reaching that many sections of your proposed code have been practically superseded. In view of the fact that the codification proposed attempts only to cover laws enacted prior to March 4, 1919, you may not be interested in the new and vital changes, but in the event it is your desire to make your codification more comprehensive, I should be pleased to render you any assistance which may be deemed advisable in connection therewith.

Sincerely,

D. H. BLAIR, *Commissioner.*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 8, 1921.

Hon. JOSIAH O. WOLCOTT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WOLCOTT: Replying to your letter of February 2, asking for any criticism I may care to make on the bill (H. R. 9389) to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws of the United States in force March 4, 1919, which bill appears to have passed the House and is now in the Senate for consideration, I beg to state that some months ago a copy of the first 335 pages of the bill was received in this department and referred to the solicitor for examination. At that time a complete copy was requested, but it does not appear that it has been received.

The solicitor reports that a few slight errors have been found in the sections of the advance part relating to the Post Office Department, a list of which will be included in a report on the complete bill, if these errors are found in the bill as passed by the House.

A copy of the complete bill has again been requested, and as soon as it is received a prompt examination and report will be made on such sections as relate to the Postal Service and the Post Office Department.

Respectfully,

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, January 31, 1923.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE,
Chairman Committee on Revision of Laws,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE: Referring to your telephonic inquiry of yesterday, I take pleasure in transmitting herewith a copy of a letter dated November 25, 1922, addressed to Hon. RICHARD P. ERNST, chairman of the Senate Committee on Revision of the Laws by the Postmaster General making certain suggestions respecting H. R. 12, a bill "to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws of the United States in force March 4, 1919."

Sincerely yours,

H. J. DONNELLY, *Acting Solicitor.*

SENATOR SMOOT'S APPROVAL.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC LANDS,
May 23, 1920.

Hon. E. C. LITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

DEAR MR. LITTLE: I am in receipt of your letter of May 20, 1920, inclosing copies of two letters received by you concerning your bill to codify the laws from justices of the Supreme Court. I thank you for sending me copies of the letters. I congratulate you upon the splendid work so far accomplished by you.

Yours truly,

REED SMOOT.

JUSTICES DAY AND M'KENNA.

1301 CLIFTON STREET,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1920.

Hon. E. C. LITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your favor of the 29th ultimo and have just received a copy of your bill for the revision of the statutes of the United States. So far as opportunity has offered, I have examined it, and it seems to me that the work is well and thoroughly done. Thanking you for the favor, I am,

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM R. DAY.

THE CONNECTICUT,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1920.

Hon. E. C. LITTLE, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have received the calendar print of the Laws of the United States, and thank you very much for the same.

The amount of research and industry which you exhibit in your bill is wonderful.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH MCKENNA.

FEDERAL JUDGE EVANS, OF KENTUCKY.

LOUSVILLE, KY., *January 9, 1923.*

Hon. RICHARD P. ERNST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I regretted very much not seeing you again while we were in Washington, but circumstances did not seem to favor your plan of dropping in on us on your way to the Capitol the morning after I saw you. I regret that such was the case, but know how busy you are and how likely you are to be diverted from one thing to another under the necessity of the situation.

The one thing which I desire to bring to your attention was the effort now being made to revise the statutes of the United States and to have the code of laws published as promptly as possible. I wanted to talk to you about this because of its importance to the United States courts and especially to the judges. I need not remind you of the enormous size and number of volumes which have accumulated since the last revision and the trouble the courts have in looking through all of them for possible enactments. It is because of this situation that I venture to bring this matter to your attention and to ask, if it be possible, that you will facilitate the enactment of proper laws. My attention has been directed to you in the matter because I saw in the newspapers that one of your committees was the one which had the matter under consideration for action.

Hoping that you are well, and that the new year will bring you blessings, I am

Very cordially yours, WALTER EVANS.

—

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1921.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LITTLE: During the recent vacation I took occasion to examine very carefully your codification of the United States Statutes. I did this with a special interest as a lawyer and as a member of the Judiciary Committee of Congress. I want to say to you that I am very familiar with codification work, having done a lot of it myself. I have never seen it as well done as you did it. I believe you have rendered a very great service not only to the professional bar but to every man who wants to know what his rights and what his duties are under United States law, and I have the honor to subscribe myself

Your obedient servant,

JAMES W. HUSTED.

—

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1921.

Col. EDWARD C. LITTLE, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLONEL: I have just taken the opportunity of looking through the new codification of the Federal laws, which is now pending before Congress and which, without doubt, will shortly be passed by both Houses and signed by the President.

I am astounded at the amount of work that has been involved in this great undertaking of revising, harmonizing, and systematizing the laws of our country. Without in any way reflecting upon the other members of the commission, I know that practically all of this work has been done by yourself. From my experience as a lawyer and a judge on the bench, I know it is impossible to praise too highly the great work you have done. It is the most important piece of legislation that has come before Congress in many a year, and I would rather go down to posterity as the author of this great work than to be known as the author of any bill that has passed Congress in the last five years.

Allow me to congratulate you on the magnificent work you have so well accomplished.

Very truly yours, PHIL D. SWING.

—

PRESIDENT DAVIS, OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION.

STETSON, JENNINGS & RUSSELL,
New York, January 31, 1923.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE: Your letter of January 10 reached my office while I was absent attending the midwinter meeting of the executive committee of the American Bar Association. Since my return a few days ago I have been hoping that I might have time to make the critical inspection of the bill which you suggest, but with the pressure of other matters it is quite clear that I shall not be able to do so in time to make my views of any service to you during the present session of Congress. There can be no question on the part of anyone that such a recodification is urgently necessary, and it will be a great pity if Congress adjourns without putting its stamp of approval upon the work. I know, of course, how difficult it is to get attention for such matters in the closing days of a busy session; but, after all, a bill of this character is distinctly a work for committees rather than for either House as a whole, and the general body, I should think, would be willing to adopt with a minimum of discussion a bill which comes to it with a favorable report.

Believe me, very sincerely yours, JOHN W. DAVIS.

LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have been patient and long-suffering in dealing with the beverage liquor traffic. They have tried every kind of regulation, taxation, restriction, local option, and the other known methods of dealing with this well-recognized evil. The history of the adoption of national prohibition is one of the finest illustrations of the development by a self-governing people of methods of control over appetite and greed.

The Colonies from the earliest days tried in vain to solve the problem. From 1633, when the Colony of Massachusetts, after declaring that many are "distempering themselves with drinke," ordered that the governor's permit be necessary to sell liquor, for over a century there were few years in which laws and ordinances were not passed, tried for a time, and repealed that others might be passed, in the attempt to control that which never has been controllable—the liquor traffic. In 1654 the preamble of one of these early liquor laws sets forth that "notwithstanding the great care this court hath had and the laws made to suppress that swinish sin of drunkenness, yet persons addicted to the vice find out ways to deceive the law." Various forms of the license systems were tried, but none curbed the growing evil.

THE WHISKY REBELLION.

The Revolutionary War brought forth an edict much like the order forbidding the sale of intoxicants to men in uniform during the recent World War, for in Cambridge General Washington issued orders to the officers of the Continental Army to prevent so far as possible American soldiers from frequenting tippling houses. The Continental Congress on September 20, 1776, prohibited the sale of all kinds of liquors to soldiers by sutlers. Even then liquor was formally and officially recognized as an enemy to the Republic and its use a treason to the State.

Taxes and imposts upon distilled liquors, proposed by Hamilton, were adopted by Congress in 1791, the anticipated revenue being estimated by Hamilton at $826,000 annually. Amendment of this act to impose the tax upon distilleries resulted in the whisky rebellion of 1793, when 13,000 soldiers had to be called out and $1,500,000—a sum larger than the three years' receipts from the liquor taxes—expended by the new Nation to curb the first open and avowed attempt to substitute the rule of advocates of personal liberty and liquor for the rule of the majority.

The fact that the action of the State of Pennsylvania in calling into question the authority of the Federal Government to thus control the liquor traffic encouraged the leaders of this insurrection is suggestive to-day, when new rebellions against the Constitution are being advocated by men who for appetite or profit would demolish orderly government.

THE GROCERY STORE FAILURE.

Aside from taverns and tippling shops, the forerunners of our saloons, liquors were for sale at the grocery stores of that day. Then, as now, impractical folk believed that sales of liquor in quantities at places not devoted wholly or principally to the liquor traffic would check the evil. The modern cry, "The saloon—never" is curiously reminiscent of the full and complete trial of the alternative grocery-store method of dealing with the liquor traffic. The failure of this method may be illustrated by the report of the judiciary committee of the Illinois Legislature, presented in 1839, when Abraham Lincoln was a member of the assembly, in which it was declared:

> Constituted, as the great majority of your committee is, of practicing lawyers from the various quarters of our State, we feel bound to add our testimony to the mass of evidence already given on the subject. In a large majority of the violations of the criminal law which have come under our observation in the courts of the State the original cause of the commission of the crime was the use of intoxicating liquors; and in that large class of cases of violations of the personal rights of individuals, as affrays, assaults and battery, riots, assaults with deadly weapons, manslaughter and murder, we are fully convinced from our observation that from three-fourths to nine-tenths have their origin in the same unfortunate source.
>
> * * * They are fully convinced from the result of their inquiries that not less than three-fourths of the paupers in Illinois have become so from the use of intoxicating liquors obtained at groceries. * * * The reports of lunatic asylums exhibit the fact that a large majority of the cases of lunacy and insanity are produced by this same fruitful source of misery.

That assembly passed a law to regulate the sale of intoxicants in groceries, but the regulation was as vain as earlier attempts. Liquor obeyed no laws. It was as lawless when in a grocery store as in a tavern.

LICENSE FAILS.

Various systems of license failed equally to accomplish the conversion of the rum devil into a respectable citizen. The higher the license the greater the number of violations of the law. The liquor dealer had to secure the money to pay his high license fees, and no statutes were able to prevent him.

In 1910, according to the internal-revenue reports of the United States and reports of licensing bodies in Massachusetts, there was a dealer in alcoholic drinks licensed by the Federal Government, but without a license from the town or city, for each 3,557 of the population of no-license cities and towns, and one for every 1,479 of license cities and towns. The bootlegger and the speak-easy were twice as numerous where license existed as where it did not. Aside from those who had protected themselves from Federal prosecution by a Federal license, there were the host of illicit dealers who held no license whatever. The license system failed wherever it was tried. Neither the limitation of the hours or the days on which liquor might be

sold, the character of the persons to whom it might be sold, or the quality of the drink furnished was as the law required. Few holders of liquor licenses obeyed the law.

BEER EXEMPTION TRIED.

The exemption of beer and cider from the prohibition laws was attempted in Massachusetts in 1870, in response to some such campaign as is being waged to-day by the brewery interests. In New Bedford, Mass., there was an immediate increase of over 68 per cent in the aggregate number of crimes committed in the first year of beer, and over 120 per cent increase in drunkenness cases. Justice Hamlett Bates, of Chelsea, declared, January 3, 1873:

The sale of beer should not be legalized; almost every beer saloon is a rum shop.

Clarke Jeilson, justice of the first district court, Worcester, and mayor of Worcester, asserted:

To permit the sale of beer by law is only a deceptive method whereby the sale of all kinds and quantities of intoxicating liquors is legalized and clothed with a kind of respectability which does not belong to that nefarious business.

To control the drink evil by banning distilled liquors and legalizing the sale of beer was tried and found as complete a failure as could be possible.

STATE CONTROL IMPOSSIBLE.

America has tried and found lamentably wanting the system suggested to-day by those who cry out for "wine and beer, but the saloon never." The State monopoly plan, which by eliminating private profit, with the corruption always associated with private ownership of places where liquor was sold, was intended to afford better control of the traffic, and was tested with thoroughness in South Carolina under the dispensary system. This system was advertised as a reduction of the entire problem to the simple terms of the State regulating itself and preventing itself from violating the law. Saloons were made impossible. All manner of safeguards were thrown around the manner of sale of liquors. The beverages were to be sold in bottles, not to be drunk on the premises, could not be sold to minors, could not be sold between sunset and sunrise, must undergo a chemical test for purity, and were to be sold only on written application of the purchaser. Gov. Benjamin R. Tillman was the conscientious advocate and defender of the system.

After one year Governor Tillman, in his message to the legislature, said of the dispensary law:

The liquor dealers have resisted its enforcement and tried to evade it by every device that cunning and greed can suggest, and they have had as active sympathizers a large proportion of the people and police of nearly all the cities and towns in the State. * * *

If it had not been for the animosities engendered by politics and the determination of political partisans to sustain the liquor dealers in every possible way, it is not likely that the tragedy which followed would have ever occurred.

The tragedy referred to was a conflict between the State constabulary and the citizens of Darlington, in which several were killed and wounded.

"The whisky rebellion," continued the governor in his message, "had broken out in full fury, and for 24 hours men held their breaths not only in this State but throughout the whole United States, for it appeared that we were on the verge of civil war."

Daniel C. Roper, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, said of this dispensary system in South Carolina:

The belief grew that the management of the dispensary had degenerated into a political and graft machine using every effort to increase sales and make profits. The result was a greater consumption of liquor, especially among the negroes and lower class of whites, than ever before.

The evils brought by the liquor traffic to the community were numerous and diverse. It is substantially accurate to say that the dilatory influence which it exercised could be measured principally by the amount of alcoholic liquor consumed, the extent of immorality and lawlessness which it promoted, and by the baneful and demoralizing influence upon politics and government which it produced. * * *

Nevertheless there is sound philosophy in the statement that the South Carolina dispensary law rendered a service to the people of the State as well as of the Nation by demonstrating as probably could not have been done in any other way the fallacy of the State monopoly method of handling the liquor question.

NO SURRENDER IN MAINE.

There is nothing new in the struggle of the wets against the law. Maine has had State prohibition for over 50 years. Again and again in county after county the liquor interests would secure the election of officials who would wink at violations of the law. Liquor would be shipped in, a fee per gallon paid by the shippers to be divided up among the officials who were in the game, and the liquor would go on sale. Public opinion would revolt and the dishonest officials would be removed, the community cleaned up again, to remain sober and decent until the same liquor-drinking and liquor-selling element once more succeeded in buying or in electing a complaisant official.

This letter, written apparently from the office of the local political committee of Lewiston, Me.—so it proclaims itself—under date of February 25, 1901, addressed to Messrs. Frank O. Dame & Co., reads thus:

Gentlemen: Our spring election comes off Monday, March 4. We are in need of funds to continue in office the present administration, which must have proved satisfactory to your line of business. Will you help us a little? Any contribution will be highly appreciated. Hoping to include your name among the list, we remain,

Yours respectfully,

CITY COMMITTEE.

Make checks payable to W. S. Keene, secretary, and mail by March 1.

The Boston wholesale liquor dealers who received this letter could hardly have misunderstood its clear significance.

In Kennebec County Sheriff Charles M. Richardson was accused by the Civic League of being unable to find his own father-in-law's liquor shop. The league found it, however, and had the sheriff's father-in-law fined $225 for maintaining a liquor nuisance. Officials sworn to enforce the law were again and again found disloyal to their State, unfaithful to their oath of office, but obedient and devoted to the corrupt liquor element in politics.

That the law could be enforced was demonstrated just recently, when Fred E. Stevens, retiring sheriff of Androscoggin County, on December 31, 1922, gave this report:

For six years the total commitments in this county for drunkenness have been 662, and the police departments of our cities have not allowed an intoxicated person to roam the streets to any extent without their being arrested and put before the court.

In 1912, the year before Stevens's first appointment, 1,044 were committed for drunkenness. In 1916, when another held the office, 818 were committed in the county for drunkenness.

Maine knows that there is no law of God nor man which the liquor crowd will not violate without compunction, but Maine has not surrendered. Maine has never hauled down its flag. Maine has never even considered repealing its oft-broken law just because liquor will not play the game, but Maine has fought, is fighting, and will fight until the disloyal, criminal, drink-selling, and drink-loving element are dead, in jail, or departed for countries where drunkenness is a virtue and not a vice.

KANSAS FIGHTS IT THROUGH.

Kansas and prohibition almost seem contemporaries. They are as twins in our thought. The thought of one recalls the other. But in Kansas, although a generation has grown to manhood without seeing a saloon in the greater part of the State, it is not long since Carrie Nation found enough saloons and enough saloon mirrors as targets for her hatchet to set Kansas and her fight against the organized law-breaking liquor element on the front page of the country's newspapers. Kansas had cleaned most of her house of these parasites, but they lingered in her great cities. By corruption, by organizing all the vice interests in the community, by presenting a united front, they fought the enforcement of the law until after a long fight, and a hard fight, the people whose voice had been heard in majority after majority successfully ousted them. Kansas did not permit her flag to be hauled down that the brewers and distillers might substitute the Jolly Roger, but continued to fight for prohibition until to-day, as Gov. Henry J. Allen said:

An attempt to repeal the prohibition laws would be voted down 10 to 1.

Kansas, according to the census longevity statement issued August 7, 1922, has the longest lived people in the country; her crime, insanity, and pauperism rates are almost the lowest in the world. Her prosperity has become proverbial.

CORRUPTION BY LIQUOR.

The history of the prohibition movement shows the liquor interests bribing public officials to wink at violations of the law, buying protection with money or political place, corrupting the electorate, and breaking whatever laws might have been adopted by the people for control of the traffic. Whether under local option or prohibition, high or low license, tavern, grocery, saloon, or dispensary system, the record is the same. There is no law the liquor element will obey but the law of self-interest.

While it has happened again and again that a local unit, a ward or a town or some division within a State which has adopted prohibition, has been dominated by the liquor forces and the law has been broken, it has never been true that the majority has surrendered to the lawless minority, repealed, weakened, or annulled the law to satisfy this minority, or even rested until the will of the majority was obeyed.

The majority of the people, seeking law and order, have in their own hands the legal means to repress the lawbreaking minority. The problem is not to compromise with lawlessness but to suppress it. Even if a compromise were offered, nothing but a complete surrender of the rights of self-government would

satisfy the liquor element, since no laws touching this traffic have ever been obeyed. Either a lawless traffic or the law itself will be destroyed.

WOULD BOYCOTT RELIGION.

No institution is respected by the liquor element. In Baltimore in this month of March the Young Men's Christian Association is threatened with boycott by the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment because this organization will not permit the liquor forces to use the association as a forum to preach nullification and to advocate the return of legalized intoxication.

In declining to grant to the A. A. P. A. the use of its meetings for liquor propaganda, the secretary of the Y. M. C. A. quoted the resolutions adopted at the international Y. M. C. A. convention at Atlantic City, which said:

That this association assert its most emphatic belief in the moral, economic, and political, as well as Christian righteousness of the cause of prohibition as enacted in the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and we call upon the entire membership of the Young Men's Christian Association to stand solidly for a complete enforcement of the prohibition laws.

The acting chairman of the antiprohibition organization, replying to this, wrote:

If, as you say, your organization is resolved to support and preach prohibition, you will, of course, want to have the fact published so that hereafter no one may contribute to or otherwise participate in the work of the Y. M. C. A. under a misapprehension as to its aims and objects.

MUST EXECUTE SENTENCE.

Neither the home, the cradle, the toil of man, the health and life of the race, the courts of justice, the temples of religion, the safety of the Republic, nothing man has loved, honored, and fought for has ever been respected by this lawless traffic. On no other terms than an unconditional surrender or a war to extermination can we meet it. Our patience, through three conturies of forbearance, has been exhausted. Not only the sobriety but the very life of America and her institutions of orderly Government depend upon the issue of this conflict. The sentence has been passed against intoxicants. That sentence must be executed with firmness and without compromise.

RELIEF WORK FOR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Chautauqua County, N. Y., has done such splendid work in looking after the claims of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war that I feel their procedure will be of interest to every Member of the House.

The members of the claims committee of the American Legion are entitled to the highest credit for their unselfish devotion to this most worthy work. The Legion renders this service to the injured service men without compensation, which includes the claim agent, who is assisted by men who have become proficient in this work, all serving without compensation. The purpose of this claims committee is to handle and assist in all claims of ex-service men in the county without charge, whether members of the American Legion or not.

It may be of interest to Legion organizations throughout the country to adopt a similar course or procedure, which, supplemented with the aid of the Members of Congress, can greatly expedite the disposition of the ex-service men's cases.

When a claim is reported and received by the claims committee of the American Legion the claimant is carefully examined to make sure that he has a just claim; that he is the party that he represents himself to be; that his discharge certificate is bona fide; that no erasures or changes have been made upon the same; and such other proof as may be of value in expediting the claim is secured. The value of this preliminary examination by members of the Legion self-trained in this work, who are in sympathy with the applicant and jealous of the good reputation of the American Legion, gives assurance that the case is bona fide at the start. When this committee has made a careful and searching examination and is satisfied in every particular that the claim is just, it assists the applicant to make out his application, sees that it is properly executed, prepares a certified copy of his discharge certificate, assists him to make a full claimant's statement, which may include obtaining the necessary affidavits from former comrades, no matter where located, and then forwards his papers to the Veterans' Bureau.

The care with which these claims are handled by the claims committee, especially the claim agent, adds materially to the character of the claims, and the thorough manner in which the facts are marshaled has proven a great factor in facilitating the work of the Veterans' Bureau.

When all the facts in a case have been assembled and filed with the Veterans' Bureau the claims committee keeps in touch with both the claimant and the bureau to make sure that no delay is incurred due to lack of information or evidence. The work of this fine organization in my district does not end here.

When a decision is rendered by the bureau which is believed to be unfair to the claimant and not in accordance with the facts and the law, then an appeal is taken and is followed through to a final conclusion.

There is another feature in connection with the work of the Legion in my county that I wish to stress. It has been my observation that the claims committee has spared no expense and trouble in an effort to help each and every worthy comrade and to cooperate in every way with the Veterans' Bureau. The organization has paid its own way, and the men have devoted long hours each day—the claim agent giving all his time gratis—in obtaining evidence and following appeals. There are many cases where it has arranged to have the applicant X-rayed, medical examinations given by outside physicians, and even observations made to be sure that the man's claim was just. The importance of an organization of this kind in his district must be apparent to every Member of the House.

I understand the work being performed by this organization has received the commendation of the highest medical authorities, and as a result of the thoroughness with which the work has been handled it has received the cooperation of the entire medical fraternity in helping to secure justice for the disabled. The work of this organization does not stop here.

It not only assists distressed comrades but extends the helping hand to their wives, widows, mothers, daughters, and children. And there is another feature of their work that has been of great value.

This organization inaugurated the idea of holding joint conferences in various localities in the country, between the Veterans' Bureau representatives, the Red Cross, ex-service men, and the claims committee. As a result the attention of many a worthy comrade has been called to this agency established for his relief. There have been a large number of tragic cases discovered by this organization—men who did not know that they were entitled to compensation, hospitalization, or vocational training.

Another feature of this organization, aside from its human aspects, which pleases me beyond measure is the fact that it has established a close cooperation between the soldier and the Government, and also between the Legion and the ex-service man.

The work of the Legion in my district has made it possible for me to look after the claims with the full assurance that I could rely upon the facts as presented without fear of doing injustice to the men or to the Government.

It is my earnest belief that if every Member will bring this matter to the attention of his local Legion it will be of great value to the soldiers in his district and greatly simplify the work of the Members here.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and myself may have permission to extend remarks in the RECORD for 10 days after Congress adjourns, to make a report on the appropriations of this Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] may have 10 days in which to file their remarks on the work of the Appropriations Committee in the Sixty-seventh Congress. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAINEY of Illinois, Mr. MCSWAIN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. HAMMER asked unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take it it is their own remarks and not an extension of magazine articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair assumes that they desire to extend their own remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection if they are their own remarks; if not, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair assumes they are their own remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the railroad question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article in the

New York World by Senator JAMES E. WATSON, of Indiana, on the work of this Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to extending remarks in the manner indicated? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The extensions of remarks referred to are here printed in full, as follows:

COMPARISON OF 1924 APPROPRIATIONS AND BUDGET ESTIMATES.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the passage by Congress of the appropriation bills at the session which has just come to a close marks the completion of legislative action on the second Budget submitted to Congress by the President under the new system. It was the most satisfactory Budget which has ever been presented to any Congress, considered both from the standpoint of the Treasury of the United States and the administration of Federal activities which will function under it. In my experience as a legislator I have never seen estimates of appropriations so free from obvious padding, so carefully squared to actual needs, or so void of proposed extravagant expansion of Government activities as these. The best test of the integrity of any Budget is reflected by the action upon it by the Representatives in Congress of the taxpaying public. The results of the action of this Congress upon the 1924 Budget and the supplemental and deficiency Budget estimates amount in the net to practical ratification of the aggregate as submitted by the President in the Budget in December and in the various supplemental and deficiency amounts as submitted by him from time to time since then.

The total of the Budget estimates submitted by the President in December, 1922, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, amounts to $3,676,606,523.19. The supplemental Budget estimates for that fiscal year submitted by him from time to time during the session aggregated $37,995,758. Of this amount the sum of $36,716,853 was submitted to provide for the fiscal year 1924 the additional compensation—$240 per annum—and the remainder, $1,278,905, constitutes the figure of actual supplemental estimates submitted subsequently to the Budget. This latter figure is an achievement in itself. In past years a flood of supplemental estimates for the new fiscal year usually followed immediately upon the submission of the Budget or Book of Estimates, and the flow continued uninterruptedly as long as there lingered any hope of having them attached to any appropriation bill. The supplemental estimates of the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress—$110,334,269.97—speak in eloquent praise of the low figure to which the supplemental estimates have been held at this session. The aggregate of the regular and supplemental estimates for the fiscal year 1924 considered by the Congress amounted to $3,714,602,281.19. Against this sum the Congress has appropriated $3,706,777,163.12. The net reduction in the Budget estimates for 1924 is therefore $7,825,118.07. At this point, however, an explanation should be entered of this net reduction. The Budget estimate for river and harbor improvements called for $27,625,760. This sum has been raised by the Congress to $56,589,910, making an increase over the Budget estimate for that purpose of $28,964,150. This increase, fortunately, has been absorbed by decreases effected in other items in the Budget. If it had not been made, the net reduction in the 1924 Budget would have been $36,789,268.07. I shall incorporate as a part of my remarks a comparison of the Budget estimates for 1924 with the appropriations that have been made for that year. (See Table II.)

The supplemental and deficiency estimates submitted to Congress from June 30, 1922, to March 4, 1923, for the fiscal year 1923—the current year—and prior fiscal years amount to $236,411,166.57. The amount of the supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year 1923 and prior years contained in the three deficiency acts under which these estimates were considered amount to $233,492,526.37. The reduction made by Congress in these estimates is $2,918,640.20. (See Table III.)

The total of reductions in the 1924 Budget estimates of $7,825,118.07, added to the foregoing reduction of $2,918,640.20, makes a combined reduction in all estimates of $10,743,758.27, or a net decrease of less than 1 per cent of the total amount requested.

The Committee on Appropriations in consideration of the regular annual appropriation bills and deficiency bills reported them to the House in the aggregate $34,690,631.67 less than the amount of the Budget estimates. The additions made to the bills by the action of the House and Senate have resulted in a decrease in this amount to the net reduction in Budget estimates heretofore stated of $10,743,758.27.

The narrowed margin between Executive request and congressional grant is ample cause for congratulation both to Congress and the Executive. It shows for the first time in many, many years that the Executive and the Congress are in substantial accord on the amount of money that the Government ought to expend in these days of stress. The decrease effected by the Congress in the first Budget, which was prepared in the first few months after the organization of the Budget Bureau, and in the deficiency estimates which were considered contemporaneously with that Budget, was approximately $312,000,000. This sum contrasted to the $10,743,758.27 reduction made in the second Budget and deficiency estimates is ample indication of the care with which the Budget was prepared.

The budget system is not perfect. In the very nature of things it can not attain perfection except through many long years of evolution. The improvement evidenced in the second year of its operation is remarkable and a source of great satisfaction to those who firmly believe in its efficacy.

COMPARISON OF 1923 AND 1924 APPROPRIATIONS.

The appropriations for the fiscal year 1924 aggregate $3,706,777,163.12. The appropriations for the fiscal year 1923, including those sums for that year carried in deficiency acts at the present session, aggregate $3,940,579,667.72. The reduction for 1924 under 1923 is $233,802,504.60. Included in the 1923 appropriations, however, is the sum of $125,000,000 of discount accruals on war-savings securities which matured in January, 1923, and which figure is not repeated in the 1924 appropriations. Deducting this sum the reduction for 1924 under 1923 is $108,802,504.60. (See Table I.)

For the information of those who desire to visualize by large groups the principal objects of appropriations for the fiscal years 1923 and 1924 in comparative array, I shall insert the following table:

General classification of appropriations for 1923 and 1924; arranged to show the principal large objects of appropriation.

	1923	1924
Interest on the public debt	$1,100,000,000.00	$950,000,000.00
Sinking fund and other funds for reduction in the principal of the public debt	330,088,800.00	345,097,000.00
Veterans' Bureau, compensation, insurance, hospitalization, and vocational training	431,398,843.45	428,160,773.00
Pensions, all wars prior to the World War	268,000,000.00	253,000,000.00
Post Office Department	573,079,833.21	584,872,991.50
Military activities of the War Department (Army)	[1] 263,338,388.52	[1] 252,150,231.00
Navy	[1] 325,297,184.16	[1] 296,586,578.00
Shipping Board	100,459,000.00	50,411,500.00
Increased compensation ($240 per annum)	38,735,173.00	35,811,893.00
Roads	35,000,000.00	32,300,000.00
All other purposes, including the Congress, the Judiciary, the executive departments, independent bureaus, and the District of Columbia	475,282,445.38	478,386,196.62
Total	3,940,579,667.72	3,706,777,163.12

[1] Include amounts under permanent and indefinite appropriations.

A new item of $90,000,000 appears in the 1924 appropriations for the first time. This sum has been granted to the United States Veterans' Bureau for the payment of losses on term insurance. The amount of insurance of this character in force is $1,850,000,000, representing 245,000 policies. The original appropriation for this purpose—$23,000,000—was made in 1917, and this sum, together with premium receipts, has been sufficient to pay the losses to the present time. From now on it will be necessary to appropriate from $90,000,000 to $120,000,000 annually to supplement premium receipts in the payment of losses. The excess of payments over receipts will average approximately $7,500,000 a month.

Another new item of considerable consequence not included in the totals of the appropriations stated herein is the amount which will be required to establish the Federal intermediate credit banks created in the closing days of the Congress to aid the agricultural and live stock industry. Each of the 12 banks is authorized to have a subscribed capital stock of $5,000,000, to be subscribed and held by the United States. While the sums needed to subscribe the capital of each bank will have to be advanced from the Treasury of the United States and will be accounted an expenditure, they are not an expenditure in the usual meaning of the term and should more properly be denominated an investment. In arriving at the estimated deficit for the fiscal year 1923, hereafter referred to, allowance has been made for withdrawals from the Treasury on this account.

The committee recommended and the Congress approved a change in the method of printing a large portion of the securities of the Government at the Bureau of Engraving and Print-

ing. Provision has been made for the purchase of 58 new power presses to replace 196 hand presses. There are in the bureau 242 power presses and 246 hand presses. A power press can produce from three to four times more work in a day than a hand press. The new law permits the full utilization of power presses and also permits the printing of faces of securities from eight-subject plates in lieu of the requirement heretofore existing that faces of notes should be printed from four-subject plates. These two changes in law will permit the full utilization of power presses and eight-subject plates in the normal operations of the bureau—a practice which was permitted and successfully conducted during the war period—and will result in a substantial economy to the Government without any deterioration in the quality of the securities. The net saving during the fiscal year 1924, after paying for the cost of purchase and installation of the new presses, will be approximately $450,000. For each subsequent year the annual saving will approximate from $800,000 to $1,000,000.

The annual appropriation heretofore made for the purchase and free distribution of garden and flower seeds by the Department of Agriculture from quota allowances to Members of Congress has been discontinued. The sum appropriated for several years past has been $360,000. The Department of Agriculture has recommended the discontinuance of the practice for several years. The acquiescence of Congress in the elimination of this item is a decided economy and eliminates an expenditure that has been the cause of much criticism and of doubtful value in the results it produced. In addition to the direct saving of $360,000, there will result savings from other appropriations, such as the transportation of the mails, which has borne the cost of distribution of the seeds, and other miscellaneous expenses connected with the distribution paid from other appropriations.

It came to the attention of the committee that the interpretation of certain provisions of the new act adjusting the pay of the military and naval forces of the Government was not uniformly considered by all branches of the service affected thereby. Ambiguity of that part of the law with reference to the granting of allowances of heat and light to officers who were granted rental allowances where no public quarters were available made it necessary for the committee to insist that such an interpretation was not within the intent of the framers of the law. Communication by the committee with all of the services concerned brought responses that the intent of Congress in this respect would be observed and the War Department appropriation act as finally approved carried a limitation removing the ambiguity from the law. If such an erroneous interpretation had been permitted to stand and officers granted allowances for heat and light in addition to their rental allowances, an unanticipated expenditure of hundreds of thousands annually would have been incurred.

The Congress has effected many small economies in the course of the preparation and passage of the appropriation bills which time and space will not permit of reiteration here. I have mentioned the foregoing items as the larger amounts and as typical examples of the character of work which Congress has done in the past and is continuing to do in the course of its functioning on the appropriation measures.

INCREASES IN BUDGET ESTIMATES.

Three large increases have been made by Congress in the Budget estimates. The amount for river and harbor improvements as contained in the Budget was $27,625,760. The Congress has increased this sum to $56,589,910, an increase of $28,964,150. Another item consists of the increase in the amount for carrying into effect the act concerning the welfare of infancy and maternity. The amount requested in the Budget was $800,000. Congress has appropriated $1,240,000, or an increase of $440,000. The third large item of increase of appropriations over Budget estimates arises in the amount for regulating immigration, which was raised from the Budget estimate of $3,000,000 to the appropriation figure of $3,300,000. I shall not comment here on the action of Congress in increasing these items. It is the prerogative of the representatives of the people to register what they believe to be the views of their constituents upon the question of expenditure of public funds as well as upon any other question. I did not favor the increase in the appropriation for rivers and harbors. I believed it to be unwarranted. A majority of both Houses of Congress, made up from both parties, supported the increase and the responsibility for their action rests with them.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS REDUCED.

The appropriations carried in deficiency acts on account of the fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years show a gratifying reduction under the amounts carried in like bills for the fiscal year 1922 and prior years. The total carried in the three deficiency acts for the fiscal year 1923 and prior years is $233,492,526.37. The comparable figure for the fiscal year 1922 and prior years carried in four deficiency acts set forth in my statement of June, 1922, is $332,760,884.55, or a reduction of $99,268,358.18. The following table gives a detailed classification of the amounts for the fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years by purposes of appropriation:

Total for 1923 and prior years		$233,492,526.37
Less Postal Service payable from postal revenues		12,108,013.58
		221,384,512.79
Veterans' Bureau—military and naval insurance		13,235,000.00
Agriculture—cooperative construction of rural post roads		25,000,000.00
Pensions—due to change from quarterly to monthly payments		16,000,000.00
Navy:		
Scrapping naval vessels	$20,950,000.00	
Increasing gun ranges	6,500,000.00	
		27,450,000.00
Treasury—refunding taxes illegally collected		121,105,000.00
Amounts to carry out new laws or treaties effective after the regular annual appropriations had been made or subsequent to the submission of the regular estimates to the Bureau of the Budget		2,595,793.87
Judgments, court awards, damage claims, and claims allowed by the general accounting office		5,842,483.08
All other amounts, the bulk of which may properly be termed "deficiencies"		10,156,235.84
Total		221,384,512.79

The items properly classed as deficiencies show a decrease from $13,137,985.49 for 1922 and prior years to $10,156,235.84 for 1923 and prior years, or a reduction of $2,981,749.65. The figures presented on deficiency appropriations are evidence of the relentless policy pursued by Congress to hold deficiencies down to a minimum. I think the Congress has achieved a record in this respect.

REFUNDING TAXES ILLEGALLY COLLECTED.

The appropriations made at this session for refunding taxes illegally collected, largely for the years 1917, 1918, and 1919, aggregate the sum of $121,105,000. While these figures by themselves seem startling, they are most satisfactory to the Government when taken in relation to the collections of back taxes. For the period covered by the fiscal years 1917 to 1922, inclusive, and for the first seven months of the fiscal year 1923 the Government collected in internal-revenue receipts $22,836,289,153.42. The amount of additional taxes collected during that period as the result of additional assessments and collections resulting from office audits and field investigations amounted to $1,606,905,243. The amount refunded to taxpayers during the period was $179,035,860.51. The amount collected from back taxes during the first eight months of the current fiscal year is approximately $300,000,000. This rate indicates that there will be collected during the entire fiscal year from this source in excess of $400,000,000.

SCRAPPING OF NAVAL VESSELS.

Another unusual item of appropriation at this session is the sum of $20,950,000 for expenses in connection with the scrapping of the seven battleships and four battle cruisers whose construction was discontinued in accordance with the provisions of the treaty emanating from the Conference on the Limitation of Naval Armament. An initial appropriation of $5,000,000 for the expenses of scrapping was made in the deficiency act approved July 1, 1922. It was estimated at that time that the total expenses of scrapping would approximate $70,000,000. The settlements made by the Navy Department with contractors thus far have been so much better than was anticipated that it is now expected the total expense will be in the neighborhood of $55,000,000, leaving a balance hereafter to be appropriated on this account of about $30,000,000. It will be of interest to the country at this time to have some idea of what saving will accrue to the Government from the scrapping of these vessels. The estimated cost of constructing the 11 ships is $436,800,000. There had been expended upon them to June 30, 1922, the sum of $155,615,000. If the vessels had not been scrapped, there would have been required to complete them the sum of $281,185,000. Deducting from this sum the estimated cost of scrapping and adding to the result a fair approximation of the value of the salvage, there will be an ultimate saving of somewhere between $240,000,000 and $250,000,000, traceable to the scrapping of the 11 vessels.

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEAR 1923.

When the fiscal year 1923 commenced the preliminary estimates of receipts and expenditures for the year indicated an estimated deficit of $822,433,231. Reductions in the estimated

expenditures for the year and increases in the estimated receipts brought the estimated deficit figures down to $273,938,712 on December 4, 1922, and still further down to $92,649,173 on January 15 last.

The estimated receipts, estimated expenditures, and estimated deficit for the fiscal year 1923, as computed on these dates, are as follows:

	July 1, 1922.	Dec. 4, 1922.	Jan. 15, 1923.
Estimated expenditures	$3,896,258,542	$3,703,801,671	$3,574,554,132
Estimated receipts	3,073,825,311	3,429,862,959	3,481,904,959
Estimated deficiency	822,433,231	273,938,712	92,649,173

Since the compilation of these figures on January 15 the large increase in the amounts required for the refunding of internal-revenue taxes illegally collected, additional expenditures for scrapping of naval vessels and elevation of guns of battleships, the enactment of the farm-credits legislation, and other unforeseen items of expenditure increase the estimated deficit as of this date to $180,000,000 for the current fiscal year. This figure, compared to the estimated deficit of $822,000,000 when the year commenced, lends encouragement to the expectation that when the year is finished even the $180,000,000 may be very materially decreased, if not disappear entirely. It must be remembered in connection with this deficit that the Government is still paying off war obligations. Included in the 1923 expenditures are $133,000,000 on account of the railroad administration; $125,000,000 on account of discount accruals of war-savings securities of 1918, which matured in January of this year; $127,000,000 on account of the refund of internal revenue taxes illegally collected—largely in the years 1917, 1918, and 1919—and many smaller items too detailed to enumerate here. If it were not for these hang-over obligations, the balance of the Government's books for the fiscal year 1923 would be on the surplus side of the ledger in a very creditable amount.

It will be interesting for the country to know at this time the decrease that has taken place in expenditures during the period which has elapsed since the armistice was signed. The expenditures for the fiscal year 1919, which was the fiscal year in which that event took place, covering the ordinary expenses of the Government and excluding public-debt retirements, were $18,514,879,955.03. The estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1924, which commences July next on a comparable basis, are $2,835,746,234.

The estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1924 are $3,361,812,359. The estimated expenditures for next year, including $345,097,000 for public-debt retirements payable from ordinary receipts, are $3,180,843,234. The estimated excess of receipts over expenditures for the year is $180,969,125.

POSTAL DEFICIT ELIMINATED.

The increase in the general postal business and the economies put into effect in the operation of the Postal Service portray a most satisfactory result. The postal deficit for the fiscal year 1921 was $81,387,387.08. For the fiscal year 1922 the deficit was reduced to $60,815,400.36. For the fiscal year 1923 the estimated postal deficit is $30,000,000. For the fiscal year 1924 it is expected that the postal revenues and expenditures will balance.

EXPEDITIOUS PASSAGE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The action of the House at the second session of this Congress—the long session—in disposing of all of the regular annual appropriation bills by April 19, and thereby establishing a new record for expeditious passage of supply bills that was five weeks earlier than the average of any previous long session for 20 years, has been maintained by the House at the present short session. The last of the regular annual bills passed the House at this session on January 19, which is more than a month earlier than the average date of passage of the last of these bills at any previous short session for more than 20 years. Five of the appropriation bills became laws during the month of January, two of them as early as January 3, and one as early as January 5, an incident previously unknown at a short session of Congress. All of the regular annual bills became laws before the 3d of March. The usual date of approval of a large number of the appropriation bills at short sessions of Congress has been March 4. The early disposition of the appropriation bills has made possible the consideration of a vast amount of legislative business in the last month of the session, which otherwise could not have been taken up. I shall insert at this point the dates of passage by House of the last of the regular annual supply bills at the short sessions of this and 11 previous Congresses:

Dates of passage by the House of the last of the regular annual supply bills at the short sessions of the last 12 Congresses;
Fifty-sixth, February 20.
Fifty-seventh, February 20.
Fifty-eighth, February 27.
Fifty-ninth, February 23.
Sixtieth, February 26.
Sixty-first, February 25.
Sixty-second, February 26.
Sixty-third, February 23.
Sixty-fourth, March 2.
Sixty-fifth, February 28.
Sixty-sixth, February 17.
Sixty-seventh, January 19.
No note is taken in the foregoing dates of the failure of any of the bills in the Senate or a presidential veto requiring their repassage at a subsequent date.

THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Committee on Appropriations in order to expedite the work of the House during the past session began its labors soon after the November elections. Five of its subcommittees were at work by the middle of November, and bills were ready for presentation to the House when it convened in December. Six of the regular supply bills had been presented to the House before the holidays, four of these had been passed by the House before that time, and the consideration of two others had been completed in Committee of the Whole with a final vote on them pending after New Year's Day. The committee gave more than the usual consideration to supply bills at a short session of Congress. It compelled justification of each request and in its search for information took 7,000 printed pages of testimony in the preparation of the 11 regular annual bills and three deficiency measures. The results which the committee has attained could only be reached by the utmost industry and sacrifice on the part of its membership and the splendid manner in which the House has received the reports it has presented. I wish here to record my thanks to all who have contributed so generously to the success of the work.

I shall append herewith as a part of my remarks five tables, which are interesting and illuminating to those who may care to study them. They cover every phase of the work of the past session with respect to estimates and appropriations:

TABLE I.—*Comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1923 and 1924.*

[Amounts carried for each of these years in regular annual appropriation acts, deficiency appropriation acts, special acts, and amounts estimated under permanent and indefinite appropriations.]

Department or establishment.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1923.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1924.	Decrease (−) or increase (+) 1924 compared with 1923.
Legislative branch:			
Regular annual	$13,122,664.30	$12,715,971.60	−$406,692.70
Increased compensation	1,694,356.00	1,705,140.00	+10,784.00
Permanent and indefinite	800.00	800.00	.....
Total	14,817,820.30	14,421,911.60	−395,908.70

TABLE I.—*Comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1923 and 1924*—Continued.

Department or establishment.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1923.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1924.	Decrease (−) or increase (+) 1924 compared with 1923.
Executive office and independent offices:			
Regular annual—			
Shipping Board	$100,459,000.00	$50,411,500.00	−$50,047,500.00
Veterans' Bureau	431,298,843.45	428,160,773.00	−3,138,070.45
Executive and other independent offices	21,021,403.93	18,062,098.00	−2,959,305.93
Increased compensation	5,527,342.00	4,916,192.00	−611,150.00
Total	558,306,589.38	501,550,563.00	−56,756,026.38
Permanent and indefinite	6,017,000.00	6,511,495.74	+494,495.74
Total	564,323,589.38	508,062,058.74	−56,261,530.64
Agricultural Department:			
Regular annual—			
Department proper	37,524,153.00	37,236,653.00	−287,500.00
Increased compensation	3,232,863.00	3,304,800.00	+71,937.00
Roads, construction of	35,000,000.00	32,300,000.00	−2,700,000.00
Permanent and indefinite	12,250,000.00	12,220,000.00	−30,000.00
Total	88,007,016.00	85,061,453.00	−2,945,563.00
Commerce, Department of:			
Regular annual	19,509,335.36	19,377,045.00	−132,290.36
Increased compensation	1,835,159.00	1,958,956.00	+123,797.00
Permanent and indefinite	3,000.00	3,000.00	
Total	21,347,494.36	21,339,001.00	−8,493.36
Interior, Department of:			
Regular annual—			
Pensions	[a] 270,423,206.67	254,774,660.00	−15,648,546.67
Interior Department proper	43,639,960.62	39,900,040.00	−3,739,920.62
Increased compensation	2,803,092.00	2,845,309.00	+42,217.00
Permanent and indefinite	27,499,000.00	28,349,500.00	+850,500.00
Total	344,365,259.29	325,869,509.00	−18,495,750.29
Justice, Department of, and judiciary:			
Regular annual	21,813,780.78	18,421,056.00	−3,392,724.78
Increased compensation	775,884.00	875,000.00	+99,116.00
Total	22,589,664.78	19,296,056.00	−3,293,608.78
Labor, Department of:			
Regular annual	6,923,476.11	6,918,556.00	−4,920.11
Increased compensation	566,832.00	566,640.00	−192.00
Permanent and indefinite		25,000.00	+25,000.00
Total	7,490,308.11	7,510,196.00	+19,887.89
Navy, Department of:			
Regular annual	[b] 321,863,512.16	294,456,528.00	−27,406,984.16
Increased compensation	537,120.00	510,672.00	−26,448.00
Permanent and indefinite	3,433,672.00	2,130,050.00	−1,303,622.00
Total	325,834,304.16	297,097,250.00	−28,737,054.16
Post Office Department:			
Payable from the postal revenues—			
Regular annual	573,079,833.21	584,872,991.50	+11,793,158.29
Increased compensation	352,800.00	337,248.00	−15,552.00
Payable from other Federal revenues—			
Increased compensation	12,000.00	11,520.00	−480.00
Total	573,444,633.21	585,221,759.50	+11,777,126.29
State Department:			
Regular annual	10,875,710.95	15,066,665.50	+4,190,954.55
Increased compensation	144,000.00	134,000.00	−10,000.00
Permanent and indefinite	106,000.00	106,000.00	
Total	11,125,710.95	15,306,665.50	+4,180,954.55

[a] Includes $16,000,000 on account of the change from quarterly to monthly payments of pensions.

[b] Includes $20,950,000 for scrapping of naval vessels in conformity with the provisions of the treaty limiting naval armament, and also includes $6,500,000 for increasing the range of the turret guns of certain battleships.

TABLE I.—*Comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1923 and 1924*—Continued.

Department or establishment.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1923.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1924.	Decrease (−) or increase (+) 1924 compared with 1923.
Treasury Department:			
Regular annual	$119,929,941.65	$115,410,510.37	−$4,519,431.28
Increased compensation	10,724,326.00	10,749,292.00	+24,966.00
Permanent and indefinite—			
Interest on public debt	[a]1,100,000,000.00	950,000,000.00	−150,000,000.00
Public debt redemption funds	330,088,800.00	345,097,000.00	+15,008,200.00
All other	31,058,110.63	31,055,093.41	−3,017.22
Total	1,591,801,178.28	1,452,311,895.78	−139,489,282.50
War Department:			
Military—			
Regular annual	262,088,388.52	251,250,231.00	−10,838,157.52
Permanent and indefinite	1,250,000.00	900,000.00	−350,000.00
Total, military	263,338,388.52	252,150,231.00	−11,188,157.52
Nonmilitary—			
Regular annual	69,824,523.00	85,096,973.00	+15,272,450.00
Permanent and indefinite	6,521,300.00	5,843,321.00	−677,979.00
Total, nonmilitary	76,345,823.00	90,940,294.00	+14,594,471.00
Total, War Department—			
Regular annual	331,912,911.52	336,347,204.00	+4,434,292.48
Increased compensation	8,831,958.00	6,102,057.00	−2,729,901.00
Permanent and indefinite	7,771,300.00	6,743,321.00	−1,027,979.00
Total	348,516,169.52	349,192,582.00	+676,412.48
District of Columbia:			
Regular annual	23,365,684.47	22,778,915.00	−586,769.47
Increased compensation	1,697,441.00	1,795,067.00	+97,626.00
Permanent and indefinite	1,624,600.00	1,512,843.00	−111,757.00
Total	26,687,725.47	26,086,825.00	−600,900.47
Miscellaneous (unclassified)	228,793.91	.....	−228,793.91
Grand total:			
Regular annual	2,381,763,418.18	2,287,211,166.97	−94,552,251.21
Increased compensation	38,735,173.00	35,811,893.00	−2,923,280.00
Permanent and indefinite	1,519,852,282.63	1,383,754,103.15	−136,098,179.48
Miscellaneous (unclassified)	228,793.91	.....	−228,793.91
Grand total	3,940,579,667.72	3,706,777,163.12	−233,802,504.60
Less sum payable from postal revenues	573,432,633.21	585,210,239.50	+11,777,606.29
Total, exclusive of sum payable from postal revenues	3,367,147,034.51	3,121,566,923.62	−245,580,110.89

[a] Includes $125,000,000 for discount accruals on war savings securities due Jan. 1, 1923.

MARCH 14, 1923.

TABLE II.—*Comparison of Budget estimates and appropriations, fiscal year 1924.*

[The appropriations for 1924 include amounts carried for fiscal year 1924 in regular annual appropriation acts, deficiency appropriation acts, special acts, and amounts estimated under permanent and indefinite appropriations.]

Department or establishment.	Budget estimates submitted Dec. 4, 1922.	Supplemental Budget estimates submitted Dec. 4, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923.	Total Budget estimates, fiscal year 1924.	Appropriations, 1924, regular annual and permanent and indefinite.	Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriations compared with estimates.
Legislative branch:					
Regular annual	$12,706,856.60	$960,655.00	$13,667,511.60	$12,715,971.60	−$951,540.00
Increased compensation	1,711,256.00	.....	1,711,256.00	1,705,140.00	−6,116.00
Permanent and indefinite	800.00	.....	800.00	800.00	.....
Total	14,418,912.60	960,655.00	15,379,567.60	14,421,911.60	−957,656.00

TABLE II.—*Comparison of Budget estimates and appropriations, fiscal year 1924*—Continued.

Department or establishment.	Budget estimates submitted Dec. 4, 1922.	Supplemental Budget estimates submitted Dec. 4, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923.	Total Budget estimates, fiscal year 1924.	Appropriations, 1924, regular annual and permanent and indefinite.	Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriations compared with estimates.
Executive Office and independent offices:					
Regular annual—					
Shipping Board	$50,411,500.00	.....	$50,411,500.00	$50,411,500.00	.....
Veterans' Bureau	440,313,000.00	.....	440,313,000.00	428,160,773.00	−$12,152,227.00
Executive and other independent offices	17,616,513.00	$58,350.00	17,674,863.00	18,062,098.00	+387,235.00
Increased compensation	.....	4,911,912.00	4,911,912.00	4,916,192.00	+4,280.00
Total	508,341,013.00	4,970,262.00	513,311,275.00	501,550,563.00	−11,760,712.00
Permanent and indefinite	6,511,495.74	.....	6,511,495.74	6,511,495.74	.....
Total	514,852,508.74	4,970,262.00	519,822,770.74	508,062,058.74	−11,760,712.00
Agricultural Department:					
Regular annual—					
Department proper	36,031,613.00	.....	36,031,613.00	37,236,653.00	+1,205,040.00
Increased compensation	.....	3,341,800.00	3,341,800.00	3,304,800.00	−37,000.00
Roads, construction of	33,000,000.00	.....	33,000,000.00	32,300,000.00	−700,000.00
Permanent and indefinite	12,220,000.00	.....	12,220,000.00	12,220,000.00	.....
Total	81,251,613.00	3,341,800.00	84,593,413.00	85,061,453.00	+468,040.00
Commerce, Department of:					
Regular annual	19,712,535.00	7,500.00	19,720,035.00	19,377,045.00	−342,990.00
Increased compensation	.....	1,958,956.00	1,958,956.00	1,958,956.00	.....
Permanent and indefinite	3,000.00	.....	3,000.00	3,000.00	.....
Total	19,715,535.00	1,966,456.00	21,681,991.00	21,339,001.00	−342,990.00
Interior, Department of:					
Regular annual—					
Pensions	255,082,060.00	.....	255,082,060.00	254,774,660.00	−307,400.00
Interior Department proper	41,276,192.00	.....	[a] 40,276,192.00	39,900,040.00	−376,152.00
Increased compensation	.....	2,918,309.00	2,918,309.00	2,845,309.00	−73,000.00
Permanent and indefinite	28,349,500.00	.....	28,349,500.00	28,349,500.00	.....
Total	323,707,752.00	2,918,309.00	326,626,061.00	325,869,509.00	−756,552.00
Justice, Department of, and judiciary:					
Regular annual	18,751,056.00	600.00	18,751,656.00	18,421,056.00	−330,600.00
Increased compensation	.....	827,000.00	827,000.00	875,000.00	+48,000.00
Total	18,751,056.00	827,600.00	19,578,656.00	19,296,056.00	−282,600.00
Labor, Department of:					
Regular annual	6,178,556.00	.....	6,178,556.00	6,918,556.00	+740,000.00
Increased compensation	.....	566,640.00	566,640.00	566,640.00	.....
Permanent and indefinite	25,000.00	.....	25,000.00	25,000.00	.....
Total	6,203,556.00	566,640.00	6,770,196.00	7,510,196.00	+740,000.00
Navy, Department of:					
Regular annual	291,803,975.00	.....	294,803,975.00	294,456,528.00	−347,447.00
Increased compensation	.....	510,672.00	510,672.00	510,672.00	.....
Permanent and indefinite	2,130,050.00	.....	2,130,050.00	2,130,050.00	.....
Total	296,934,025.00	510,672.00	297,444,697.00	297,097,250.00	−347,447.00
Post Office Department:					
Payable from the postal revenues—					
Regular annual	590,166,191.50	.....	590,166,191.50	584,872,991.50	−5,293,200.00
Increased compensation	.....	337,248.00	337,248.00	337,248.00	.....
Payable from other Federal revenues—					
Increased compensation	.....	11,520.00	11,520.00	11,520.00	.....
Total	590,166,191.50	348,768.00	590,514,959.50	585,221,759.50	−5,293,200.00

[a] This sum is $7,500,000 more than the amount stated in the Budget. The difference arises under the Reclamation Service. The Budget does not include in the 1924 totals the amount for that service estimated to be funded from repayments to the reclamation fund ($7,500,000). As previous estimates and appropriations are computed on the basis of including such funding from repayments, it is confusing not to add that sum to the total for 1924, otherwise the Reclamation Service will show apparent reductions for 1924 under 1923 and prior years that are not actual.

TABLE II.—*Comparison of Budget estimates and appropriations, fiscal year 1924*—Continued.

Department or establishment.	Budget estimates submitted Dec. 4, 1922.	Supplemental Budget estimates submitted Dec. 4, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923.	Total Budget estimates, fiscal year 1924.	Appropriations, 1924, regular annual and permanent and indefinite.	Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriations compared with estimates.
State Department:					
Regular annual	$14,952,237.79	$231,800.00	$15,184,037.79	$15,066,665.50	−$117,372.29
Increased compensation	.....	134,000.00	134,000.00	134,000.00	.....
Permanent and indefinite	106,000.00	.....	106,000.00	106,000.00	.....
Total	15,058,237.79	365,800.00	15,424,037.79	15,306,665.50	−117,372.29
Treasury Department:					
Regular annual	117,833,768.87	.....	117,833,768.87	115,410,510.37	−2,423,258.50
Increased compensation	.....	10,789,292.00	10,789,292.00	10,749,292.00	−40,000.00
Permanent and indefinite—					
Interest on public debt	950,000,000.00	.....	950,000,000.00	950,000,000.00	.....
Public debt redemption funds	345,097,000.00	.....	345,097,000.00	345,097,000.00	.....
All other	31,055,093.41	.....	31,055,093.41	31,055,093.41	.....
Total	1,443,985,862.28	10,789,292.00	1,454,775,154.28	1,452,311,895.78	−2,463,258.50
War Department:					
Military—					
Regular annual	263,384,200.00	.....	263,384,200.00	251,250,231.00	−12,133,969.00
Permanent and indefinite	900,000.00	.....	900,000.00	900,000.00	.....
Total, military	264,284,200.00	.....	264,284,200.00	252,150,231.00	−12,133,969.00
Nonmilitary—					
Regular annual	56,389,779.28	.....	56,389,779.28	[a] 85,096,973.00	+28,707,193.72
Permanent and indefinite	5,843,321.00	.....	5,843,321.00	5,843,321.00	.....
Total, nonmilitary	62,233,100.28	.....	62,233,100.28	90,940,294.00	+28,707,193.72
Total, War Department—					
Regular annual	319,773,979.28	.....	319,773,979.28	336,347,204.00	+16,573,224.72
Increased compensation	.....	8,599,437.00	8,599,437.00	6,102,057.00	−2,497,380.00
Permanent and indefinite	6,743,321.00	.....	6,743,321.00	6,743,321.00	.....
Total	326,517,300.28	8,599,437.00	335,116,737.28	349,192,582.00	+14,075,844.72
District of Columbia:					
Regular annual	23,531,130.00	20,000.00	23,551,130.00	22,778,915.00	−772,215.00
Increased compensation	.....	1,810,067.00	1,810,067.00	1,795,067.00	−15,000.00
Permanent and indefinite	1,512,843.00	.....	1,512,843.00	1,512,843.00	.....
Total	25,043,973.00	1,830,067.00	26,874,040.00	26,086,825.00	−787,215.00
Grand total:					
Regular annual	2,291,141,164.04	1,278,905.00	2,292,420,069.04	2,287,211,166.97	−5,208,902.07
Permanent and indefinite	1,383,754,103.15	.....	1,383,754,103.15	1,383,754,103.15	.....
Increased compensation	1,711,256.00	36,716,853.00	38,428,109.00	35,811,893.00	−2,616,216.00
Grand total	3,676,606,523.19	37,995,758.00	3,714,602,281.19	3,706,777,163.12	−7,825,118.07
Less Post Office (payable from postal revenues)	590,166,191.50	337,248.00	590,503,439.50	585,210,239.50	−5,293,200.00
Total, exclusive of Post Office	3,086,440,331.69	37,658,510.00	3,124,098,841.69	3,121,566,923.62	−2,531,918.07

[a] Includes $28,964,150 in excess of the Budget estimates for rivers and harbors.

MARCH 14, 1923.

TABLE III.—*Comparison of Budget estimates and appropriations, deficiency and supplemental, fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years.*

[Amounts considered and appropriated in deficiency appropriation acts approved Sept. 22, 1922, Jan. 22, 1923, and Mar. 4, 1923.]

Department or establishment.	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years, submitted from July 9, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923.	Deficiency and supplemental appropriations, fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years, made from July 9, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923.	Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriations compared with estimates.
Legislative	$341,572.72	$360,516.32	+$18,943.60
Executive and independent offices	14,954,819.65	14,992,437.65	+37,618.00

TABLE III.—*Comparison of Budget estimates and appropriations, deficiency and supplemental, fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years*—Continued

Department or establishment.	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years, submitted from July 9, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923.	Deficiency and supplemental appropriations, fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years, made from July 9, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923.	Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriations compared with estimates.
Agriculture	$25,652,608.06	$25,597,608.06	−$55,000.00
Commerce	774,528.74	768,903.74	−5,625.00
Interior	17,794,334.59	17,632,805.84	−161,528.75
Justice	4,804,332.57	4,541,408.04	−262,924.53
Labor	8,761.44	7,601.86	−1,159.58
Navy	28,181,476.71	28,181,476.71	.....
Post Office	14,102,113.58	12,108,013.58	−1,994,100.00
State	429,351.34	589,361.03	+160,009.69
Treasury	122,683,887.04	122,338,382.09	−345,504.95
War	6,073,895.40	5,834,700.23	−239,195.17
District of Columbia	609,484.73	539,311.22	−70,173.51
Total	236,411,166.57	233,492,526.37	−2,918,640.20

MARCH 14, 1923.

TABLE IV.—*Recapitulation of comparisons of Budget estimates and appropriations.*

Net reduction in Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1924 (as per Table II)	$7,825,118.07
Reduction in Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1923 and prior fiscal years (as per Table III)	2,918,640.02
Total net reduction	10,743,758.27

MARCH 14, 1923.

TABLE V.—*Chronological history of regular annual and deficiency appropriation bills, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session (July 9 to Sept. 22, 1922), third session (Nov. 20 to Dec. 4, 1922), and fourth session (Dec. 4, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923).*

Title of the acts.	Reported to the House.		Passed the House.		Reported to the Senate.		Passed the Senate.		Law.	
	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.
REGULAR ANNUAL BILLS.										
Agricultural Department	1922. Dec. 18	$68,781,553.00	1923. Jan. 3	$69,068,053.00	1923. Jan. 6	$72,901,653.00	1923. Jan. 13	$73,741,653.00	1923. Feb. 26	$69,536,653.00
Commerce and Labor Departments	Dec. 11	25,779,101.00	1922. Dec. 13	26,079,101.00	1922. Dec. 14	25,979,601.00	1922. Dec. 15	26,346,101.00	Jan. 5	26,295,601.00
District of Columbia	1923. Jan. 4	22,624,895.00	1923. Jan. 8	22,078,607.00	1923. Jan. 20	22,244,483.00	1923. Jan. 25	24,469,985.00	Feb. 28	22,778,915.00
Independent offices	Jan. 6	496,235,771.00	Jan. 12	496,235,771.00	Jan. 16	497,711,371.00	Jan. 22	498,333,556.00	Feb. 13	496,634,371.00
Interior Department	1922. Dec. 22	294,264,700.00	Jan. 3	294,346,400.00	Jan. 5	294,709,400.00	Jan. 5	294,757,400.00	Jan. 24	294,674,700.00
Legislative establishment	1923. Jan. 19	12,603,376.60	Jan. 22	12,601,326.60	Jan. 23	12,703,931.60	Jan. 25	12,706,071.60	Feb. 20	12,706,071.60
Navy Department	1922. Dec. 13	293,806,538.00	1922. Dec. 18	293,806,538.00	1922. Dec. 21	295,604,378.00	1922. Dec. 30	295,604,378.00	Jan. 22	294,456,528.00
Post Office Department	Dec. 28	584,614,191.50	1923. Jan. 3	584,614,191.50	1923. Jan. 11	585,064,191.50	1923. Jan. 13	585,222,991.50	Feb. 14	584,872,991.50
State and Justice Departments	Dec. 7	33,188,151.50	1922. Dec. 12	33,185,051.50	1922. Dec. 13	33,471,008.00	1922. Dec. 14	33,488,708.00	Jan. 3	33,250,421.50
Treasury Department	Dec. 6	115,119,810.37	Dec. 9	115,112,310.37	Dec. 12	115,533,410.37	Dec. 12	115,538,190.37	...do....	115,386,510.37
War Department	1923. Jan. 12	314,064,294.00	1923. Jan. 19	333,654,204.00	1923. Jan. 29	340,341,396.28	1923. Feb. 9	340,443,896.28	Mar. 2	336,347,204.00
Total, regular annual bills	.....	2,261,082,381.97	.....	2,280,781,553.97	.....	2,296,264,825.75	.....	2,300,652,930.75	.....	2,286,939,966.97
DEFICIENCY BILLS.										
First, 1923	1922. Sept. 18	560,688.08	1922. Sept. 19	560,688.08	1922. Sept. 21	2,346,642.15	1922. Sept. 22	2,831,742.15	1922. Sept. 22	2,454,210.09
Second, 1923	Dec. 30	74,645,674.06	1923. Jan. 4	74,690,174.06	1923. Jan. 6	74,925,009.14	1923. Jan. 8	75,025,201.31	1923. Jan. 22	74,925,774.14
Third, 1923	1923. Feb. 22	153,804,843.68	Feb. 26	154,582,240.35	Feb. 28	156,780,772.45	Mar. 1	156,835,086.46	Mar. 4	156,359,742.14
Total, deficiency bills	.....	229,011,205.82	.....	229,833,102.49	.....	234,052,423.74	.....	234,692,029.92	.....	233,739,726.37
Total, regular and deficiency bills	.....	2,490,093,587.79	.....	2,510,614,656.46	.....	2,530,317,249.49	.....	2,535,344,960.67	.....	2,520,679,693.34

MARCH 14, 1923.

TABLE VI.—*Recapitulation of appropriations by acts and irrespective of fiscal years.*

[Sixty-seventh Congress, second session (July 9 to Sept. 22, 1922, inclusive), third session (Nov. 20 to Dec. 4, 1922), and fourth session (Dec. 4, 1922, to Mar. 4, 1923).]

Title of acts.		Appropriations.	Contracts to be met by futnre appropriations.	Total.
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS, FISCAL YEAR 1924.				
Agriculture		$69,536,653.00	$39,200,000.00	$108,736,653.00
Commerce and Labor:				
Commerce	$19,377,045.00			
Labor	6,918,556.00			
		26,295,601.00		26,295,601.00
District of Columbia		22,778,915.00	2,175,000.00	24,953,915.00
Executive and independent offices		496,634,371.00		496,634,371.00
Interior		294,674,700.00	157,500.00	294,832,200.00
Legislative		12,706,071.60		12,706,071.60
Navy		294,456,528.00		294,456,528.00
Post Office		584,872,991.50		584,872,991.50
State and Justice:				
State	$14,829,365.50			
Justice	18,421,056.00			
		33,250,421.50		33,250,421.50
Treasury		115,386,510.37		115,386,510.37
War:				
Military activities	$251,250,231.00			
Nonmilitary activities	85,096,973.00			
		336,347,204.00	12,588,700.00	348,935,904.00
Total, regular annual acts		2,286,939,966.97	54,121,200.00	2,341,061,166.97
DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACTS.				
First deficiency, fiscal year 1923		2,454,210.09		2,454,210.09
Second deficiency, fiscal year 1923		74,925,774.14	25,000,000.00	99,925,774.14
Third deficiency, fiscal year 1923		156,359,742.14	1,245,000.00	157,604,742.14
Total, deficiency acts		233,739,726.37	26,245,000.00	259,984,726.37
MISCELLANEOUS ACTS CARRYING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1923 AND 1924.				
Increased compensation act, fiscal year 1924		35,811,893.00		35,811,893.00
Federal Farm Loan Bureau, salaries, fiscal year 1924		24,000.00		24,000.00
Miscellaneous relief and other acts		314,141.99		314,141.99
Total, miscellaneous acts		36,150,034.99		36,150,034.99
Total, regular, deficiency, and miscellaneous acts		2,556,829,728.33	80,366,200.00	2,637,195,928.33
PERMANENTS AND INDEFINITES, FISCAL YEAR 1924.				
Agriculture		12,220,000.00		12,220,000.00
Commerce		3,000.00		3,000.00
Independent offices		6,511,495.74		6,511,495.74
Interior		28,349,500.00		28,349,500.00
Labor		25,000.00		25,000.00
Legislative		800.00		800.00
Navy		2,130,050.00		2,130,050.00
State		106,000.00		106,000.00
Treasury:				
Interest on the public debt	$950,000,000.00			
Sinking fund and other public debt retirement funds	345,097,000.00			
Ordinary permanents and indefinites	31,055,093.41			
		1,326,152,093.41		1,326,152,093.41
War:				
Military activities	900,000.00			
Nonmilitary activities	5,843,321.00			
		6,743,321.00		6,743,321.00
District of Columbia		1,512,843.00		1,512,843.00
Total, permanents and indefinites		1,383,754,103.15		1,383,754,103.15
Grand total		3,940,583,831.48	80,366,200.00	4,020,950,031.48

Classification of foregoing appropriations by fiscal years.

Fiscal year 1924	$3,706,777,163.12
Fiscal year 1923	103,075,958.58
Fiscal year 1922 and prior fiscal years	130,730,709.78
Total	3,940,583,831.48

MARCH 14, 1923.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 1924, for which appropriations have been made by the last session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, is the fifth year since the war came to an end. Liquidation of the war's heavy liabilities has been steadily going on during the past four years, and the Government should now be on a basis of peace-time expenditures. A heavy-burdened taxpaying people rightfully expect heavy reductions from the large expenditures made necessary by the war during the preceding years. As I have said many times, the only true test by which it can be determined whether Congress has reduced appropriations and been really economical is by a comparison of its appropriations with those made in previous years for similar purposes. This test can be applied to the appropriations carried in the regular annual supply bills for the fiscal year 1924 by comparing them with the appropriations carried in the regular annual supply bills for the fiscal year 1923.

The following table shows appropriations made for the two fiscal years named:

Department or establishment.	Appropriations for 1923 regular annual supply bills.	Appropriations for 1924 regular annual supply bills.
Legislative (Congress)	$12,788,324.95	$13,122,664.30
Executive office and independent offices	536,638,771.45	496,634,371.00
State Department	10,443,488.16	15,066,665.50
Treasury Department	118,835,308.81	115,410,510.37
War Department	325,164,492.67	336,347,204.00
Navy Department	294,336,577.00	294,456,528.00
Interior Department	297,565,108.67	294,670,700.00
Post Office Department	565,064,786.50	584,872,901.50
Agricultural Department (exclusive of road construction)	36,929,173.00	38,236,653.00
Commerce Department	18,743,245.00	19,377,045.00
Labor Department	6,916,920.00	6,918,556.00
Department of Justice	17,851,221.00	18,421,056.00
District of Columbia	22,841,609.80	22,778,915.00
Increased compensation	38,735,173.20	35,811,893.00
Grand total	2,302,854,200.01	2,292,125,662.67

It will be observed that the aggregate amount directly appropriated in these supply bills for 1924, exclusive of permanent and indefinite appropriations, is $2,292,125,662.67, and that the amount carried in the same bills for 1923 was $2,302,854,200.01. This shows on its face a reduction of only $10,728,537.34, or less than one-half of 1 per cent, notwithstanding the fact that we are one year further removed from the war. It should be stated, however, that certain of the bills for 1924 make reappropriations of unexpended balances, and these sums do not appear in the figures above given. For example, $35,000,000 was reappropriated for construction of ships by the Navy; $450,000 for the Ordnance Department of the Navy; $500,000 for military training camps; $800,000 for settlement of claims of foreign governments and their nationals; and $75,000 out of proceeds of sale of materials of the Alaska railroad. In addition, there was appropriated by miscellaneous relief and other acts $314,141.99 and $24,000 for additional salaries for the Farm Loan Bureau. These sums total $37,163,141.99, and when added to the sums directly carried in the regular supply bills for 1924 it will be found that the appropriations are $26,434,604.65 more than for 1923. It may be stated here that the entire appropriations for Government operations for the year 1916, the last full fiscal year preceding the war, were $1,115,004,194.55, which includes permanent, indefinite, and deficiency appropriations for that year. It must be borne in mind that the figures just given for the years 1923 and 1924 do not include permanent and indefinite appropriations, which amount to nearly one billion and a half dollars, nor do they include deficiency appropriations. When these are considered, it will be found that the appropriations for 1924 are more than three and one half times greater than the entire running expenses of the Government for the year 1916.

The total appropriations, including regular annual, increased compensation, permanent, and indefinite, for 1924 amount to $3,706,777,163.12, to which the reappropriations of $37,163,141.99 should be added, making $3,743,940,305.11. The appropriations for 1923, including $233,739,726.37 appropriated for deficiencies during the year, were $3,940,579,667.72. It has always been necessary to make appropriations to supply deficiencies during the fiscal year, and if we assume, as we are warranted in doing, that the deficiencies for 1924 will require as large appropriations as were made for 1923, the entire appropriations for 1924 will amount to $3,977,680,031.48, or $37,100,363.76 more than for 1923. Attention should be called to the fact that the appropriations made for 1923 include as a part of the interest on the public debt $125,000,000, which was necessary to take care of accrued interest for previous years on war-savings stamps and which is not a legitimate charge against the 1923 appropriations. This sum should, therefore, not be taken into consideration in a comparison of the appropriations for the two years, and for the purposes of such comparison it should be deducted from the 1923 appropriations. In addition to this the sum of $50,000,000 was appropriated in 1923 to settle claims arising out of the war against the Shipping Board. No appropriation for this purpose was needed for the year 1924. It should, therefore, also be deducted for the purposes of comparison. The sum of $16,000,000 additional was required for pensions in 1923 on account of changing from quarterly to monthly payments. The change having been established, such sum was not needed for the year 1924, and should, therefore, also be deducted from the 1923 appropriations for the purposes of comparison. These sums total $191,000,000. If we assume, as we are justified in doing, that the deficiencies for 1924 will be as large as they were for 1923, it will be seen that the appropriations for 1924 will exceed those for 1923 by $190,937,221.77, and if reappropriations are included by $228,100,363.76.

Comment is unnecessary. The figures speak for themselves. They are startling in view of the oft-repeated declarations of the administration that there have been great reductions and economies in Government expenditures. There will be appended at the end of this statement a table showing the appropriations for 1923 and 1924, but I wish to again emphasize the fact that the figures for 1923 include deficiencies appropriated during the year amounting to $233,739,726.37.

By recent act of Congress the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized and directed to subscribe for stock in the Federal intermediate credit banks to the extent of $60,000,000. The amount subscribed will be withdrawn from the Treasury during the fiscal year 1924 and must be added to the appropriations for that year.

In addition to the appropriation made, the last session of Congress authorized contracts to be made amounting to $80,366,200, and which must be met by future appropriations from the Treasury. There has been a repression of public works during the past few years on account of business depression and other causes, but it is quite evident that this work will be resumed in the near future, and this will result in still further charges on the Treasury. On December 30, 1922, and February 8, 1923, the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to Congress recommendations for an extensive Federal building program throughout the United States which it is estimated will cost $96,136,000; and on February 20, 1923, the Secretary of the Treasury recommended the rehabilitation of existing facilities for the marine hospital and quarantine station services at a number of places throughout the country, to cost $8,786,500—a total of $104,922,500. These recommendations will come up for consideration at the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, and whatever authorizations are made must be charged to the appropriations and commitments for 1924.

NUMBER OF CLASSIFIED AND UNCLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES.

In the last few days the newspapers have carried a statement purporting to have been issued from the White House that the employees of the United States have been reduced by 98,792 in the last two years. This number evidently includes common laborers who were employed in the shipyards, arsenals, and other work of the United States. A statement of the Civil Service Commission shows no such reduction in the number of classified and unclassified employees. The report of the commission indicates that on July 1, 1921, the number of such employees was 597,483, and on July 1, 1922, 560,863, a reduction of less than 37,000 during the entire year. On January 1, 1923, there were 542,513, which shows a reduction of slightly more than 18,000 during the preceding six months. On June 30, 1916, there were 438,057 employees throughout the United States. There are nearly 24 per cent more of such employees in the United States at the present time than there were before the war. The number of those employed in the departments in the city of Washington makes an even worse showing in so far as reduction and economy is concerned. In other words, on December 31, 1922, there were 67,320 employees in the District of Columbia, as compared with 39,442 on June 30, 1916, an increase of over 70 per cent.

CONDITION OF TREASURY JUNE 30, 1924.

In his annual report, dated November 20, 1922, the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that the receipts for 1924 will be $3,361,812,350, exclusive of postal revenues. The postal revenues for 1924 are estimated at $585,605,501. This makes the total receipts for 1924, as estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury,

$3,947,417,851. It has been shown that the total appropriations and reappropriations for 1924 are $3,977,680,031.48, assuming that the deficiencies during 1924 will equal but not exceed those of 1923. This indicates a deficit on June 30, 1924, of $30,262,180.48, unless the receipts for the year are greater than was anticipated by the Secretary of the Treasury or unless greater saving and economy is practiced, thereby reducing the expenditures below the appropriations.

The Secretary has included as a part of the estimated receipts capital assets amounting to $317,288,280, which should be applied to the reduction of the national debt, rather than to the payment of current operations and expenses of the Government. These capital assets will soon be exhausted and this is not placing the Government on a "pay-as-you-go" basis, as the people were assured would be done. The capital assets referred to are as follows:

Farm-loan bonds, principal and interest	$28,909,825
Foreign loans, principal repayments	31,225,000
Foreign loans, interest	222,761,045
Receipts, sale of war supplies, War Department	25,800,000
Receipts, sale of war supplies, Navy Department	1,000,000
Receipts, sale of Government property	7,592,410
Total	317,288,280

These assets were made possible by the loans made during the war, and they should be applied toward the reduction of the public debt; but in order to avoid a deficit, both this year and next year, the administration is using them to pay current expenses of the Government. Except for these capital assets the Treasury would face a deficit of $347,550,460.48 according to the present estimates on June 30, 1924, and a deficit of over $500,000,000 on June 30, 1923, as will be hereafter shown, thus showing that on a business basis of receipts and expenditures the Government is running far behind in meeting current expenditures with current receipts. It is manifest that unless there is a more rigid reduction of appropriations and expenditures, and unless the administration effects real economy and savings in the future, the Government will soon have to resort to an increase in taxation or the floating of new loans to meet its ordinary annual expenditures.

CONDITION OF TREASURY JUNE 30, 1923.

President Harding's recent announcement of a large reduction in the 1923 deficit, which he claims is due in large part to reduced expenditures, a policy of economy and an "effective coordination of routine business," and which has been given wide publicity in the press, creates an entirely false impression by stating only a part of the facts, which, when given in full, completely refute the claim that the reduction is largely due to reduced expenditures or administrative economy.

The President frankly admitted that a part of the reduction was due to increased revenue, which is a fact and a vital one; but he did not give the details or an explanation of the cause of the increase. His other statements with reference to alleged reductions in expenditures and to administrative economy, I regret to say, are misleading, because the reductions for which he takes credit are not reductions in the annual recurring expenditures of the Government, but such as they are grow out of the manipulation of revolving funds and the postponement of expenditures, as in the case of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the construction of post roads, respectively.

The principal reduction of the 1923 deficit is due to two causes, namely:

First. Increase in tax revenue.

Second. The sale of capital assets and the use of receipts therefrom to pay the current expenses of the Government.

The capital assets in large quantities have been sold, and the receipts therefrom have been misapplied to the reduction of the deficit when they should have been applied to the reduction of the national debt.

In the address referred to, delivered January 29, 1923, and reprinted recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, President Harding said:

> The executive departments estimated that they would call upon the Treasury during the 12 months of the year, July 1, 1922, to June 30, 1923, for $3,771,000,000, while the estimate for ordinary receipts for that period reached a total of only $3,073,000,000. This situation indicated withdrawals from the Treasury of $698,000,000 more than it was anticipated would be received from ordinary sources * * *.
>
> The statement of expected receipts and proposed and anticipated expenditures given in the Budget for 1924, transmitted to Congress December 5 last, showed a probable excess of expenditures over receipts for the fiscal year of 1923 of $273,000,000, a downward revision of $425,000,000 in the estimate made in July. * * * I am now advised that a revised estimate, just completed, showed a further reduction in the anticipated deficit for 1923 of $181,000,000, which indicates, as the situation exists to-day, an apparent deficit of $92,000,000 for the current year.
>
> This gratifying result is due not only to reductions in the program of expenditure but also to an increase in the anticipated total revenue and other receipts for the year. The adherence to the policy of economy and the effective coordination of routine business were important factors in reducing this estimated deficit.

At the same time and in the same place Gen. H. M. Lord, Director of the Budget, also made an address, in which he stated that the increase in estimated receipts as of January 15, 1923, in round figures, was $408,000,000, and the reduction in estimated expenditures at $321,000,000; but he did not, like President Harding, make any extravagant claims that the reduction of the deficit was due so largely to economy or retrenchment; on the contrary, he said:

> This great reduction is not due solely to efforts for retrenchment, no matter how heroic, nor to the intelligent and profitable efforts to increase receipts, successful as they were. The campaign for a balanced budget has received material assistance from fortunate conditions and happenings that we can not with reason depend upon for the elimination of the remaining excess of expected expenditures over anticipated receipts.

President Harding stated that the deficit for 1923, estimated July 1, 1922, to be $823,000,000. Taking the Treasury books on their face, it is seen that $408,000,000 of increase of receipts was not a real deficit. Hence the President in his address claims credit for wiping out by Budget savings mainly a huge deficit that did not actually exist. In other words, the Treasury underestimated receipts $408,000,000 on July 1, 1922, and, instead of apologizing for its mistake, claims credit for wiping out an imaginary deficit to that extent. Of these underestimates last July, $325,000,000 of the increase were tax-revenue receipts.

The table of original estimates of the Director of the Budget for 1923 does not show in sufficient detail all of the estimated receipts which have been applied to the reduction of the deficit, but the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1922 contains the estimates in question. They are as follows:

Farm-loan bonds, principal and interest	$30,034,825
Foreign loans, principal repayments (estimated)	31,250,000
Foreign loans, interest (estimated)	224,737,965
Receipts from sale of war surplus supplies, War Department (estimated)	70,000,000
Receipts from sale of war surplus supplies, Navy Department (estimated)	12,000,000
Sales, Government property	12,345,325
Total	380,368,115

This $380,000,000 estimated receipts comes from the sale and use of capital assets. It means that Government property and Government securities have been, or will be, sold and the amount applied to the reduction of the estimated deficit. It requires no argument to the average business man or the average man of intelligence to prove to him that he could not long do business by making up a deficit from the sale of his capital assets. In addition to this, it is estimated that supplies have been furnished by the War and Navy Departments to other departments in the sum exceeding $62,000,000, which furnishes another instance of the action of the administration in consuming capital assets to meet current expenses and taking credit for them in statements to the public as if they were current receipts or a reduction of expenditure. The rapidity with which the Government is cashing in its capital assets is shown in the one item of receipts from the sale of war material alone by the War Department since 1919 of $606,000,000. It would be fair to assume that at the rate this administration is selling and using its capital assets there will be few, if any, left when the Democratic Party comes into power in 1925. This money which is used to pay the current expenses of the Government could and should be applied to the payment of bonds. The war materials sold were purchased with the money received from the sale of Liberty bonds. Capital assets should be balanced against capital or permanent liabilities.

Surely there is nothing in this enormous sum for which the administration can take credit on account of retrenchment or economy, but rather, as Director of the Budget Lord says, to "fortunate conditions and happenings that we can not with reason depend upon for the elimination of the remaining excess of expected expenditures over anticipated receipts"—not to mention the "fortunate condition" of selling and using the Government's capital assets.

President Harding says that the present estimate of the 1923 deficit is $92,000,000. If to this sum be added the $380,000,000 of capital assets sold or used as heretofore stated and the $62,000,000 furnished by the War and Navy Departments to other departments, it will be seen that if the administration did not use the capital assets resulting from the World War the deficit would now be upward of a half billion dollars despite the increased receipts from customs and internal revenue. It is clear that the amount derived from the sale and use of capital

assets does not show any reduction of expenditures or any economy on the part of the administration.

These figures, too, do not take any account of the large increase in estimated receipts from the sale and use of capital assets made January 15, 1923.

Now let us turn to the estimates of expenditures. The original estimate was $3,771,258,542. The estimate of January 15, 1923, was $3,574,554,132. This includes everything. Confining this to the total ordinary expenses of the Government, which excludes interest on the public debt and other public-debt expenditures, the original estimate was $2,431,596,542. The estimate of January 15, 1923, was $2,107,148,301, a claimed reduction of $324,000,000. The reduction in total expenditures, however, including everything, was approximately only $197,000,000, as Director of the Budget, General Lord, points out—

> the difference being largely accounted for by the fact that the estimated payment of interest on the public debt had been increased by $125,000,000 and covered the discount accruals of the 1918 war-savings securities not originally estimated for as chargeable to the current year's expenditures.

The first large item of reduction in the estimated expenditures is in the Emergency Fleet Corporation and is explained by Director of the Budget Lord as follows:

> The estimate of expenditures, amounting to over $136,000,000 on July 1, 1922, has been so reduced that on January 15, 1923, the figures indicated a credit of $4,541,000. This was brought about in part by the curtailment of expenditures in various ways.

Stating that the later estimate is the net figure and needs an explanation for a clearer understanding, he then gives the following tabulation:

Estimated expenditures.

Withdrawals on account of claims appropriation	$20,000,000
Withdrawals on account of expense appropriation, Emergency Fleet Corporation	50,000,000
Withdrawals on account of expense appropriation, United States Shipping Board	459,000
Total	70,459,000

Deposits in the Treasury have been or will be made as follows:

Construction loan fund, 1922	$25,000,000
Construction loan fund, 1923	25,000,000
Miscellaneous collections and liquidations	25,000,000
Total	75,000,000

As there has been no reduction in the ordinary running expenditures of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, the reduction in estimated expenditures can only be due to two sources: First, an overestimate of $66,000,000 on July 1, 1922, or a postponement of payment of claims.

The deposits that have been or will be made in the Treasury show that $25,000,000 came from the construction loan fund of 1922, which was presumably not used; a similar amount from the construction loan fund of 1923, which will not be used; and a similar amount from miscellaneous collections and liquidations, which may have been from the sale of ships, but not estimated in the original estimate of receipts, so that there is no economy or reduction shown in this.

The next item of reduction in estimated expenditures is in the railroad administration and transportation act and loans to railroads. Of this, Director of the Budget Lord says:

> The first estimate of more than $284,000,000 has been reduced in the second estimate to approximately $149,000,000. This is due to reductions in the estimated loans, guaranties, and reimbursements to railroads for the current fiscal year. The figures given are net, and are the result of in-and-out operations of the revolving funds. It is expected at this date that a further reduction of approximately $20,000,000 will be made in this estimate of expenditures.

This statement simply shows that the railroads in 1923 are largely financing themselves, instead of being largely financed by the Government, as was necessary heretofore. To what extent the sale of railroad securities has figured in the operations of the revolving fund is not stated. But the explanation of General Lord is sufficient to show upon its face that this reduction in estimates is not due to any administrative economy or retrenchment.

The third item, the estimated reduction of expenditures which needs to be considered, is that of construction of rural post roads. The original estimate was for $126,000,000. In the January 15, 1923, estimate this is reduced to $90,000,000. In other words, some of the States will not cooperate in road construction and others are not cooperating fully, so that the amount now estimated for expenditures on post roads is $36,000,000 less than originally estimated. There is no economy or retrenchment in this. It is simply a postponed expenditure which will be a charge on the Treasury in the future.

In these three items alone—the Emergency Fleet Corporation, the railroad administration and transportation act and loans to railroads, and construction of rural post roads—we have a reduction in estimated expenditures of $311,541,000, or within $13,000,000 of the estimated reduction which President Harding loudly claims is due to economy and retrenchment and with which reduction neither economy nor retrenchment had anything to do.

In all of the figures quoted in the foregoing there is nothing to show any reduction in expenditures due to administrative economy. So with analysis the President's claim of a reduction in the ordinary running expenses of the Government and his claim of administrative economy and business acumen fall to the ground. The principal reduction in the deficit has been due to the collection of back taxes and increase in customs revenue and the sale of capital assets. In this connection it should be remembered that it was the Democratic press which first called the attention of the administration to these delinquent taxes, alleging that the delinquencies amounted to about $1,000,000,000. The increase in collections of customs taxes is due to the high rates of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill and temporary abnormal conditions. This latter part of the increase simply amounts to increased taxation of the American people, and the Government share of the tariff taxes is only a small part of the tariff taxes the American people are compelled to pay under the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act.

Unless the administration actually practices the economy of which it boasts, one of the outstanding conclusions which may be drawn from President Harding's statement—the conclusion in which taxpayers are chiefly interested—is that an increase instead of a decrease in taxes is inevitable in the near future. Real economies in government are reflected in reduced taxation. This is the question in which the people are vitally interested. The people are not so much interested in methods of Government bookkeeping, the manipulation of revolving funds, and statements of "paper savings." What they are vitally interested in is the question of whether or not there has been any actual reduction of expenditures in the ordinary annual recurring expenses of the Government. No figures have yet been produced, either by President Harding or Director of the Budget Lord, to show that there has been any such reduction.

The table referred to is as follows:

Comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1923 and 1924.

Amounts carried for each of these years in regular annual appropriation acts, deficiency appropriation acts, special acts, and amounts estimated under permanent and indefinite appropriations.]

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1923.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1924.	Decrease (—) or increase (+) 1924 compared with 1923.
Legislative branch:			
Regular annual	$13,122,664.30	$12,715,971.60	—$406,692.70
Increased compensation	1,694,356.00	1,705,140.00	+10,784.00
Permanent and indefinite	800.00	800.00	
Total	14,817,820.30	14,421,911.60	—395,908.70

Comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1923 and 1924—Continued.

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1923.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1924.	Decrease (−) or increase (+) 1924 compared with 1923.
Executive Office and independent offices:			
Regular annual—			
Shipping Board	$100,459,000.00	$50,411,500.00	−$50,047,500.00
Veterans' Bureau	431,298,843.45	428,160,773.00	−3,138,070.45
Executive and other independent offices	21,021,403.93	18,062,098.00	−2,959,305.93
Increased compensation	5,527,342.00	4,916,192.00	−611,150.00
Total	558,306,589.38	501,550,563.00	−56,756,026.38
Permanent and indefinite	6,017,000.00	6,511,495.74	+494,495.74
Total	564,323,589.38	508,062,058.74	−56,261,530.64
Agricultural Department:			
Regular annual—			
Department proper	37,524,153.00	37,236,653.00	−287,500.00
Increased compensation	3,232,863.00	3,304,800.00	+71,937.00
Roads, construction of	35,000,000.00	32,300,000.00	−2,700,000.00
Permanent and indefinite	12,250,000.00	12,220,000.00	−30,000.00
Total	88,007,016.00	85,061,453.00	−2,945,563.00
Commerce, Department of:			
Regular annual	19,509,335.36	19,377,045.00	−132,290.36
Increased compensation	1,835,159.00	1,958,956.00	+123,797.00
Permanent and indefinite	3,000.00	3,000.00	.....
Total	21,347,494.36	21,339,001.00	−8,493.36
Interior, Department of:			
Regular annual—			
Pensions	270,423,206.67	254,774,660.00	−15,648,546.67
Interior Department, proper	43,639,960.62	39,900,040.00	−3,739,920.62
Increased compensation	2,803,092.00	2,845,309.00	+42,217.00
Permanent and indefinite	27,499,000.00	28,349,500.00	+850,500.00
Total	344,365,259.29	325,869,509.00	−18,495,750.29
Justice, Department of, and judiciary:			
Regular annual	21,813,780.78	18,421,056.00	−3,392,724.78
Increased compensation	775,884.00	875,000.00	+99,116.00
Total	22,589,664.78	19,296,056.00	−3,293,608.78
Labor, Department of:			
Regular annual	6,923,476.11	6,918,556.00	−4,920.11
Increased compensation	566,832.00	566,640.00	−192.00
Permanent and indefinite	.....	25,000.00	+25,000.00
Total	7,490,308.11	7,510,196.00	+19,887.89
Navy, Department of:			
Regular annual	321,863,512.16	294,456,528.00	−27,406,984.16
Increased compensation	537,120.00	510,672.00	−26,448.00
Permanent and indefinite	3,433,672.00	2,130,050.00	−1,303,622.00
Total	325,834,304.16	297,097,250.00	−28,737,054.16
Post Office Department:			
Payable from the postal revenues—			
Regular annual	573,079,833.21	584,872,991.50	+11,793,158.29
Increased compensation	352,800.00	337,248.00	−15,552.00
Payable from other Federal revenues—			
Increased compensation	12,000.00	11,520.00	−480.00
Total	573,444,633.21	585,221,759.50	+11,777,126.29
State Department:			
Regular annual	10,875,710.95	15,066,665.50	+4,190,954.55
Increased compensation	144,000.00	134,000.00	−10,000.00
Permanent and indefinite	106,000.00	106,000.00	.....
Total	11,125,710.95	15,306,665.50	+4,180,954.55

Comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1923 and 1924—Continued.

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1923.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1924.	Decrease (−) or increase (+) 1924 compared with 1923.
Treasury Department:			
Regular annual	$119,929,941.65	$115,410,510.37	−$4,519,431.28
Increased compensation	10,724,326.00	10,749,292.00	+24,966.00
Permanent and indefinite—			
Interest on public debt	1,100,000,000.00	950,000,000.00	−150,000,000.00
Public debt redemption funds	330,088,800.00	345,097,000.00	+15,008,200.00
All other	31,058,110.63	31,055,093.41	−3,017.22
Total	1,591,801,178.28	1,452,311,895.78	−139,489,282.50
War Department:			
Military—			
Regular annual	262,088,388.52	251,250,231.00	−10,838,157.52
Permanent and indefinite	1,250,000.00	900,000.00	−350,000.00
Total, military	263,338,388.52	252,150,231.00	−11,188,157.52
Nonmilitary—			
Regular annual	69,824,523.00	85,096,973.00	+15,272,450.00
Permanent and indefinite	6,521,300.00	5,843,321.00	−677,979.00
Total, nonmilitary	76,345,823.00	90,940,294.00	+14,594,471.00
Total, War Department—			
Regular annual	331,912,911.52	336,347,204.00	+4,434,292.48
Increased compensation	8,831,958.00	6,102,057.00	−2,729,901.00
Permanent and indefinite	7,771,300.00	6,743,321.00	−1,027,979.00
	348,516,169.52	349,192,582.00	+676,412.48
District of Columbia:			
Regular annual	23,365,684.47	22,778,915.00	−586,769.47
Increased compensation	1,697,441.00	1,795,067.00	+97,626.00
Permanent and indefinite	1,624,600.00	1,512,843.00	−111,757.00
Total	26,687,725.47	26,086,825.00	−600,900.47
Miscellaneous (unclassified)	228,793.91		−228,793.91
Grand total:			
Regular annual	2,381,763,418.18	2,287,211,166.97	−94,552,251.21
Increased compensation	38,735,173.00	35,811,893.00	−2,923,280.00
Permanent and indefinite	1,519,852,282.63	1,383,754,103.15	−136,098,179.48
Miscellaneous (unclassified)	228,793.91		−228,793.91
Grand total	3,940,597,667.72	3,706,777,163.12	−233,802,504.60
Less sum payable from postal revenues	573,432,633.21	585,210,239.50	+11,777,606.29
Total, exclusive of sum payable from postal revenues	3,367,147,034.51	3,121,566,923.62	−245,580,110.89

[NOTE.—The figures for 1923 include $233,739,726.27 for deficiencies; $125,000,000 accrued discount on war savings stamps for previous years; $50,000,000 for claims against Shipping Board; and $16,000,000 for pensions—all of which should be deducted for purposes of comparison.]

Mr. RAINEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the hope of this country is in its men and women. The children of to-day are the men and women of to-morrow, the parents of generations yet unborn.

What, then, is there of national concern more important than the best possible training of those who are to "carry on," to carry forward the ideals that this Nation stands for?

Education is frankly recognized by thinking people everywhere as the basis of successful democratic Government. Numerous problems are now testing democratic governments as they have never been tested before. Therefore, education now and in the future needs to be supported and developed as never before. Otherwise, the whole structure of civilization is threatened with disaster. Education is at once insurance against danger and the key investment that makes possible greater development in the future.

This bill—to establish a new salary schedule for the public-school teachers of Washington, and to reorganize under substantive law the school system of the National Capital—must be passed, and passed quickly, for two impelling reasons:

(1) The salaries paid here are entirely inadequate to hold good teachers, and in spite of our proneness to boast, the schools of Washington are in such condition that the less said on that subject the better.

(2) We should have a model school system and an inspirational salary schedule here, which will give real impetus and standing to the profession, and which will be a model and encouragement to communities throughout the land.

You and I know that the people "back home" look to Washington for guidance. You and I know that if our schools here are not what they should be and if the best teachers are quitting and efficient teachers can not be hired to take their place, with a consequent disintegration of the school system, it is our fault. But beating our breasts and saying "Mea culpa, mea maxima culpa," is not correcting the mistake.

What are we going to do about it?

Now is the acceptable time to vote right.

We build a schoolhouse—not only here but in your home town, and in mine. We are tremendously concerned about the proper light, and fire escapes, and the right sort of desks, and ventilation, and what not. All well and good; but when we come to select the teacher we simply do the best we can for a meager wage.

That is all wrong. The most precious thing we have is our children. I say this personally for ourselves and collectively speaking for the Nation. If we have a new model automobile or a costly piece of machinery we would not let Tom, Dick, and Harry tinker with it, would we? But we let most anyone tinker with the most delicate and susceptible machinery imaginable—our children's brains, and hearts, and character.

For we must not forget that the book learning our children get is but the smallest part of their education. The teacher has them in their tenderest, most plastic years. The teacher has them from 6 to 8 hours a day. The teacher helps more than anyone else, except the mother, to mold the character. We can not be too careful about who teaches our children—careful not only that they "know their matter," but that they are of exceptional character, are in the profession through love for and devotion to the work, that they think right and act right as examples for our children to pattern after.

That is what we should have been doing and have not been doing—now is the time for reformation.

The salaries paid to teachers in Washington to-day were fixed 17 years ago. They are so small in comparison with what the teachers can earn in outside employment that the best teachers are quitting the schools, because they must live and most of them have others besides themselves to support. It is impossible to get well-trained teachers to take their places because of the inadequate salaries.

This is not just talk. Here are facts to back it up: A survey of all cities in the United States with over 100,000 population shows Washington hovering around the bottom of the list in all groups and grades. In the eight lower grades Washington pays from $1,200 to $1,600, while my home city, Chicago, pays from $1,475 to $2,100. Forty-five out of a list of 48 cities pay more than Washington. For principals of elementary schools Washington pays from $1,200 to $1,600, while in Chicago we pay from $2,500 to $4,250. Washington stands last in a list of 43 cities reporting. For director of special subjects—music, art, household arts, physical education, and manual training—Washington pays from $2,000 to $2,500, while in Chicago we pay from $3,750 to $5,000. Forty-nine cities in a list of 73 reporting pay more than Washington. In the lower group of high-school teachers Washington pays $1,440, while Chicago pays $1,600; and 33 out of 47 cities pay more than Washington. In the upper group of high-school teachers Washington pays $2,200 to $2,500, while Chicago pays $2,400 to $3,400; and 14 out of 18 cities pay more than Washington.

We are not giving our teachers here especially, and in a lesser degree elsewhere, a living wage. We expect them to be well educated, to have teacher training, to dress neatly, to keep abreast of modern developments and newer teaching methods, to read magazines and new books and attend lectures, and so forth, and we do not pay them enough to keep the wolf from their doors.

I warn you now that unless the teachers and prospective teachers of our country are assured of satisfactory returns on their investments in education and for their services the teaching profession will decline. There will be a still greater shortage of competent teachers and the Nation will suffer an irreparable loss from the decadence of its educational system.

During the war we had a sad spectacle here. We saw teachers who have given a lifetime of devotion to teaching getting a mere pittance in the classrooms, while some of their pupils, and generally pupils not specially capable, went direct from the classrooms to get on Uncle Sam's lump-sum appropriation pay rolls several times the salary their teachers had to shift along on.

But I do not need to preach to you Members of the House. I see facing me former college presidents, like Dr. SIMEON D. FESS, former superintendents like Representative W. W. CHALMERS, also of Ohio, and I think I am safe in saying that at least half the membership of the House taught school at one time or another. You know the situation and conditions then; and they have not improved much since, especially here in Washington. Many of you taught as a makeshift, and I am sure that most of you, at least, gave good instructions; but I am equally certain that you do not want your children and their children taught by makeshift teachers who take the job merely as a stepping-stone to some other job that will pay better. I am sure you all join with me in the desire to see the teaching profession made so attractive that it will draw in the best talent of this country, so that we can have careful selection and elimination of the less desirable.

Invariably disinterested but qualified educators from outside of Washington, when asked to indicate the outstanding needs of our school system here, place a new salary schedule as one of the most urgent.

Never in my legislative experience have I had personal experience of such a universal demand for a specific piece of legislation. Educational authorities in my home district and State, and organized into national associations, parent-teachers' associations, and mothers' clubs have all appealed to me to support this measure, not only for the teachers and schools of Washington but as a good influence that would spread all over our land for the betterment of our future citizens.

We have seen delegations of mothers besieging the doors of "key" Members, telling with tears in their eyes how imperative is the need that their children, in whom are centered all their hopes and ambitions, for whom they have suffered and slaved, may have the influences that will make them better American citizens.

Back in my district and in yours these women would not have to humiliate themselves making public pilgrimage; they could make the decision for better teachers and better schools by their votes. In our home cities they could command, where here in voteless Washington they must bend the suppliant knee. Shall their pilgrimage be in vain? You who have wives and mothers and who are the fathers of children answer me.

We have seen the people of the District united in this appeal, supported by the District Commissioners and the school authorities, and backed by the best public sentiment of the entire country.

There are several reasons for the urgency of this legislation—why we must pass it now: (1) The salary of employees should be legalized; (2) certain approved developments of the system await legal authorization; (3) other developments await legislation; and (4) higher compensation is necessary.

First, the present salary of practically every employee of the Board of Education is subject to a point of order in Congress, because it is not provided for in law. The several increases in compensation which teachers and others have received are authorized only in the appropriation bill, and hence are only legal from year to year. The salaries of all employees of the Board of Education should be established by law and should not be left in their present uncertain state.

Second, since the organic act of 1906, which established the present school system, many changes in organization of the school system have taken place. These changes indicate a progressive development of a growing school system. However, they are not now fully recognized by law, as they should be. A few illustrations of these changes will suffice:

(a) Junior high schools have been organized in the school system, but there is no legally authorized salary schedule for them. Teachers serving in those institutions now serve either as a class 6A of high-school teachers or as Class IV or Class V of elementary-school teachers. It is impossible to organize effectively a junior high school under the restrictions thus imposed.

(b) Administrative principalships of elementary schools with 16 or more classes have been created. They have no salary schedule. As in the case of all teaching principals their salary now consists of a salary as a teacher and additional compensation based upon the number of session rooms.

(c) The community-center department is recognized by law, but no salary schedule has been legally established for its employees. Lump-sum appropriations are now made. The salaries of permanent employees in the department should be fixed by appropriate legislation.

(d) Vocational schools have been established. They should be legally provided for in salary legislation. This is particularly important because it is desirable that this type of institution be largely extended in the school system.

Third, in addition to the above developments which have already taken place there are certain other unfortunate conditions which can not be modified under the present law.

(a) Session-room pay is now provided by law for teaching principals as additional compensation for serving as principals of elementary schools. This pay is $30 per year for each session room. The present method of paying principals by giving them salaries of teachers and this session-room pay should be replaced by an appropriate salary schedule for teaching and administrative principals. The new salary should be higher than their present compensation. Session-room pay should be abandoned.

(b) Teachers in elementary schools are now grouped in Classes I, II, III, IV, and V. Originally the minimum and maximum salaries for the various classes differed. The practice was to appoint all new teachers to Class I, which covers Grades I and II, and to promote from one class to another as vacancies occurred in the upper grades. This practice resulted in the placing of all new teachers in the primary grades and in the advancement of the more experienced teachers to posi-

tions in eighth grades. Since the basic salary has now been made the same for each class, the continued existence of these five classes is no longer necessary or desirable. Indeed, the present arrangement interferes with the successful organization and administration of the elementary schools. These five classes should be abolished and the salary schedule made uniform for all regular elementary-school teachers.

Fourth, in addition to the necessity for legalizing the salaries of employees and for a new salary schedule to provide for the past and future developments and extensions of the present school system, a new salary schedule is necessary in order to correct certain injustices which now exist due to past salary adjustments. Moreover, increased compensation for employees is necessary if the Washington school system is to compete successfully with other school systems in securing efficient teachers and officers.

So, if you have conferred with the school authorities and the District Commissioners and have listened to the hearings before the Senate and House committees, which have exhaustively investigated this subject, you will see that the proposed salary schedule is more than legislation fixing the compensation of employees; it is also legislation providing for the organization of the school system. The salary schedule must fix pay for positions, but positions are conceived and created in accordance with one's judgment as to how a school system should be organized and operated.

The legislation fixing the salaries of employees and establishing the plan of organization and administration of the school system of Washington was passed in 1906. Outside of piecemeal legislation in appropriation acts, no supplementary legislation has been passed since that time.

Now, I charge you, do not overlook that during the 17 years intervening great progress has been made in the theory and practice of educational administration. Junior high schools have been established as an integral part of the school system. The extended use of public-school buildings beyond the traditional five-hour day, both for evening and summer school work and for adult education, recreation, and civic improvement, has been recognized and generally provided for in cities like Washington. Larger units of elementary school organization are generally accepted as financially necessary and educationally desirable. Throughout the country in more recent years there is a marked tendency more nearly to equalize salaries of elementary and high school teachers by establishing salaries on the basis of the qualifications possessed rather than on the grade of work taught. Vocational and prevocational education has been generally established since 1906. All these and many other developments have taken place since the organic school law was passed in 1906. New legislation is now a necessity not only to provide adequate compensation for employees but also to bring up to date the organization and administration of the school system.

We here in Congress concerned about many and varied subjects of interest to our constituents have not kept in close touch with these developments and the need for new legislation to meet the changed educational conditions. But for a long time the school officials have felt the urgency for such legislation. Attempts have annually been made in the school budget to secure increased salaries for employees, over those established by law. Moreover, the appropriation acts have frequently carried scraps of legislation to meet new situations as they have arisen. This is not a good practice. The salary schedule should be established through legislation and the school estimates for salaries prepared in accordance with that schedule. Moreover, the need of recognizing and establishing by law the many new practices which have necessarily been inaugurated in the school system is equally urgent.

Now let us come to a showdown on how this new schedule of salaries is figured and just what it means for the teachers and the tax-paying public.

The proposed salary schedule for Washington was based on the present compensation in Washington and on the schedules received from other cities. Since Washington must compete with other cities for its supply of teachers, it must be prepared to pay as high for their services as other cities pay. If Washington is to have as good teachers and as good teaching as other cities it must pay salaries sufficiently high to secure and retain such teachers. It is on the principle of supply and demand that the new salary schedule is based.

The new proposed schedule will not in any case place Washington at the head of the list of cities paying leading salaries. In general, Washington will stand from one-third or one-fourth the way from the top of such a list. Nevertheless, in view of the comparatively low salaries which Washington now pays, the new schedule will provide a substantially better salary for all educational employees than the present schedule provides.

As my last shot to impress upon you that this legislation must pass, I can do no better than quote to you from the annual report of the District Commissioners, not elected by the people but designated by the President. They say:

> This is the most important school legislation for the District of Columbia that has been presented to Congress in more than 15 years. The public is back of it; the District needs and wants it. The school authorities of the District have been gratified to receive the assistance of public opinion and public support. They appeal not only for support but for active assistance in impressing on Congress the necessity of passing this legislation at the earliest possible opportunity.

Do it now!

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of the permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD to say a few words about a few subjects.

First of all, I wish to express regret that no action whatever was taken upon House Joint Resolution 400, introduced by me, for the purpose of promoting peace and to equalize the burdens and to minimize the profits of war. The principle contained in this resolution was indorsed by the President in his inaugural address March 4, 1921, and again repeated in his message to Congress on December 8, 1922. The American Legion are unanimously back of this proposition, and I have received numerous letters from all parts of the country strongly indorsing the movement. Everybody that I have talked with says that it is an effort to accomplish justice, and only a very few have expressed any misgivings about it, and this few have indorsed its idea and purpose but say that they doubt if it can be made practicable and workable. Those same objections were made to the proposition to draft man power to fight in time of war. It was said that men would not fight unless they had volunteered through a patriotic purpose. It was said that if men were compelled by law to leave their homes and to enter the ranks that they would not prove efficient soldiers. The records of the last war completely refute these arguments, and I feel sure that it is to be for a long time at least the fixed and settled policy of this country that in time of war the principles of the selective service law shall be applied.

I appeared before the Judiciary Committee of the House and earnestly urged a favorable report on said joint resolution. The matter was referred to a subcommittee, and owing to the sickness of the chairman of the subcommittee no report was ever made to the full committee, and consequently the full committee never reported the resolution to the House. This will certainly result in the delay of at least one year for the enactment of suitable and proper legislation, considered in coolness and calmness four years after the end of the great World War, and we hope many years before the breaking out of any future war.

My purpose to appoint a nonpolitical and bipartisan commission that would be composed of a large majority of persons favorable to the policies of the Republican Party must appeal to every man as entirely fair. I do not consider this a political question, and I waited one year and a half after the President expressed his approval of this principle in his inaugural address before I took any steps whatever. I have no evidence to believe that inaction was due to the fact that a Democrat was the author of the joint resolution. I do hope that in the next Congress some action along this general line may be taken, and if there is a better chance for favorable action upon a bill introduced by a Republican, then I hope for such action upon the bill introduced by the Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of South Dakota. I have stated publicly that I think his bill ought to be amended in two or three particulars before enactment into law, but that can be easily done either in the Committee on Military Affairs or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

THE COAL PROBLEM UNSETTLED.

I also regret that there was so much delay during the Sixty-seventh Congress in taking some action looking toward an ultimate settlement of the coal problem. It should have been taken up the very first thing, and by now legislation should have been enacted for the relief of the people and the industries of the Nation. A few days ago it seemed that spring had come in this city, and men were walking everywhere without their overcoats. To-day the snow is falling thick and fast, and there will doubtless be some suffering even in this central city. But what must be the conditions in the North and New England States imagination and newspaper reports can supply. Pitched battles have been held between municipal authorities and railroad authorities over the possession of trainloads of coal. Citizens of the United States feel that coal placed by the Creator beneath the soil of our country should be used for the comfort of our own citizens. There are many questions connected with this coal problem which are intricate,

far-reaching, and vital. I feel that I have done my duty in relation to it. I have been studying it in a general way for about seven years. I have called the attention of the Congress and the country to it several times. I have communicated my ideas to the coal commission now investigating the problem. I will continue to do all in my power as opportunity offers to assist in the enactment of such laws by Congress as may be constitutionally possible for the purpose of stabilizing and standardizing the distribution and supply and price of coal.

THE RURAL CREDITS LEGISLATION.

As heretofore stated, I voted for the amalgamating, consolidated, hodgepodge of legislation designed and intended to be a compromise to extend facilities for intermediate credits to the farmers. By intermediate credits we mean credits more than six months and less than three years, and intended to assist the farmers primarily in the financing of his production period. It is a sad commentary upon the half-hearted performance by the Republican Party of its platform pledge that this legislation was postponed and shunted to one side and pigeonholed for nearly two years, and then when it was apparent that the farmers of the country would not stand for being longer trifled with the various plans and schemes for relief were thrown together in order to make it possible to have some legislation before the adjournment of Congress. We remember that there was no such delay in taking up the revision of the tariff schedules upward. We remember that there was no such delay in trying to get action on the ship subsidy. We remember that the claimants for damages suffered by dealing in sugar during the war were given a chance to have their claims heard and passed by Congress. We remember that other special interests had their day or days in Congress long ago. But when the matter of proper financial relief for the farmers was to be heard, delay and postponement was the order of the day. And yet some people wonder why there is a "farm bloc." Some people grow blue in the face when rural credit legislation is proposed. Some people seem well-nigh disposed to charge members of the "farm bloc" with disloyalty to party and to country. Everybody speaks in generalities about the basic necessity of agriculture. Everybody with common sense knows that if the country is to prosper the farmers must prosper. Everybody with half sense ought to know that if the country is to continue to eat and to wear, then the farmers must continue to find agriculture reasonably profitable, and yet people have not objected to the Federal reserve system for the purpose of financing industries and commerce. People have not objected to the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been lent by the Government to the railroads. Some people have thought that the protective tariff system, whereby profits are turned into the pockets of favorites to the tune of about $3,000,000,000 a year, is necessary to national prosperity. Many people who oppose the rural credits legislation are strongly in favor of the ship subsidy, by which the owners of merchant marine vessels will receive all sorts of favors and preferments and actual cash payments from the Treasury of many million dollars a year.

It seems to be all right to subsidize some manufactures and some railroads and some ships, but some people suffer holy horrors about legislation intended to make agriculture reasonably profitable. As a matter of fact, the direct benefits and advantages of the legislation, promoted largely by the farmers, known as rural credits, will go to the bankers and to the investment public. The farmer must still, as heretofore, go to his local banker and offer his character, his labor, and the products of his labor as security for his loans. That is right, and the farmer does not object. Then it is up to the banker to say whether or not the farmer can make a safe paper. If the banker thinks that the farmer is honest and will produce things that people must buy and can give good security, then under the new system the banker can not any longer honestly tell the farmer that he can not accommodate him. Under the present system the banker will take the farmer's paper and will rediscount it either with the private corporation contemplated by the Capper bill or will rediscount it with the intermediate credits bank contemplated by the Lenroot-Anderson bill. Then all of these notes of the farmer, indorsed by the local banks, can be assembled into central places and in the hands of a trust agency and against them will be issued bonds or obligations, called "debentures," and these will be offered to the big savings banks and trust companies and the executors and administrators and trustees of the multimillionaire estates. So that the system contemplated will enable the local bank to accommodate more customers and to make more profits, and will afford a safe and sound investment for the huge aggregations of capital. But indirectly the farmer will get a benefit, because he will be able to borrow money from the bank, which heretofore has been totally unable to accommodate him. The general principles of this legislation are sound, and though there are details that must be corrected by future Congresses, yet it is certain to afford much relief to the present condition of the farmers.

"NORMALCY AND ECONOMY."

We heard much during the campaign of 1920 about normalcy and economy. We see in many newspapers and magazines criticisms of the profligacy and wastefulness of Congress's appropriations. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I think that these criticisms are misdirected and unjustified. The records will show that with very rare exceptions the estimates submitted through the Budget commission from the executive branch of the Government have been cut down by the Congress when it considered appropriations. It seems that as a general proposition the executive departments are always in favor of the larger appropriations. Each head of a department seems to think that his is the most important of all, and he is constantly pressing for more money to carry on increased activities.

The head of the department merely reflects the ambition of the chiefs of the bureaus in his department. We have heard that representatives of the executive departments have criticized Congress as being miserly and narrow and close fisted. I think, therefore, that instead of criticizing Congress, which has to be very resolute and firm to withstand the propaganda for increased appropriations, the country ought to recognize that Congress is the real friend in normalcy and economy, and the guns of criticism ought to be turned upon the executive heads.

AGRICULTURE DENIED RELIEF.

Mr. Speaker, in two very important and nation-wide aspects this Congress failed to perform its duty to agriculture, and I believe that it will be held responsible to the country for its signal failure. The first of these is the failure to take final and definite action upon the proper policy of the Government toward Muscle Shoals; whether that policy shall be to lease it to Henry Ford or to somebody else, or to sell it or to operate it as a Government proposition, is not the matter now up for consideration. The question is that some final settlement of policy should be made. Water is going over the wheels that will never come back. Time is speeding for the present generation. The fields of the country are already growing less productive for lack of a proper supply of nitrates. An all-wise Providence has supplied us with the means to correct this tendency to the impoverishment of our soil. No nation is stronger than its soil. The food supply of the nation is the broad basis upon which it must constantly rest. For us to neglect to utilize the marvelous possibilities of the Muscle Shoals power is to show our shortsightedness and our neglect of the rights and interests of the next generation. Then, again, Mr. Speaker, this Congress failed in its duty to agriculture by refusing to act upon an appropriation of $10,000,000 to enable the President to buy in the markets of the world, notably Chile, and to resell to the farmers of America, at cost, sufficient nitrates to meet the current demands until Muscle Shoals is developed, and also especially to buy, anywhere in the world, calcium arsenate to enable the southern cotton farmer to fight with some hope and exactness the pest of the boll weevil. This matter of an adequate supply of cotton is not a local and selfish proposition of the southern farmer alone. It is a nation-wide problem.

The northern and eastern populations must have cotton to make their cloth and to keep their textile plants and population busy. If there is a cotton famine, the real and ultimate sufferers will not be so much the southern farmers as it will be the peoples of the North and East, who will be compelled to pay high prices for cotton cloth. If there is a cotton famine, the southern cotton farmer will receive an increased price per pound, and it has often happened that a short and small crop of cotton brings as many dollars into the pockets of the southern farmer as do large crops. Since the southern farmer raises cotton not to eat but to sell, he is concerned most vitally in the number of dollars it will bring. Gentlemen must therefore not think that by enabling the farmer to have nitrate to rush his cotton plant to maturity and to have calcium arsenate to assist in killing the boll weevil it is conferring a direct and exclusive benefit upon the southern cotton farmer alone. As I have just stated, the problem is nation-wide and will be ultimately most vital to the people in those sections where cotton is not grown. This situation illustrates as well as anything can the truth of the proposition that a prosperous and successful agriculture is more vital and indispensable to the safety and security of the great city populations than to the farmer population itself. The reason is perfectly obvious when

analyzed. If the farmer does not find agriculture profitable, he will raise only enough commodities for himself and family. If it does not pay him to labor and to invest for the purpose of producing a surplus, he will discontinue raising any surplus. But you can not starve the farmer out. He can eat his own cattle and his own grain, and though he may not have automobiles and fine clothes and education for his children, yet one can not starve him out. But out of this is the picture with reference to the great cities. The population of these congested centers would begin to starve within two or three weeks if compelled to rely on their accumulated stores of things to eat. If the farmer would not constantly ship into the city, and if the trains and trucks running into the city did not constantly carry their cargoes of food supplies of all sorts, the city population would soon begin to starve. And when things to eat can not be had, it makes no difference how much gold may be in the vaults, or how fine the houses may be, or how many silks and furs may be in the stores, or how much jewelry and diamonds may be in the vaults; all these things will be as nothing, and men will go mad with hunger and will surge out toward the country, seeking for meat and bread, and will be driven back by the farmer with his pitchfork. People who think that the farmer is narrow and selfish and unpatriotic and wants to exploit the whole population must get that out of their heads. The farmer is patient, conservative, patriotic. He is the best type of those fathers of the colonial days who laid the firm foundation of this Republic. Practically all the people who declared and won our independence were farmers. And the history of this country shows that the men and women who have led in the upbuilding, regenerating agencies of this Nation have been recruited from the farm. The farm is the reservoir of the Nation's fresh blood. The farm is the type of American individualism. The farm embodies and personifies in its highest form the spirit of American liberty. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we feel justified in saying to those who criticize the farmer and the farmer's friends in Congress that they are shortsighted and narrow and need to take a nation-wide view of the farmer's problems.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Lasker ship subsidy bill has failed of passage. Everybody concedes that such a bill would have no chance in the Sixty-eighth Congress; and it may be safely predicted that it would have still less chance in the Sixty-ninth Congress.

With the aid of perhaps the most extensive, most adroit, and most insidious propaganda ever disseminated in behalf of any bill, with the president of the Shipping Board zealously exerting every possible public and private influence to effect its passage, with the President and the Republican leaders strenuously bringing to bear all possible pressure to whip Members into line for the bill as an administration and party measure, and with a Republican majority of 169, the bill passed the House by a majority of only 24, and then only after the adoption of amendments, in the absence of which the bill would admittedly have been defeated; even then the bill was saved by the votes of 82 Members who retire March 4, 66 of whom were repudiated by their constituencies in the recent elections; but for "lame-duck" support the bill would have been badly defeated in the House. A vote upon the bill had been deferred until after the election, because it was recognized that they could not muster a majority who were willing to vote for the bill and then face their constituents in the ensuing election; and the President called an extra session immediately after the election for the sole and specific purpose of putting through the ship subsidy bill. It is a matter of common knowledge that such a bill would never have been reported out of committee either in the House or Senate but for the extraordinary zeal and persistent pressure of the President.

As correctly stated by the American Economist in a recent issue:

> If a ship subsidy bill can not be passed under the circumstances surrounding the pending bill, no such bill ever can be passed.

Wherefore it is high time for ship-subsidy mendicants to stop begging and hoping for bounties from the Public Treasury and to apply their energies to a constructive solution of the problem. Many shipowners in an effort to convert the public and the Government to a policy of ship subsidies have preached the doctrine that they can not succeed without subsidies until they not only frightened off the investing public but they themselves apparently became obsessed with that belief. As long as they thus waste their energies and ignore efficiency in the hope that such practices will be offset by Government aid they will fail. On the other hand, if they devote themselves to economic, efficient, businesslike methods, they will succeed, as those are doing who employ such methods.

I do not sanction the dark picture of our present and future American merchant marine painted by the prosubsidists in an effort to drive Congress to a subsidy policy. However, I do say that the virtual elimination of the present Shipping Board expenses and loss, the ultimate sale of our Government-owned tonnage, and the maintenance of our existing trade routes can be effected, and the further development and the permanent maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine can be assured by the adoption of certain policies.

Most of our difficulties being due to unnatural restraints, artificial politicies, unbusinesslike methods, and wasteful practices, the problem can not be solved by the adoption of a still more unnatural, artificial, inefficient, and wasteful system.

On the other hand, we should remove the causes which hamper our shipping, eliminate the unnecessary cost and waste, and then rely upon the intelligence, genius, skill, and efficiency which characterize Americans and which enable them to maintain supremacy in practically every other line of endeavor.

The specific policies which I recommend may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Abolish the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation.
2. Appoint a bipartisan congressional committee to investigate and cull out all useless employees of the Shipping Board organization.
3. Place one responsible man of demonstrated ability, honesty, and patriotism at the head of the remaining organization and of our shipping affairs.
4. Cancel all MO-4 contracts and lease the ships now in operation on trade routes under bareboat charters, or, wherever that may be impossible, place such trade routes in charge of salaried managers, until such vessels can be sold. This alone would eliminate nearly all of the immense Shipping Board organization and expense and all of the voyage losses.
5. Lease the ships on very low bareboat charter rates; give the charterers an option to buy the ships at world-market prices, agreeing to give them credit on the purchase price for the amounts they have paid in charter hire, provided they complete payment of purchase price within a reasonable, specified period.
6. Transfer a goodly number of our suitable idle ships to the Army and Navy for use as transports and auxiliary vessels in case of emergency.
7. As to the remainder of our Government tonnage, from time to time fix and publish specific prices, in conformity with prevailing world prices for like tonnage, and sell on reasonable terms and time to any American citizens who desire to buy and are able to pay for same, requiring the more valuable and suitable ships to be operated under the American flag.
8. Employ a liberal policy in the payment of compensation for the carriage of our ocean mail, engaging American ships as far as possible, all of which is fully authorized by the act of 1891, now in force.
9. Our merchant marine should have the full cooperation and aid of our Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, commercial attachés, radio service, and other Government functions.
10. The Government and Government officials should patronize American ships whenever possible.
11. The American public should loyally support the American merchant marine, as do the nationals of other countries. They should ship and travel on American ships whenever possible, instead of patronizing foreign ships, as many noisy advocates of subsidies do.
12. The establishment of oil stations wherever they would be needed by our Navy and our merchant marine.
13. A proper revision of conference rates.
14. The adoption of a uniform, short, simple bill of lading.
15. Strict enforcement of the seamen's act, particularly sections 4 and 13, which will insure and maintain an equalization of wages on American ships and on foreign ships operating to and from our ports.
16. The enactment of a law prohibiting the payment of gratuities to masters of vessels.
17. Simplification of the administration of the supervisory work of the Government agencies in charge of shipping, including abolition of the dual system of inspection of ships; inspections should be made so as not to delay the departure of ships.
18. Enactment of a load line law similar to the laws of the European maritime powers.
19. Specific definition of the liability of ocean cargo carriers for loss or damage to goods, so as to avoid needless and expensive litigation.
20. Establishment of foreign trade zones in our ports.
21. Foreign-built ships owned by American citizens should be permitted to register under the American flag.

22. The repeal of tariff duties on all shipbuilding materials and the repeal of all restrictions against the use of imported materials in our ship construction.

23. A tariff for revenue only. A tariff which is so high as to prevent the importation of foreign goods and which in turn cuts down our exports because of inability of foreigners to pay for our products with their own will naturally diminish our foreign commerce and militate against our merchant marine. Our ships need both incoming and outgoing cargoes. While it is not expected that those wedded to a high protective tariff policy will accept this recommendation, even for the sake of our merchant marine, yet it would be of vast assistance. However, with the adoption of the other suggestions recommended our merchant marine could succeed in spite of a high protective tariff, although not to the extent it could without such a tariff.

24. Our shipowners must establish efficient organizations at home and shipping agencies and connections abroad.

25. Our shipping companies should establish local agencies throughout this country such as are maintained by railroads and by the leading foreign steamship lines.

26. They should make arrangements with the railrods for connecting rail and ocean transportation so that inland shippers can easily ascertain rates and make arrangements for through shipments.

27. Americans have a splendid opportunity to outdistance their competitors in the study and development of modern, scientific machinery and methods, such as the development and employment of the Diesel type of engines, the improvement of port, terminal, warehousing, loading, and unloading facilities, and in the study and adoption of other constructive plans.

28. American shipowners should eliminate overcapitalization, squeeze out watered stock, cut out wasteful overhead, get rid of useless officials, reduce the exorbitant salaries of many executives; in other words, get on a sound, economical business basis.

29. American shipowners should forever stop begging for public bounties and should apply themselves to effecting the results just suggested. They should quit disseminating the false doctrine that Americans are not competent to succeed in the maritime industry without subsidies.

Some of the foregoing suggestions are not of vital importance, but in my opinion all will help.

I have heretofore discussed in detail these more important proposals and the reasons therefor. Most of these suggestions can be carried out without additional legislation. Under existing law the Shipping Board has ample authority to cancel the infamous MO-4 contracts, including the payment of husbanding fees, which are being voluntarily paid, and to sell, lease, or operate our ships as I suggest, which course would permit the reduction of the vast Shipping Board force of employees to a minimum and would eliminate all operating losses and most of the Shipping Board expense. It simply depends on whether the Shipping Board so wills as to whether it will regard the interest of the public and a great, widely distributed American merchant marine, or will regard the wishes and interests of a very few private shipping magnates.

The adoption of the foregoing proposals, even to a reasonable extent, will insure the full establishment and the permanent maintenance of a sound, healthy, successful, privately owned American merchant marine, fully adequate for all of our needs in peace or war; and it will do it without the adoption of a single vicious policy or a single additional burden upon the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Speaker, to meet the objections which have been urged against the provisions of the Towner-Sterling educational bill I present some reasons why this important measure should be enacted. It was furnished me by the National Educational Association, Washington, D. C., and requested that same be published as extension of remarks in eight-point type.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO.

Like all Gaul the Towner-Sterling bill is divided into three parts. It proposes:

To create a department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet.

To create a national council of 100 representative educators and laymen, which will meet annually at the call of the secretary.

To give Federal aid to encourage the States in the solution of five educational problems, fundamental alike to worthy citizenship in both State and Nation:

1. The removal of illiteracy.
2. The Americanization of the foreign born.
3. The promotion of physical education.
4. The training of teachers.
5. The equalization of educational opportunities.

WHY A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION?

The Federal Government now spends millions yearly for strictly educational work. This work is scattered among several Federal departments. A department of education would coordinate this work and eliminate waste. Effective administration of the Federal Government's present educational activities demands the creation of a department of education.

Education is of primary importance to the welfare of the Nation. It should have from the Nation the recognition which a place in the Cabinet would give. Such primary recognition would insure for education much greater attention from public men and from newspapers and citizens generally.

A department of education would adequately provide for research and investigation. Effective school administration demands reliable statistical and experimental evidence upon which to base plans for educational growth. Such investigation can not be made by one State, and an attempt by the 48 States to do so would lead to duplication of effort and a waste of money.

WHY FEDERAL AID?

Education of the country's future citizenry is not a luxury, but is the Nation's greatest necessity, since the life and prosperity of the Republic depend upon a citizenship which is physically, intellectually, and morally sound. The Nation looks to the States for its citizens; it should aid the States in their training.

President Harding, in his address to Congress on November 21, 1922, stated the case for Federal aid as follows:

"I believe in Government aid becomingly bestowed. We have aided industry through our tariffs; we have aided railway transportation in land grants and loans; we have aided the construction of market roads and the improvement of inland waterways; we have aided reclamation and irrigation and the development of water power; we have loaned for seed grains in anticipation of harvests. It has all been commendable and highly worth while."

The Federal Government has repeatedly aided education by land grants and money. No aid to any cause has yielded larger returns. With Federal aid and encouragement the States would remedy their educational weaknesses.

WHY A NATIONAL COUNCIL?

There is needed some agency which will furnish an official clearing house for the ideals and plans developed by the various States. This the national council would do. The fact that there are 48 independent State school systems in the United States has given abundant opportunity for initiative and originality in educational practices.

The secretary of education, charged with carrying on research into educational problems and with the distribution of Federal aid, would desire to seek the advice of the chief school officers of the various States and of competent experts and laymen. The national council provides the agency for doing this most effectively.

The national council would enable leaders representing both the States and the Nation to develop a national point of view in matters educational. The council would be composed of (1) the chief school officers of the States, (2) 25 persons representing various educational interests, (3) and 25 prominent laymen.

VAST PRESENT SUPPORT.

Over 25,000,000 citizens through the organizations which represent them have indorsed the Towner-Sterling bill. Among these are:

The National Education Association.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
National League of Women Voters.
Daughters of the American Revolution.
National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teacher Associations.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Women's Christian Temperance Union.
Women's Relief Corps.
National Committee for a Department of Education.
International Sunday School Council of Religious Education.
American Federation of Labor.
All Masonic organizations of national scope.
National Federation of Music Clubs.
American Library Association.

* * * * * * *

STATE CONTROL MAINTAINED.

State control of education is insured by the provisions of the Towner-Sterling bill. Section 13 of the bill reads:

"That all the educational facilities encouraged by the provisions of this act and accepted by a State shall be organized, supervised, and administered exclusively by the legally constituted State and local educational authorities of said State, and the secretary of education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto; and this act shall not be construed to imply Federal control of education within the States nor to impair the freedom of the States in the conduct and management of their respective school systems."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are men in Congress and out of it who reverse Doctor Coué's famous slogan and repeat constantly: "Day by day, in every way, under prohibition we are getting worse and worse."

In view of the fact that a false statement repeated often enough will in the end be believed by some persons, it is worth while to examine the so-called arguments of foes of prohibition and see just what basis they rest upon.

PUT OVER ON THE PEOPLE.

The first and foremost plea which crops up in any discussion is that prohibition was in some mysterious fashion enacted while the people's backs were turned.

A more absurd statement was never uttered. The fact is that never in the history of America was there given so overwhelming evidence of the people's deliberate and determined will as in the action which outlawed the liquor traffic.

From the very beginning of this Nation the question had been discussed and considered. In 1776 Dr. Benjamin Rush, signer of the Declaration of Independence, published a book on the evils of alcohol. In 1777 the Continental Congress passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That it be recommended to the several legislatures of the United States immediately to pass laws the most effectual for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived if not quickly prevented.

One hundred and forty-four years ago the Congress of the United States, representing the people of the new Nation, went to the very limit of their power in passing a bone dry law. Unfortunately that Congress could not enact a law binding upon the States and the recommendation was not followed, but the fact of its passage would indicate that no snap action was taken on the problem in these latter days.

In 1789, the year when the Constitution was adopted, 200 farmers in Litchfield, Conn., organized a temperance society, the first in this country. Other societies sprung up and in 1851 the Independent Order of Good Templars was organized to strike a blow at the liquor traffic.

In 1873 the Woman's Temperance Crusade was begun and later the Woman's Christian Temperance Union took up its great task. In 1890 the Anti-Saloon League was launched for the purpose of harnessing the Christian church against the saloon.

During every year since the organization of this Government there has been discussion of the liquor problems and organized effort to solve it by destruction of the traffic. In 1856 the Independent Order of Good Templars declared for constitutional prohibition. In 1876 Senator Blair, of New Hampshire, introduced a resolution in Congress for the submission of such amendment to the States. In 1914 such a resolution received a majority vote in the Congress of the United States.

Nor was this all. By local option, county option, and State prohibition methods every single community in the country was brought face to face with the question. For 60 years elections were held at which the people voted for or against the liquor traffic.

Step by step the upholders of sobriety and decency won their way. Facing the most powerful business organization in America, they fought out their cause before the American people. So overwhelming was their evidence and so strong their position that in 1916, of the 2,543 counties in the United States 2,238 were in the dry column by the vote of the people, only 305 counties in the entire Nation permitting the sale of alcoholic beverages.

In the course of the conflict Congress took one step after another. It banned the sale of liquor in the Capitol; it prohibited the sale of liquor in the Indian country, at all military posts and reservations, in the Navy, and in the Panama Canal Zone. The District of Columbia was declared dry, and the shipment of liquor and the mailing of liquor advertisements into prohibition States was made unlawful.

Then with the entrance of the United States into the World War came war prohibition and finally the submission of the constitutional amendment to the States. The vote in Congress was almost 3 to 1 in favor of the amendment. As rapidly as the State legislatures could assemble they ratified the amendment. Forty-six out of 48 States rallied to the cause and declared that they were in favor of the utter destruction of this traffic, out of which has come all the extensive evils foreseen by the Continental Congress 140 years before.

The liquor interests then took the issue to the Supreme Court, and the best attorneys their money could secure argued the unconstitutionality of the action taken by the people. On June 8, 1920, the Supreme Court of the United States by a unanimous decision upheld the validity of the amendment and the enforcing code.

Since then there has been no backward step. Of the 33 States which had gone dry by their own action, not one has shown any desire to repeal the law. In 1920 the people elected a Congress more overwhelmingly in favor of prohibition than the one that submitted the amendment or passed the Volstead law. That Congress passed the antibeer law to prevent the use of beer as a medicine.

Ohio, while her soldiers were in France, gave a majority of 28,759 in favor of prohibition. Ohio, after her soldiers had returned, increased that majority to 200,000, proving that the soldiers of America fight for human welfare, not for the liquor traffic.

Mr. Speaker, this great question was solved in American fashion. The battle was fought over a period which covered the entire history of the Nation. No unjust advantage was taken. The liquor traffic was intrenched in power, with vast money chests, with newspapers and paid orators defending their interests.

Every argument that could be used by the ingenuity of the human mind to bolster their cause was brought forward. The liquor interests stole the livery of patriotism in which to serve treason. Prohibition was denounced as an effort to enslave the American people, as "prejudice, bigotry, hate, and tyranny." It was described as a "dictatorship over tastes and appetites" and as an iniquitous assault upon industries long legalized.

Their arguments failed to stand the test. They said they paid great sums in taxes, when every dollar they paid in required twenty-five more to take care of the fruits of their traffic. They went down before scientific research and economic truth, proving that alcoholic liquor injures business, morals, health, and happiness. Then the liquor interests reveled in debauchery and corruption. They bought and sold voters and public officials. They cracked the whip over every aspirant for office. They manipulated the ballot and robbed the ballot box.

In spite of all their power and unscrupulous use of dishonest and despicable tactics they failed. In a fight where all the odds were on their side they were overthrown and beaten.

DELIBERATE DECISION OF PEOPLE.

The American people called the liquor traffic to the bar of public opinion and calmly and deliberately decreed its destruction. It met its doom because of its stealth and secrecy; its deeds of darkness and its sins against the light; its hidden alliance with every force of evil and its bitter opposition to every force of decency; its partnership with pollution and its devotion to depravity; its friendship for every miscreant and its enmity to every friend of sobriety and sanity.

It was ordered destroyed because of its crimes of blood and brutality; its maimings and its murders; its suicides and sepulchers; its pains and poverty; its disease and degeneracy; its insanity and imbecility; its wrecked homes and broken hearts and ruined lives.

It was ordered destroyed because of its treason to free government; its attempted overthrow of democracy and establishment of despotism; its lawlessness in lawmaking; its jungle attacks upon the judiciary; and its ambushed assaults upon honest executives.

By every possible standard of judgment the prohibition amendment and the laws carrying it into effect are sacred enactments of the American people. They are the law of the land, written by greater majorities than any law in American history.

That intoxicating liquor shall not be manufactured and sold in this country is the supreme law of the land. Reverence for that law is the sacred duty of every American citizen. A patriotic citizen is not bound to praise it but he is bound to obey it. He may believe it unwise and is at liberty to urge its repeal, but he must not violate it.

I saw General Foch, supreme commander of the allied armies, in the midst of his fellow officers at the time of the great Chateau-Thierry drive of July, 1918. His commands were obeyed by more soldiers than any other conqueror in the

world's history. Confident but careful, efficient and brilliant, he was a figure calculated to arouse the wildest enthusiasm. I saw General Diaz, commander in chief of the Italian Armies, as in the presence of his King he pinned decorations on the breasts of valiant warriors of his country. He and his men had just turned a disastrous defeat into glorious victory and were preparing to strike their last crushing blow against the armies of the Hapsburg Empire. Viewed under such circumstances, Generals Foch and Diaz seemed almost supermen, giants of power and great in achievement. They were great then, but they were greater still when they declared on their arrival into this country some months ago that they had brought no liquors with them and that they proposed to obey American prohibition laws while they remained in America. Over there they served as examples for conquerors who wield the thunderbolts of war and destruction. Over here they served as examples for reverence and respect for civil law, for the obedience to the express will of the Nation, without which there must be anarchy and the downfall of all government.

You may have your own opinion, but for my part I hail these men greater when they cheerfully obeyed America's law while here as America's guests than when they had power to advance or stay the march of mighty armies of fighting men.

But it is a notorious fact that this law is being scorned by many persons in America. Quantities of liquor are being made, transported, and sold. Unholy fortunes are being accumulated by criminals. With lawless spirit certain groups of men are brazenly defying the law.

VIOLATION NO REASON FOR REPEAL.

The enemies of the eighteenth amendment and the enforcement laws declare that violations are evidence that the laws should be revoked. Since when has it been American policy to repeal laws because criminals violate them? Such an argument means that the laws against murder, theft, and all other crimes should be erased from the statute books, simply because they are defied by criminals.

Every sane man knew when the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead law were enacted that there would be violations. Those laws dealt with a vast, nation-wide organization which always and everywhere scorned the laws enacted to curb its evils. This organized traffic held sway for many years and it controlled vast sums of money.

That liquor has been the source of most of our crime decisions of our courts assert in the strongest language. The Supreme Court of the United States, in Crowley *v.* Christensen (137 U. S. Rep. 86), says:

> The statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor saloons than to any other source.

Again, Chief Justice Coleridge, of England, has said:

> Nine-tenths of all the criminals that come before the courts are made criminals by the saloon. If we could make England sober, we could shut up nine-tenths of her prisons.

In Beebe *v.* State (6 Ind. Sup. Ct. p. 542) we read:

> Drunkenness produces from four-fifths to nine-tenths of all the crime committed. Its tendency is to destroy the peace, safety, and well-being of the people.

No; the defiance of an outlawed traffic is not a reason for the repeal of the law but rather an added reason for its complete enforcement. Five years ago the fight was for a great moral principle. To-day it is for the grandest political principle in the world—the principle that all political power is vested in the people; that under our flag the citizenship, working through orderly procedure, must rule.

Having submitted to evil power until a fair victory was won, the advocates of majority rule do not propose to sit supinely by while liquor-worshipping enemies of law and order carry out their purpose to make the American people not rulers but victims, not citizens but subjects.

IS MORE LIQUOR BEING CONSUMED?

Then the foes of prohibition declare that it is a failure because as much liquor is being sold as ever before. They could secure conclusive answer to this statement by interviewing the distillers and warehouse receipt owners, who still have some 30,000,000 gallons of whisky in their warehouses.

They are shedding copious tears because the withdrawals from these bonded warehouses of spirituous liquors have been reduced from 133,000,000 gallons per year before prohibition to about 2,000,000 gallons this year under prohibition. Here are the statistics from the public records about the reduction in the manufacture and distribution of beverage intoxicants:

Production of spirits, excluding alcohol but including brandy, reduced from 98,517,252 gallons in 1914 to 1,631,056 gallons in 1922.

Importation of spirits, all kinds, reduced from 4,220,670 gallons in 1914 to 280,000 gallons in 1922 (estimated).

Tax-paid spirits withdrawn, excluding alcohol but including brandy, reduced from 80,531,942 gallons in 1914 to 2,790,875 gallons in 1922, and this not for beverage use.

Spirits in bond, including brandy but not alcohol, reduced from 284,406,699 gallons in 1914 to 38,924,246 gallons in 1922.

Alcohol withdrawn, tax-paid, reduced from 58,775,333 gallons in 1914 to 16,391,489 gallons in 1922.

Beverage spirits, including part of alcohol used for beverage purposes, reduced from 105,500,000 gallons in 1914 to nil in 1922.

Beer, produced and imported, was reduced from 2,057,000,000 gallons in 1914 to nil in 1922.

WHAT EFFECT ON CRIME?

There have been foes of prohibition who asserted that the adoption of this great moral reform has increased crime.

With the closing of the swinging portals of the saloon the number of arrests for drunkenness, misdemeanors, and crimes were reduced in city after city of the country. From 5,068 arrests per 100,000 of population in Massachusetts in 1917 the ratio fell to 3,872 in 1921. In Boston the ratio of arrests for drunkenness fell from 100.2 per 100,000 in 1917 to 49.2 in 1922, in spite of the fact that the latter year saw all persons visibly under the influence of liquor arrested, while in the former year only those unable to care for themselves were taken in charge. Montana found her number of murders decrease 45 per cent in the average of the four dry years compared with the previous four wet years, while in the same periods burglaries decreased 32 per cent and robberies 57 per cent. Chicago and Cook County, Ill., found 43 per cent fewer murders reported in 1922 than in 1917, 22 per cent fewer burglaries, and 12 per cent fewer robberies. State after State might be cited to the same effect.

Some time ago I sent a letter to the chiefs of police in all the cities of Pennsylvania having a population of 25,000 and over. I received answers from a large number of them giving fact, not fiction.

Here are a few examples: In Allentown during 1917, 536 persons were arrested for drunkenness and disorderly conduct; in 1921 the number was 135.

In Reading there were 839 arrests on such charges in 1917 and 487 in 1921.

In Norristown there were 322 in 1917 and 96 in 1921.

In Williamsport there were 1,167 in 1917 and 287 in 1921.

In New Castle there were 2,526 in 1917 and 637 in 1921.

In Pittsburgh there were 38,887 in 1917 and 16,990 in 1921.

In all the cities in Pennsylvania there was a decrease of 60 per cent in such crimes between the last wet year and the first dry year. That is the fact instead of booze propaganda.

FACTS ON DRUG ADDICTION.

We have further been informed that the drinker, denied his alcohol, turns to drugs to obtain the excitement which is missing from nonintoxicating drinks, and that we are making a nation of drug addicts. The only trouble with the theory is that there are no facts to support it. Col. O. G. Forrer, administrative assistant in the narcotic division under Chief L. G. Nutt, who is compiling data relating to the use of drugs, arrests, convictions, and so forth, firmly opposes the idea that prohibition has resulted in an increase of addicts.

The truth is—

Says Colonel Forrer—

> that victims of the drug habit practically in every instance are young men and women, often in their teens. Rarely are they alcoholics. The difference between an alcoholic and a drug addict is that the alcoholic after a spree is usually sorry and repentant—experiences a period of reform. The drug addict has no such experience. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that there has been an increase of addicts, I attribute the condition to reaction from the strain and abnormal condition of humanity caused by the World War. Environments were changed; boys and girls were taken from quiet homes, from the simple life, and thrown into a strenuous whirl of excitement, receiving unusual salaries and wages, and following the armistice there has been inevitable reaction, and in striving to attain normalcy the weak, following the line of least resistance, have resorted to drugs which restore to a marked degree desired excitement.

Dr. Woods Hutchinson, the health expert, speaking on this same question, says:

> We happen to be in an unusually favorable position to get at the facts of this problem because of the Harrison narcotic law, requiring rigid recording and reporting of all narcotic drugs prescribed or sold. The first six months went by without any change in either the number of drug addicts or the amount of narcotics consumed (after advent of prohibition). This was explained by the supposition that all habitual users of alcohol to excess had been warned so far in advance that they had been able to lay in private stocks. But a year passed with still no change and finally it dawned upon us that the cutting off of alcohol had not made the slightest increase in the number of so-called dope fiends.

THAT DANGER TO THE HOME.

Then they lift their hands in holy horror over "search and seizure." They denounce the antiliquor selling laws on the ground that they mean violation of the fourth amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees the right of every citizen to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures.

These dealers in illicit liquor are indeed tenderly concerned for the home. Given their way they would send a debasing and destroying force into every home in the land. They would ruin happy households and put out the hearth fires in countless

homes. They would send beloved sons to prison and gallows and the daughters to the streets and brothel.

There never was greater hypocrisy than this bootleggers' chorus about the rights of Americans to be secure in their homes. The enforcement law and the antibeer bill expressly declare that no home shall be entered by enforcement officers without a search warrant. It does permit the search of outhouses and automobiles, but even the most tender-hearted bootlegger would hardly hold that a booze garage or a whisky truck should be wrapped in the sanctity of the home.

Back of the arguments which seek to delude unthinking people into a fear that their homes are in peril stand the interests which wrought more destruction to the homes of America than anything else in our history—the outlaw liquor traffic. American homes will be secure only when these home destroyers themselves are made helpless to work evil.

THE COST OF PROHIBITION.

Then we hear anguished cries about the cost of enforcing prohibition. What are the facts? For the fiscal year the prohibition-enforcement unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue received $6,750,000 out of the Treasury of the United States.

Commissioner Haynes has issued the following statement of the amounts deposited in the Treasury during the fiscal year of 1922 incident to the enforcement of the national prohibition laws:

Federal court fines and forfeitures collected during the year, not including collections in the Territory of Alaska	$2,824,685.01
Amounts paid in compromise	1,739,622.80
Amounts collected in taxes and penalties, not including taxes on legal manufacture and legal sale of intoxicating liquors	239,964.14
Total	4,804,271.95
Approximate amount of bonds on which action has been taken toward forfeiture	3,000,000.00

The fact is that the enforcement, as far as the prohibition unit is concerned, has paid for itself. And the further appropriation to the Department of Justice has been more than covered by the direct returns from convicted lawbreakers. Happy, indeed, would we be if every violator of American laws paid the cost of his detection and conviction as does the criminal who breaks prohibition laws.

But above and beyond that fact it is true that if America spent not seven but seventy millions and prevented the toll levied upon the taxpayers for taking care of the finished product of the liquor traffic, it would be the most efficient economy in the history of governmental administration.

LIBERTY WAS NEVER LICENSE.

Then there are the cries of "personal liberty" which were so much in evidence when this great battle was being fought out before the American people. The people deliberately decided that they would suffer some curtailment of personal liberty in order to serve the common good.

If these latter-day advocates of personal liberty were true to their vaunted philosophy they would wage war against all pure-food legislation which interferes with the personal liberty of manufacturers. They would cry out against health and quarantine regulations which hamper the liberty of persons suffering from contagious diseases. They would call for the abolition of restrictions upon the sale of dope and the operation of brothels. They would enlist in a crusade upon all the limitations upon license which are necessary if civilization is to endure.

They dare not do this. They demand personal liberty only for the maker, seller, and user of intoxicants. And the people of America took that demand into account and refused it. They decided in favor of the personal liberty of the hosts of sufferers from alcohol, of the pauperized families of drunkards, of the mothers and children who never had a fair chance, of the victims of a greedy system which coined blood into dollars.

THE NEW NULLIFICATION THEORY.

There have been many schemes offered by wet advocates to overthrow the eighteenth amendment. There is one which seeks to levy a tax upon beer and use it for a soldiers' bonus. Then there was the plan of local-option districts based on congressional districts. The latest seems to be the repeal of the Volstead law and the permission to the individual States to deal with the whole question.

What does that policy mean? Simply the nullification of the Constitution. If it were carried out, it would mean that we would be exactly where we were before the eighteenth amendment was adopted. That is carrying State rights to a point never advocated by John C. Calhoun.

No; this is a national problem and must be solved by national measures. We dealt with it by piecemeal and fractions until it became apparent to every sane man that only through national action could the liquor traffic be made helpless to harm America.

Those who oppose prohibition should be honest. They should seek the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. Of course, they know that when they could not control 13 legislative bodies in all the Nation it is difficult to imagine that they can control 72 for the repeal.

But they should understand that what they can not do directly and out in the open they will not be permitted to do indirectly and through stealth and secrecy.

THE DANGER IN APPLE JUICE.

There are those who shed tears over the alleged inconsistency in the law which permits the farmer to have his cider while the city man can not have his beer. They do not seem to know that Congress can not legalize the manufacture of liquor which is in fact intoxicating. Of course, the evil aimed at was a commercialized liquor traffic which threatened the life of the Nation. Thus far the makers of fruit-juice wines have not organized into associations opposed to prohibition because of their profits.

It was understood when the law was passed that home producers of fruit juices and cider have no delicate apparatus to determine the one-half of 1 per cent alcoholic content, but that it can be easily determined when such beverages are intoxicating in fact. There was also no desire to prevent farmers and fruit growers from conserving their fruit for the manufacture of cider, which may be used as a beverage as long as it is not intoxicating in fact, after which time it may be permitted to develop through the process of fermentation into vinegar.

PROPAGANDA THAT NEEDED PROP.

Never was there such a campaign of misrepresentation against any governmental action as in the case of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead law. And never was the weakness of arguments so apparent. The foes of prohibition said that immigrants would not seek our shores with such illiberal laws in force. Yet we see whole communities seeking to enter our gates, and it becomes necessary to pass a 3 per cent quota law in order to cut down the numbers admitted.

They said the outlawing of the saloon would bring panic to the cities, yet the old-time barrooms have gone and their places are taken by legitimate places of business which add to the comfort of all the people.

They said that prohibition was unconstitutional, and that no court would ever declare such a departure from the spirit of our Government to be valid law. Yet the Supreme Court by a unanimous vote upheld its constitutionality and declared it an integral part of our organic law.

They said prohibition would not prohibit, and now they say that the law as enforced is tyrannical and means overriding the rights and liberties of the people.

THE PEOPLE WILL RULE.

To-day, with prohibition as a part of American policy, we know the worth of these alleged arguments. The people are more determined than ever to have their will enforced, and they have elected five dry Congresses in succession to show any doubting Thomas where they stand. They propose to see that sympathizers with booze are not made enforcement agents. They propose to deal with men in high places which presume high character when they join the regiment of rebellion and incite violation of law. They propose to do everything necessary to secure the success of this great reform to which they deliberately set their hands and their hearts.

Mr. Speaker, this whole question is concerned with the fundamentals of self-government. Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, elected on a platform whose first and foremost plank was enforcement of the prohibition laws, has expressed the issue in splendid fashion. It would be well if every public official and every American joined with him in the following declaration made in his inaugural address when he assumed the duties of chief executive of the Keystone Commonwealth:

Pennsylvania must either control the criminals who are openly breaking the law or be controlled by them. With all good citizens, I believe that this Commonwealth is greater and more powerful than any band of lawbreakers whatsoever, and I intend to act on that belief.

This administration will be dry. The executive mansion will be dry, and the personal practice of the governor and his family will continue to be dry, in conformity to the spirit and letter of the eighteenth amendment.

The law is the law. It is the foundation of order, safety, and prosperity, and of the Commonwealth itself. Every State official takes oath and is in honor bound to obey it. I shall expect and demand from every public servant appointed by me or subject to removal by

me, from the highest to the lowest, entire and ungrudging obedience to the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead law. They are part of the law of the land.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I invite attention to some railroad problems.

During the Sixty-fifth, Sixty-sixth, and Sixty-seventh Congresses transportation problems have demanded most careful investigation. In the study of the problems handled in those Congresses it is proper to take into account some significant facts of history.

In 1912 American railroads furnished to the people of this country the best transportation service at the lowest rates ever enjoyed by the people of the United States. That achievement followed as the direct result of Republican legislation and administration extending over a period of nearly 50 years.

Thirty or forty years ago the railroads of the country were left largely to exercise their own choice as to rates of transportation and also the kind of service they would render. During a long period of time they levied and collected the highest rates that the traffic would bear and still live. In other words, they fed the horse just enough to keep him alive and in sufficient strength to pull another load. The rule of rate making in those days exacted all that the traffic would bear. The roads were domineering toward the public and arrogant toward their employees. The railroad managers manifested a spirit that assumed the right to command and the duty of the rest of the world to obey and pay the bill. A long-suffering public, however, witnessed the appearance of labor organizations that finally subdued the arrogance of employers to employees and enforced a more equitable reckoning for the rewards of their toil.

Then the public awoke from its dream of years to the realization that it was still the paymaster for all the financial obligations that were being imposed upon them through quarrels between employers and employees and all sorts of exactions in rates. A reckoning began and the interstate commerce act of 1887 was written, and the Interstate Commerce Commission created under that act to administer rules of equity and justice between the transportation agencies on the one hand and the public on the other. That act and all similar acts are based upon the fundamental proposition that the public is a partner in this great transportation question, and should be an active partner and not forever a silent partner. Various modifications of that act have followed from time to time in attempts to enforce this rule of equity and justice. Note the result in 1912, as stated above, namely, the people of the United States were then enjoying the best transportation service at the lowest rates that have ever appeared in the history of the American Republic.

The Republican Party was retired from power in both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government in 1913 and the Democratic Party then took control. Note the marked contrast. After eight years of Democratic rule in the White House and an almost equal period of rule in Congress, the transportation rates levied upon the people of the United States in 1920 were the highest and most exacting ever known in the history of the country. From 1913 to 1921 transportation charges gradually advanced to their highest peak under Democratic legislation and administration. In 1914 the World War broke out, and gradually events carried our country nearer and still nearer the verge of the conflict, and the slogan of 1916, "He kept us out of war," really helped to hasten our entrance into the war. It not only hastened that event, but it withheld preparation in the meantime and left us almost helpless at the opening of our part in the contest. Note in this connection, if you please, the important bearing of war preparations and plans upon methods and theories of transportation.

In time of war the railroads must of necessity be subject to the immediate orders of the Government. In times of peace, however, in a republic, the transportation problems are handled more largely as individual enterprises. Germany, for instance, had developed a centralizing system of transportation under the control of the empire. Thus you see the nation that is prompted by the war spirit as its chief purpose will advocate and exercise government control and ownership of railroads, while a republic, the messenger of peace, has no need for such a centralization of the transportation facilities of the country.

August 29, 1916, a Democratic Congress authorized the President of the United States to assume control of the railroads of the country in the event of war. Note the significant fact that President Wilson signed that law while his political supporters were ringing the changes on the campaign slogan, "He kept us out of war." That legislation proves conclusively a concealed purpose that anticipated our participation in the World War. On the 28th of December, 1917, President Wilson issued a proclamation taking over the railroads and appointing the crown prince, William G. McAdoo, as Director General of Railroads. They claim that the railroads had broken down. It would have been nearer the truth, in fact, the actual truth, if they had said that the railroads had been swamped by the War and Navy Departments through priority orders for shipment of goods that would not be required for six months to a year or more. How could an independent railroad management conduct business while the clerks at their desks in the War and Navy Departments were using rubber stamps to issue priority orders without any centralizing agency of either department to decide whether it should be a priority order of not? Nevertheless, the President assumed control of the roads under that law, and in the proclamation designated the crown prince as director general. President Wilson said the roads should be guaranteed a net income equivalent, as nearly as possible, to the average annual net earnings for the test period of three years ending June 30, 1917. Upon that principle the Federal control act of March 21, 1918, was based. Thus the roads taken over by the Government were guaranteed rates showing an average net income annually of 11.27 per cent. That penalty was levied upon the people of the United States in time of war by the Wilson administration.

After the crown prince took charge he increased salaries promiscuously so that a car tester with only a week's experience on the railroad received larger salary than a conductor on a passenger train who had served 15 years to learn the business. The conductor with 15 years' experience as a railroad man was compelled to take into his train any car that that tester or inspector might assign to him. Crews were added at little stations where none had appeared before. The force in the little shops all over the country was increased from one-fourth to three-fourths, and sometimes doubled. Note the pay roll in its increase in the total. That will tell you the story in significant figures, with gross discriminations against some of the best employees in the service.

During the period of the war the management of the director general was largely one of distinct favoritism. When we came to strike the balance and pay the bills we found that he had cost the country over $2,000,000,000 in railroad subsidies on rates and a billion and a quarter more for equipment, with very slow payment for the return of anything.

This country has never seen, and I hope it never will again see, such a period of railroad debauchery as we had under the rule of the crown prince.

Those who have followed the history of those transactions with thoughtful care realize the unnecessary financial embarrassment that has been forced upon the country. The waste and extravagance of the McAdoo administration of the railroads forced higher rates upon the shippers of the country and much heavier burdens upon the taxpayers to supply the revenues required to pay the subsidies thus imposed upon the Government in behalf of the railroads.

It would be well worth while to study the Federal control act of March 21, 1918, which was urged upon Congress by President Wilson and Director General McAdoo. That act levied upon the taxpayers of the country subsidies in the form of guaranteed rates. They have drawn out of the National Treasury over $2,000,000,000, with some claims yet to be settled and paid. The plan which they adopted in that act did not even contemplate the repayment of a single dollar of the billions paid in subsidies to the roads.

In view of this record, why should our Democratic friends ever argue against subsidies for any purpose in any amount? That Federal control act is the crowning piece of subsidy legislation. It involves all of the evil influences that have advanced railroad rates to their highest point, and our Democratic opponents are directly responsible for it. Under the Harding administration efforts have been made to reduce those rates, and reductions have been made to the extent of about 18 per cent. While I think much larger reduction ought to be made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, it is gratifying to note the fact that under Republican rule some reduction has been made and no increases have been made in any direction.

TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1920.

The transportation act of 1920 abolished the guaranteed rates adopted by the Wilson administration through the Federal control act of March 21, 1918. Thus the taxpayers of the country were emancipated from all payment of subsidies to the railroads after the 1st day of September, 1920. It should be distinctly remembered that the transportation act of 1920 did not increase rates in any way, but it did abolish the principle of subsidies to railroads. It simply permitted the continuance of guaranteed rates under the Federal control act until September 1, 1920. That action was necessary to prevent a financial collapse and panic throughout the country and also to prevent universal

strikes. The McAdoo administration of the railroads had forced upon the country demoralization, which compelled the Government to buy its way out.

You readily recall the fact that President Wilson announced in advance that he would return the roads to their owners on the 1st day of January, 1920, and subsequently issued a proclamation returning the roads on the 1st of March, 1920.

The transportation act of 1920 became effective on the 28th day of February, 1920. These dates are quite significant when studied in the light of the history of these transactions. Some have argued, apparently for political reasons, that no legislation was needed for the return of the roads. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the legal authorities of the Government, have held to the contrary, and asserted that widespread disaster to all enterprises of the country would have resulted if some such legislation had not been enacted. It was necessary to make legislative provision for the proper legal observance of the financial obligations levied upon the National Treasury by the Federal control act. This fact must be taken into account in securing a correct understanding of the real purpose of passing the transportation act of 1920.

We have heard much in regard to watered stock. This act is the first and only act that prohibits the issuance of watered stock. The increase in rates, unwarranted in some particulars, was made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, whose members had been appointed by President Wilson. The commission acted upon the legal authority delegated to it by statutes enacted prior to the war. It still maintains that authority, and has full power to reduce railroad rates upon proper showings, without any regard to existing provisions of the transportation act of 1920. Many people have made a similar mistake in citing that act as the source of authority on the part of the commission to change railroad rates. It is true that section 15a did prescribe a rule for rate making whereby 6 per cent was fixed as the maximum rate. That section was incorporated into the law by means of a Senate amendment, which I opposed in the House. It should never have been adopted. Nevertheless, the fact that the rule for rate making 6 per cent maximum expired on the 1st day of March, 1922. Its terms that still remain in force should be repealed so that the country may understand that there is not anything left in the law that was carried in that section.

The provision of that act restricting the powers of the State railway commissions and correspondingly enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission should be repealed, so that the authority of the State commissions may be fully restored to them in the adjustment and conduct of intrastate transportation.

All provisions of the act of 1920 that restrict in any way the operation of competitive rates should be repealed, and only the provisions that are necessary to carry out the terms of the contracts made under the Federal control act of 1918 should be retained.

NO GUARANTY.

Contrary to the view asserted by many, that section—15a—does not guarantee rates. That section does not make railroad property a favored class of property by guaranteeing a fixed return upon it. This is evidenced by the fact that during the year 1920 the net earnings on the rates in question were only about 3.3 per cent on the valuation fixed by the commission in 1922. If there had been a legal guaranty of 5½ per cent or 6 per cent, the roads would surely have claimed it and collected it.

Not one cent, however, has ever been collected as a guaranty under that section.

Moreover, it is impossible to collect a guaranty under that provision of law for the simple reason that it does not give any pledge for a fixed return.

Five and a half or six per cent was indicated as the maximum beyond which the roads should not go with an average net return. It is unfortunate that many newspapers and public speakers have advised the public erroneously in regard to this provision of law. While I voted against it originally, and would vote for its repeal now, it is only fair to state the facts in order that the public may understand the true situation.

It is equally unfortunate that many newspapers and public speakers have asserted that the valuation of railroad property has been fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission for rate-making purposes at a valuation of $30,000,000,000. That statement is wholly incorrect. Anyone who desires to obtain reliable information can ascertain the fact that the valuation fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the act of 1913 is $18,900,000,000. In this connection it is also appropriate to note the fact that the physical valuation of railroad property has not been made under the transportation act of 1920. That work was authorized and directed by the La Follette Act of 1913. Many provisions of the transportation act of 1920 have run their course, served their purpose, and expired under their own limitations. In view of this fact it would be wise to draft and pass a bill repealing that act and securing the retention and perpetuation of all of its provisions that should be kept in force in carrying into effect the unexecuted provisions of the Federal control act of March 21, 1918.

Of course the provisions of the transportation act of 1920 prohibiting the issuance of watered stock should be retained and made permanent law.

This course of action would clarify railroad legislation to such an extent that the public could readily grasp the situation under existing law.

The authority and power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to increase and decrease rates on interstate transportation existed before the transportation act of 1920 was passed, and the commission has full authority to proceed on matters of that kind without regard to that act.

I regret that we were not able to secure the passage of the Sweet or the Capper bill in this Congress for the repeal of section 15a and for the restoration of the authority and powers of the State railway commissions and also the revival of competitive rates among railroads.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following summary of the achievements of the Sixty-seventh Congress by Hon. JAMES E. WATSON, United States Senator from Indiana:

SUMMARY OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS.

(By JAMES E. WATSON, United States Senator from Indiana.)

In commenting upon the steady and consistent improvement of domestic finance and business in the face of conditions in Europe, the financial column of the New York Times a few days ago said:

"The further advance in stocks is quite unmistakably a reflection not of European conditions but of the financial and industrial situation at home. Whether the market could have moved as it did if the financial mind had taken seriously the predictions of disaster in continental Europe is another question, but the actual fact is that the investment market has to all intents forgotten Europe. It has its eye on the weather signs of business conditions in this country and moves in response to what it sees. These conditions are somewhat remarkable."

In commenting upon the same phenomenon, a noted author and writer on economic subjects says:

"The explanation, as repeatedly pointed out, is that trade conditions in America are so sound and promising that they have outweighed in the minds of security holders every other consideration."

Undoubtedly conditions in America are sound and promising. Never in the history of American industry has there been such production. Basic industries are running capacity or nearly so. Running capacity to-day means an output of from 50 to 100 per cent greater than in pre-war times. This is because during the war practically every basic industry increased its capacity at least 50 per cent. Some doubled their capacity. To illustrate: If an industry increased its capacity 50 per cent during the war and is now running 80 per cent of its capacity, it is producing 120 per cent more goods now than it did in pre-war times.

EVIDENCES OF PROSPERITY.

The United States Steel Corporation is operating 90 per cent of its capacity. Despite this fact, its unfilled orders to-day are approximately 7,000,000 tons, the largest on record since the war.

Pig iron production for the month of January was within a few thousand tons of its highest record of September, 1918. In both the iron and steel industry deliveries are no longer promised until the last quarter of this year.

The number of active textile spindles is the greatest known in the history of the textile industry in America and the purchase of cotton by domestic textiles, nothwithstanding the high price, has never been equaled.

The total motor vehicle production for 1922 was 65 per cent greater than the previous year and was the greatest in the history of the automotive industry.

The year 1922 was the greatest building year for many years, but according to the most conservative estimates the current year will far eclipse 1922. Contracts already made for construction to begin during the present year exceed $5,116,600,000.

Car loadings during 1922 were the greatest in the history of American railroads.

LABOR FULLY EMPLOYED.

These are some of the outstanding features of the prosperous activity in our underlying industries. This activity is accurately reflected in the labor situation. It is a matter of common information that except among those with whom loafing is chronic and by choice, there is no man to-day who can not find a job at good wages. In many of our industries and trades, labor is so scarce that wages are equal to those of war times.

The financial world reflects the activity in industry and transportation. According to the last report of the Comptroller of the Currency the resources of the national banks in each of the 12 Federal reserve districts showed a consistent and substantial increase during the year. The aggregate increase in the resources was over $2,000,000,000, and the aggregate increase in the deposits of the national banks during the year was $2,345,379,000. The report of savings banks and savings departments of banks and trust companies show an increase during the calendar year of $1,500,000,000 in deposits and an increase of 2,300,000 in the number of depositors.

RETAIL BUSINESS IMPROVING.

The retail business of the country returned to normally prosperous conditions. Without exception in any section of the United States the holiday business transacted by the retail merchants last December was the greatest since 1919. Reports of such organizations as mail-order houses, which serve a wide and varied trade, show tremendous increases of business during the last year. A typical report was that made by a large Chicago mail-order house showing the increase in gross sales to have been 21.6 per cent greater than in 1921.

The New York Times says these conditions are remarkable. They are, but not because of anything per se. There have been previous times in the history of this country when conditions were quite as prosperous and industries were relatively quite as active. The present conditions are remarkable for two reasons: First, they exist only in the United States, and second, their existence is in high contrast to conditions two years ago.

FROM "HARD TIMES" TO "GOOD TIMES."

It is not difficult to recall the conditions of two years ago. Briefly, hard times prevailed. Scarcely an industry but was seriously and adversely affected. Many were completely closed. Between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 workers employed under normal conditions were in enforced idleness, which brought distress not only to them but because of their crippled buying power brought distress to business. Depositors were drawing their savings from banks to meet their living expenses. Interest rates on gilt-edge loans were 7½ per cent. Liberty and Victory bonds were selling at far below par, averaging about $85. Agricultural sections faced bankruptcy and thousands of individual farmers were going bankrupt. Finance and commerce lacked confidence and feared what the future might bring forth. All lines of industry and business were contracting rather than expanding, although at that very time the shelves of retail stores were empty and there was a scarcity of all lines of manufactured goods as well as a famine in buildings in every city.

For a nation to swing in 24 months from such industrial, agricultural, and business depression to such prodigious activity and prosperity as exists to-day is really remarkable under any circumstances. It is all the more so in view of the very patent fact that while this radical change for the better has been going on in this country conditions have not improved in Europe. In many ways they have grown worse in the past two years. With the exception of the British pound, values of currency in nearly all European countries are lower to-day than they were when the armistice was signed, which clearly shows a lack of ability upon their part to handle the problems of peace. This fact clearly demonstrates that the improvement in conditions in the United States was not in common with any world-wide improvement. Quite the contrary. It was made in face of very adverse world-wide influences.

THE IMPROVEMENT IS NO ACCIDENT.

Partisan critics of the Republican administration try to explain this remarkable improvement in every way except the true way. It is due to two years of Republican administration and legislation.

The business man who two years ago was living from hand to mouth, the farmer who was facing bankruptcy, the workingman who was walking the streets, the manufacturer who was closing down his plant, the banker and the investor who was facing the future with timidity and fear, may or may not realize that the changed conditions under which they are working and doing business to-day are due to the acts of a Republican Congress, but such is the fact.

These acts have, to classify them largely, cut down public expenses and public taxes, introduced economy in public administration, given timely assistance to agriculture, and afforded needed protection to industry and the wage earner. None of this legislation was particularly spectacular. In fact, there is nothing spectacular in a program of economy. It is the spendthrift who causes a sensation.

The Sixty-seventh Congress, which has just adjourned, first assembled on April 11, 1921, when it was called in special session by President Harding. It has been practically in continuous session ever since. During that time it has enacted constructive legislation which in quantity and quality has not been equaled by any previous Congress in the history of the United States. To meet the critical conditions which existed when it came into power four laws were speedily enacted—the Budget law, the emergency tariff, the revitalization of the War Finance Corporation, and the restrictive immigration act. To review them briefly, seriatim:

CREATION OF THE BUDGET.

Without doubt the creation of a budgetary system of handling public expenditures was the greatest piece of constructive fiscal legislation since the Civil War. No problem of government in any nation to-day compares in importance to that of reduction of public expenditures and taxes. Burdens of unnecessary taxation are at the bottom of much of the popular unrest and practically all of the commercial paralysis that prevails in nearly every country. It is not accident that the United States is the one exception to this world-wide condition. That it has accomplished the task of making both ends meet in the routine administration of its financial affairs is due to its Budget system. All the credit for the existence of this system must be given to the Republican Congress.

It is a matter of record that the Republican Congress elected in 1918 enacted a Budget law practically identical with the one now in force and operation only to have it vetoed by President Wilson. This clearly shows the intent and purpose of the Republican Congress to place the Government's financial affairs upon a businesslike basis. One of the first acts of the Sixty-seventh Congress in special session was the reenactment of the Budget law which created the Budget Bureau and endowed it with all the powers under which it has so successfully functioned.

Not only was this done but the machinery of the House was reorganized in order that there might be the utmost cooperation with the Budget Bureau in handling appropriation bills. This act of the House was purely voluntary. Furthermore, the House Committee on Appropriations, to which all Budget Bureau estimates are submitted, has made it an unwritten law that the estimates are to be taken as the maximum of appropriations. These facts clearly prove the desire and purpose of the Congress to assist in every possible way to balance the books of the Government and get public expenditures back to a basis consistent with rigid public economy. Further proof of this is evidenced by the fact that the total appropriations of the first session of the Sixty-seventh Congress were $172,523,046, or 7 per cent, less than the Budget Bureau asked for.

AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS IMPROVED.

It is no exaggeration to state that agricultural conditions were worse when the Republican administration took charge in March, 1921, than they had been for at least a generation. In many sections they were worse than at any time in their history. National disaster was imminent, because agriculture is a basic industry which can not face bankruptcy without involving all the Nation.

The farmer is the Nation's greatest producer. In addition to being America's greatest producer he is the Nation's greatest consumer—the greatest single buyer in America of manufactured products. The farming class is the largest consumer of steel with the exception of the railroads, the largest buyer of textile goods, the largest buyer of leather goods, the consumer of 46 per cent of all wool products, the purchaser of 30 per cent of all motor vehicles, the largest shipper of freight. All told, the farming class furnishes 40 per cent of the buying power of America. In view of this it was necessary for the protection and salvation for the rest of the country that agricultural classes be given immediate relief. There was no class legislation about such action.

MEASURES FOR FARMERS' RELIEF.

In order to afford agricultural sections immediate relief, the War Finance Corporation was revitalized and its powers extended so that it could make loans for agricultural and livestock purposes out of a revolving fund of $1,000,000,000. Within a few weeks from the time Congress did this the War Finance Corporation was approving loans at the rate of $1,500,000 a

day. During the first year of its operations it made loans at the average rate of $1,000,000 a day, including Sundays. There is not the least doubt but that this speedy work upon the part of the Sixty-seventh Congress saved the agricultural sections of the Nation from bankruptcy, which would have dragged all business and industry with it into a panic of untold proportions and duration.

Another early act of the special session was the passage of the emergency or farmers' tariff. Benefits from this tariff were immediately in evidence. Before the tariff was enacted American farmers were receiving less money in American markets than was being paid in foreign markets for like products. Within 30 days from the time this tariff went into effect the situation was reversed. Prices paid in American markets for American farm products were higher than prices paid for like products in foreign markets. This difference in favor of the American market was consistently maintained throughout the life of the emergency tariff and guaranteed the American farmer much higher prices for his harvests than he otherwise would have received and stabilized the market prices for all his products.

With the enactment of these two laws, which gave him ample and immediate credit and afforded him protection in his home markets, the American farmer began to climb back toward normal conditions. The return was gradual because his situation was critical. He has not fully recovered yet, but some indication of the improvement of his condition is evidenced by the fact that up to January 1, 1923, he had repaid to the War Finance Corporation 41 per cent of the money loaned him. He is now selling his products at a price above the cost of their production, although the relative buying power of the dollar which he receives for his products is not yet what it should be. His condition has so improved, however, that he is again in the market for the output of American industries.

Agricultural sections of the Nation last year produced from 7 to 15 per cent more motor vehicles than they did in 1921. Merchandisers of all kinds of good in agricultural sections report a vastly increased trade. All this is due to the assistance given the farming classes by Congress. This increased buying upon their part explains in a large measure the resumption of activity in American industry and the reemployment of the millions of idle workmen.

To consummate the effective service rendered the farmer by this Congress, it passed the last two days, after full consideration in both Houses, a combination of the Capper, the Lenroot, and the Strong bills that undoubtedly will place within the reach of the farmers of the country such financial facilities as will enable them further to stabilize their industry by increasing the value of their products and affording better marketing conditions.

The restrictive immigration act was placed upon the books at a time when unemployment was at its height. It was also at a time when the desire to leave the various war-torn countries of Europe was uppermost in the minds of millions of Europeans. Had not Congress enacted the law at the time it did, there is no doubt that the country would have been flooded with hundreds of thousands of immigrants who would have only been added to the army of unemployed and increased the critical problem which confronted both private industry and public government.

FOUR GREAT CONSTRUCTIVE MEASURES.

These four pieces of legislation enacted early in the life of the Sixty-seventh Congress saved the country from a panic and started it on the solid highway back to normalcy. In these four pieces of legislation were embodied the fundamentals of public economy, reduced taxes, restored business confidence, based on a revival of agriculture and industry. Out of all of this developed the present remarkable conditions of industrial and commercial activity and prosperity. The present conditions could not and would not exist had it not been for these four acts of the Sixty-seventh Congress. Could anything be more constructive? Had the Congress which has just adjourned done nothing else, the enactment of these four laws would have entitled it to rank in legislative history as one of the greatest Congresses.

But it did more than this. It supplemented these acts with legislation which accelerated the return of all private enterprise to a condition of prosperous activity and enabled the Government to reduce public expenditures to the lowest possible point consistent with efficiency in public service.

For example, it reduced public taxes $820,000,000 a year, the bulk of which is lifted from the family and the individual of average income. It found the country officially in a state of war with Germany and Austria-Hungary and by joint resolution reestablished peace with those two nations. It created a Debt Refunding Commission to place our foreign loans on a businesslike basis, and it later accepted the report of that commission in relation to the settlement of the debt of Great Britain to this Government. By doing this it insured the repayment of 35 per cent of the foreign loans made by this Government during the World War. This in turn means the reduction of our interest charges on the public debt; means strengthening and stabilizing the value of our Government bonds. It undoubtedly means a further reduction in public taxes.

OTHER SALUTARY MEASURES.

The Congress supplemented the farmers' tariff and the War Finance Corporation act with a series of acts which further strengthened and stabilized agricultural conditions. Among these was the increase of the funds of the Federal farm loan bank in the sum of $25,000,000; the authorization of the formation of cooperative marketing associations; the enactment of the packers and stockyards act for the live-stock interests and the grain futures act for the farmer; it came to the relief of drought-stricken areas in our great Northwest and extended the time of payment due on irrigation and reclamation projects throughout the West.

It enacted the Sweet law which created the Veterans' Bureau, consolidated all Government agencies dealing with ex-service men, and facilitated the work of relieving disabled war veterans. It appropriated for the use of that bureau more money than was appropriated for any other public purpose except the payment of the public debt and interest thereon.

All criticism and charges to the contrary, this Republican Congress has done more for the ex-service man of the United States than has been done for the ex-service man of any other nation or has been done by this country for the veterans of any previous war. The session just adjourned appropriated $428,660,773 for the Veterans' Bureau, beginning July 1 next. This is an increase of $10,606,870 over the appropriations for the current year. These sums, together with previous appropriations for ex-service men, make a total of $2,282,579,011 which has been appropriated and expended, or appropriated for expenditures upon work and relief for ex-service men. All this money has been appropriated by Republican Congresses since the signing of the armistice.

OTHER ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CONGRESS.

It provided for the reorganization of the Philippine financial system and an extension of Philippine credit in order to save those islands from bankruptcy, which they were facing as a result of eight years of government under the Democratic régime.

It extended relief to starving millions of Russia.

To promote our foreign trade, it amended the Edge Act to facilitate the organization of corporations engaged in export business.

It granted liberal aid for public roads.

It reorganized the Indian Bureau and gave long-needed assistance to the Patent Office.

It strengthened the enforcement of the Federal prohibition amendment.

It provided for the creation of more Federal judges and courts in order to relieve the congestion of business and expedite justice.

It created a fact-finding commission to study the coal industry.

It enacted the maternity act asked for by the women of the country to safeguard the welfare of infancy and maternity. In this connection, it appropriated more money for the Labor Department than has ever been appropriated for that department. It was the only department of the Government that received increases in appropriations. Notwithstanding the charges that have been made by Democratic labor leaders that this Congress has been hostile to the interest of wage earners the fact remains that at the last annual convention of the American Federation of Labor the legislative committee of that federation reported that this Congress had enacted 17 laws favorable to labor which were indorsed by the American Federation of Labor's legislative department. The statement of this fact may be found on page 92 of the official report of the proceedings of that convention and gives the official lie to those political demagogues who seek to stir up bitterness and resentment among wage earners against this administration.

A TARIFF FOR PROSPERITY.

One of the most important pieces of legislation placed upon the books by the outgoing Congress was the permanent tariff, which insures industry and agriculture alike protection from destructive tariff competition and guarantees the workingman steady employment at good wage. It is not to be expected that this tariff law will please the free trader or the internation-

alist. It was not enacted for that purpose. America has always prospered under a protective tariff; foreign markets have expanded, and stimulated production has increased competition and resulted in lowering of commodity prices at home. There is every reason to believe the present tariff will result as previous protective tariffs have resulted. Already the operations of the law have refuted the charges made upon the floor of the Congress to the effect that its enactment would destroy our foreign trade and erect a "Chinese wall" around the country that would prevent other nations from trading with us.

Our exports during the months the law has been in force are at the rate that will show a total foreign trade for the year in excess of $1,000,000,000 over the exports of the last fiscal year before the outbreak of the European war, at which time the world was at peace, conditions were normal, and there was upon the statute books the Underwood free-trade tariff. The imports under the present tariff for the month of October—the only month for which complete figures are available—show an increase of nearly 100 per cent over the imports for the month of October in 1921. This clearly shows that this tariff is not a Chinese wall which isolates this country economically from the rest of the world.

A RECORD TO BE PROUD OF.

This is in brief a record of the outstanding accomplishments of the Sixty-seventh Congress. In the face of this record it is manifestly unjust and absurdly untrue to characterize it as a "do-nothing" Congress. In spite of this splendid record the Sixty-seventh Congress was the object of much criticism. It is only natural to rail at Congress. That is the prerogative of a free people. It is always to be expected. A candid analysis of the criticisms justifies the assertion that they came from those who failed to get class or sectional legislation enacted. One may search the record in vain to find where the Congress yielded to the demands for legislation which benefited only one section of the country or only one class of people at the expense of all the country and all the people. One may search the record in vain to find where it enacted any destructive legislation. A prominent critic of Congress recently stated that if its record had been one-half as good as business was there would be no reason to find fault with it. Unfortunately for the critic, his logic is getting the cart before the horse. The truth of the matter is that had this been one-half as bad a Congress as its critics maintained business would not to-day be good. Neither this country nor any other country could have the sound and prosperous conditions that exist to-day in the United States if during the past two years there had been in continuous session a national lawmaking body that had not enacted constructive and helpful legislation. To fully appreciate what the Sixty-seventh Congress did one has only to look back and see how far all lines of business, all private enterprise, public economy, and readjustment have progressed since April 11, 1921. During all that period the Sixty-seventh Congress was in session formulating the policies of the Government and enacting the laws under which both public affairs and private business must be conducted. The proof of the pudding is the eating, and the proof of the wisdom of the Sixty-seventh Congress is in the advancement of the material welfare of this country since it assumed legislative control.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a speech I made to the blind war veterans, together with the introduction of the director, in 8-point type.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SPEECH TO THE BLIND WORLD WAR VETERANS—"HOW A BLIND MAN GOT TO CONGRESS, HOW HE HAS STAYED THERE, AND WHAT HE HAS SEEN THERE."

(By Mr. SCHALL, of Minnesota.)

Mr. Joseph E. Vance, director of the Evergreen School for the Blind, at Baltimore, on the 2d day of March, 1922, introduced Mr. SCHALL as follows:

ADDRESS OF MR. JOSEPH E. VANCE INTRODUCING MR. SCHALL.

I have the honor and pleasure this evening of introducing Congressman THOMAS D. SCHALL, who represents in the House the tenth district of Minnesota, the State from which I hail.

Mr. SCHALL is totally blind, having lost his sight a decade or so ago through an electric shock. I have watched his public career with a great deal of interest for, on the battle ground, I followed closely and minutely his first fight for a seat in Congress. A man of character, ability and brilliancy, self-made and well-made, having earned his own living since a little boy of nine years—a graduate of the school of toil and hard knocks as well as the University of Minnesota, with a degree of good fellowship and democracy as well as A. B. and LL. B. Whatever he is, and I consider him one of the foremost figures of the nation's history to-day, is due to his tenacious will and steadfastness of purpose and courage to fight for the right as he conceives it.

Congressman SCHALL is peculiarly fitted to bring to us to-night a message, not only because he is blind, but because of the phenomenal success he has made of his life, in spite of the seemingly overwhelming handicap in which his environment has placed him. He is a notable example of a man who molds his own environment instead of succumbing to it.

Eight years ago when he first ran for Congress no one of political acumen had the hardihood to dare to think of his success. Without organization, without newspaper support, without money, and little known, single-handed and alone, with the exception of his loyal and brilliant "better three-fourths," as he calls her, who was his guide and adviser, he tackled the job as an Independent Progressive Republican, and he won over both machines of the older parties, strongly entrenched and plentifully nourished with money. His speaking campaign for that election is unequaled, I dare say, anywhere in the world, for number of speeches, endurance, ability, and brilliancy. His clarion voice was heard at every cross-roads and hamlet, for he spoke outdoors, having no money to hire halls, and whoever caught the tones of sincerity was impelled to believe, as did Theodore Roosevelt, when he said, "I believe in TOM SCHALL with all my heart."

No one can come in touch with TOM SCHALL, whether they are Members of Congress or ordinary citizens, and hear him speak but will be convinced of his sincerity and honesty of purpose, as the following words from a few of the great and leading souls of the House with whom he has come daily in contact will illustrate.

Former Speaker Champ Clark said, "SCHALL is able and fearless and a cracking good speaker."

Democratic Floor Leader CLAUDE KITCHIN said: "SCHALL is one of the most eloquent and attractive speakers in the House, and enjoys the esteem and confidence of the entire membership, regardless of party."

Hon. James Mann, former Republican floor leader, said of SCHALL: "Masterful, sincere, very eloquent speaker, always listened to with great interest in the House."

Hon. FRANK MONDELL, present Republican floor leader said: "We of the House owe a debt of gratitude to our Colleague SCHALL for the example he has set us of cheerful, helpful, and efficient service. If Mr. SCHALL had two good eyes, he could not be more efficient in the discharge of his duties."

Hon. MARTIN MADDEN, chairman of the great Appropriation Committee, said of Mr. SCHALL: "I have watched his activities with deep interest. I have been charmed with the force with which he has presented questions to the House. I have listened with interest to his speeches from time to time and unhesitatingly pronounce him one of the most forceful speakers it has been my privilege to know. I congratulate the district that sent him here on the wisdom of its choice."

Dr. SIMEON D. FESS, chairman of the Committee on Education and a member of the Rules Committee, says: "Mr. SCHALL's high recognition among his colleagues is not due to a sense of pity, but because his ability, his industry, his devotion to his cause in public service, his constancy on the job, have impressed his personality upon each Member."

I have quoted these men at such length because I want you boys to understand that the future is by no means closed to you, for what one blind man can do another can attempt, and to corroborate my statement that Congressman SCHALL is to-day one of the most able and persuasive orators of Congress, and that in TOM SCHALL, a blind man's voice and sincerity of thought have been a deciding factor in many critical issues of the House.

I could cite many illustrations where Mr. SCHALL, as a Member of the House, has stood for what he believed to be right regardless of those about him. To illustrate his unwavering courage in standing by his convictions and letting the future decide as to the wisdom of his course, I recall one instance only a short time ago, and I am not saying whether at the time I stood with him or not upon the proposition, when by voice and vote he stood alone against the whole Congress.

Again, it was Congressman SCHALL's vote that was the deciding factor in the organization of the war Congress. Though a Republican, Congressman SCHALL reasoned that the Executive and Senate being Democratic, the House should also be Democratic, and courageously, regardless of political consequences to him, cast his vote for the organization of that House by the Democrats, so that the responsibility of our entrance into and conduct of the war about to be entered upon

should be unhampered by party differences, and we could function immediately, as he well put it in a speech made at the time.

Had Congressman SCHALL's vote been other than it was, the House might have been held up in its organization for weeks or months, as had been demonstrated through past experiences, where the House has been equally divided. The fact that Congressman SCHALL had the courage and was willing to offer his political career on the altar of his country's immediate need gives only one of the many examples of his service as a Member of Congress.

Another illustration I remember right now and will put it in here. It was Congressman SCHALL, as a member of the powerful Rules Committee of the House, who was a strong factor in denying a rule which would have permitted the Sterling-Graham sedition bill which had passed the Senate to get before the House. Had this measure come before the House, in the feverish, antianarchistic, unnatural, war-bred temper of that body, in the opinion of those qualified to know, it undoubtedly would have passed, and if it had the country would have been chagrined with a law that would have hung men who dared advocate a change in our Government, however essential that change might be to fit the needs of the present time.

Had not Congressman SCHALL cast his vote as he did in the organization of the War Congress, the history of the world undoubtedly would have been different, for had not the House organized immediately instead of a procrastination which would have come had his vote been different, you boys and your companions would not have been upon the battle fields of France as early as you were, and had not the American troops taken up the cudgel the very day they did, against the German entrance into Paris, Paris would have succumbed. And had Paris, the center of transportation and manufacture of munitions, been captured the war would soon have been lost. I cite this illustration to show that it was a blind man, at a critical point in the world history, who turned the tide of world affairs and thereby demonstrated that physical sight has nothing to do with moral intuition and vision.

It will be of interest to you blind veterans of the World War to know that Congressman SCHALL's physical courage is not less than his concentrated moral courage, for in the summer of 1918 he went to France and during July and August he mingled with the boys at the front, sharing their danger and hardship. During his return, on September 5, two or three hundred miles off the coast of Brest, the army transport on which he had taken passage was torpedoed and he thereby knows something of the dangers and trials of the American sailor. He has been in the depths of the ocean in submarine, and to the heights of the heavens by airplane. There's nothing that the seeing can do that he dares not. Thus I present him to you as a "regular fellow," who asks no quarter because of handicap.

I have asked him to tell us something of his early struggles for livelihood and an education, of his ambitions, of his hopes as a boy, how he came to be a candidate for Congress, how he succeeded in obtaining and holding that coveted seat, what part he has taken as a Member of that most distinguished body, and what he conceives, if he desires, to be the most important legislation looking to the stability of our great Republic. In short, I have assigned him the subject, "How a blind man got to Congress and what he sees there." Four times his constituency have elected him to Congress, the last two times by overwhelming vote, and I am certain that the next election will return him almost unanimously, for you only have to know him to be for him. He is preeminently fitted as a statesman, and I predict that the State of Minnesota will in a short time further honor itself by electing him to a seat in the United States Senate.

I have the honor to introduce to you the most distinguished blind man in the world, Congressman THOMAS D. SCHALL.

ADDRESS OF MR. SCHALL.

Mr. SCHALL. A moment's analysis of your ingenious chairman's announcement of the subject upon which I am to speak, How I got to Congress, how I've stayed there, what I have seen there, and what I think, as a Member of that body, should be done looking to the welfare of our country, will reveal the inference that I am to speak upon myself. That task has been made precarious through the eloquent and brilliant though flattering handling of that same subject by the chairman, and I approach it with qualms of an anticlimax, and while speaking to you I am mustering in my mind what I can say to hold fast to what I already have in your opinion, through the charity of your chairman. Understanding how you face life, benumbed by the consciousness of a grim handicap, I yield to the wish of your chairman in the hope that it may be helpful or useful in fortifying your endurance through the long night in Gethsemane.

But beyond my personal experience, I wish to bring to you something that has come to me in the dark, made manifest not by the light of the eye nor by the light of the sun, but by that inward light which is the true guide for us all.

Your chairman says I am a self-made man. It may be a poor job, but it's my own. For 30 years I had the privilege of God's sunlight. Most of you have not had so many years of sight, but you have had enough of sight to understand the world as the seeing man sees it, and you will, therefore, not find yourselves, let us say, in the dilemma of the blind standpat Republican who has never seen and, in all probability, never will, who wanted to find out what the living image of the emblem of his party looked like, and being led to an elephant felt of his ear and remarked that it seemed like a palm leaf. Feeling of his legs he said they felt like a tree. He ran his hands over his side and declared, it resembles the side of a house. He took hold of his tail and remarked that it felt like a rope.

We who have had our sight should be grateful in that we have established the proportions of things as seeing men understand them and are therefore better equipped to compete with the seeing world than the men and women who have never seen the world in its three dimensions.

My father was an educated man, a descendant of one of the early families of Virginia, whose ancestry fought in the revolution and our other wars. Dad served from the first tap of the drum to the end of the Civil War on the side of the Union. Some of his family served with the South. My mother could barely read or write. When I was three years of age father was taken from us, and, because of his improvidence, mother was forced to fall back upon the use of her hands for our livelihood. She was a good seamstress and a good cook. She tried to make our living by sewing, but in those days there were more jobs to be had cooking. Her job took her and me to the back ends of hotels and restaurants, so I got my start in life back where the garbage, tin cans, and the flies and the profanity were thickest, and developed on such fertile soil a hot and belligerent temper which by constant curbing I have gradually learned to pretty well control, but at times, when exasperated, it gets beyond me and I am chagrined to find my language still retains a strong flavor of alley origin. Mother gave me all she had. Because of her lack, there was instilled in me the necessity of an education, laid in me the foundation of right and wrong, and taught me honesty and gratitude and gave me that larger heritage of a firm faith in God. She taught me that if I ever wanted a thing I should put myself in such a position that I could with clear conscience ask God for it. As a small boy, selling newspapers on the streets, if another newsy got upon my corner—which in those days was a definite possession in the law of newsies—I issued a note of warning; then, if he did not conform, I declared war, and always before I tackled the bout I used to fervently pray, "God help me lick him," and He must have helped me, for I have never been licked. If I was I didn't realize it. I have never faced a battle in all my life, either physical or mental, that I did not breathe that prayer, "God help me." When I rose to my feet to-night I said, "God help me tell these lads the thing that will best help them to brace their shoulders to the cross, best strengthen them along the weary way that they must tread alone, that no one but the blind can understand. We are all blind here to-night. This kind of speech under other circumstances would be impossible.

Because we shrink from burdening the sympathy of the seeing with our sorrow we perhaps assume a cheerfulness we are far from feeling. Thus the impression gets about that we are very happy. Because of our general understanding of things, the seeing person often attributes to us a sixth sense, which is really only the more intensive use of the four remaining senses. It is hard for the seeing person to understand our difficulties.

Often when I am invited to a town to speak and am met by a deputation of leading citizens, in trying to get off the train I attempt to put down my cane to see how far it is to the platform. Some kind soul, with the best intentions, will invariably grab my cane and start pulling on it, persistently hanging on though I try to persuade him to let go as it's my only eye, and before I can get it away from him some other well-meaning person may seize me about the body and with noisy grunts of satisfaction of disagreeable duty well performed will lift me and baggage off bodily like a sack of meal to the platform, thus attracting attention entirely unnecessarily and

making me and them and everyone else ridiculous, and convincing the observer of the propaganda that a blind man is entirely helpless, which he is under those circumstances, when attacked by a group of such thoroughly determined but well-meaning gentlemen who think they understand a blind man, believing that all they need to meet any situation is eyes. Perhaps, when I get to the hall, one of them will cordially insist on taking my arm, instead of allowing me to take his, whereby I could read his muscles and conjecture what he is about to do in our progress. Brim full of his duties as chairman, he seizes me with masterful kindness and hustles me down the crowded aisle, forgetting that I can not conveniently or gracefully, at the rate of speed he sets, climb over chairs or pews. Not being of the fourth dimension, I come bump up to the door jamb, which is all he has left for my physical passage. And I must equal the kindly spirit with which my discomfiture has been wrought, and smile and say, "Thank you!"

Thus, through hard knocks, as the chairman has indicated, I have learned some things; one of them is to insist, when I go upon these expeditions, that Mrs. Schall be included. She thus saves me much, but sometimes determined officials succeed in relegating her and embarrassing confusion often ensues. Or, if feeling my way along corridor or street, by indirection finding direction out, I go with hand or cane extended, it is a common thing for some kindly intentioned seeing person to take my hand and guide me away from the very object whose contour would give my direction. Or, if I ask where a certain thing is, they rejoin, without thought: "There it is—right there"—which means so much to a man without sight. Or, unthinkingly, they assume that we are lame and halt and deaf, because we are blind.

I remember, when I was visiting a shell-shock hospital in France and was feeling with my fingers the model of an airplane made by one of the soldiers, the woman in charge took it out of my hand and began to explain, as to a child, what I could have discovered much more quickly and accurately by my sense of touch. But we all know that our difficulties arise through lack of understanding rather than of heart, and we appreciate and cherish the good intent, and it is a great consolation to us, even if it has been of no real service, to have felt the kindly impulse that prompted it.

In finding our way about in a strange town or locality, it is so hard to find some one who has imagination enough to give us specific directions. Many people are unaccustomed to use their minds and content themselves with a wave of the hand, saying, "over here," or "over there," which only demonstrates that they have limited their capacity of thought to their eyes.

It is this same sort that are continually putting up to us, when matters of judgment or decisions are in question, their infallible conclusions, always prefacing their proffered judgment with the statement, "now, you can't see," or "if you could see," thus disposing of any contention of yours as of no weight, settling for you immediately with their slight eye judgment a thing which is as obvious to your discernment as it is to them, and upon which you have spent perhaps earnest thought and arrived at conclusions of which it is patent they have not had the slightest conception.

Their assumption of superiority, based entirely upon the fact that they can see, is only equalled by the patience with which the blind endure it, for their observation is very often superficial and is full of discrepancy when compared to the enforced, minute, careful, and retentive observation of the blind, and it is undoubtedly upon this comparison that the sixth-sense propaganda is based, while in reality it is only the comparison of an understanding mind and pair of eyes without attachment.

Ask the seeing person the time. He will pull his watch out and tell you. A moment after ask him again. Five times out of ten, if one of the unattached sort, he will have to look at his watch again. And the fact that you have asked him just a moment before may this time connect him up, and he will photograph the information conveyed to you, so the next moment he will remember; while the blind, in answering such a question, must answer it through the brain, and will remember and thereby develop a keener observation, for they must know what they know.

In the last campaign one of my opponents was reading a speech to a large audience of men, which we had both been invited to address, when I came into the hall. I heard him read that the present Congressman was blind, and that to return him only meant the election of Mrs. Schall to that great office, for she, as the Congressman himself admits, is his eyes. "Why not send a man to Congress, who can look after your interests, instead of electing a woman?" When it came my time to reply I admitted that Mrs. Schall was my eyes, and vouchsafed that I had always claimed, as the chairman has told you, that she is my better three-fourths; but I said that I am now ready, for the sake of argument, to certify that she is 99 per cent of the Congressman, but still, at that, I think I have my opponent licked a mile, for I, at least, am making my own speeches and must do so as your Representative in Congress. Eyes really are not of much value to a constituency where they are used only to lip off words perhaps gathered by other brains. A rich Congressman could easily hire some brilliant secretary to amalgamate for him, where, with overweening dignity, if somewhat monotonously, he could drone to empty seats of Congress, all of which can go into the RECORD, as easily read as if spoken new wrought from mind and heart. What you want in Congress is a soul, a mind, an understanding. Eyes are not so terribly valuable. They can be hired by the week. Pig eyes have been successfully grafted to the human use.

There are two ways to acquire knowledge; one through the sight, the other through the ear. The eye speaks to the senses; the ear speaks to the heart, the feelings. The ennobling difference between one soul and another is their different capacity for feeling.

To the blind man, work is his pleasure. He lives through his mind, and like the used key it must grow brighter. All his other senses are sharpened, and through concentration, all other things being equal, he must excel. The interest of the seeing man is diffused by the passing show. The minds that have accomplished the most in this world have been those most capable of concentration. The blind man's interest in the glitter and show of things is gone. His pleasures and recreations are narrowed down to the product of his brain. His wants, physically, are few. Money, to the blind man, outside of the actual comforts of life, is useless. His great desire is to win the praise of the seeing world, his only ambition to serve mankind and leave a name that his children may honor.

Edison, the greatest inventor of this or any age, is great because he is able to concentrate his mind. And he was able to do this because he was totally deaf. Beethoven composed his greatest symphony after he was totally deaf. The late Joseph Pulitzer, one of the greatest editors and newspaper owners, starting as a poor boy, attained distinction while totally blind. William Scanlin, the manager of one of the greatest charitable institutions in the world, the Light House, in New York, is blind. Dr. Edward D. Campbell, head of the department of chemistry at the University of Michigan, is blind. A former Postmaster General of England was blind. Doctor Babcock, of Chicago, the great heart specialist, is blind. One of the most able brains the United States Senate ever had, Thomas P. Gore, of Oklahoma, is blind.

As a rule the hearing of the blind is most minute, keen, and accurate, for the ear must compensate for the loss of sight. Thus the blind know their friends, by voice, by their step, by some little peculiarity that to the seeing has gone entirely unnoted. A familiar, facetious remark to the blind is, "You don't know what I look like." Strictly speaking, from a physical standpoint, outside of their height or breadth, they may have us on this; that is, we would not know the color of their eyes or their hair, but we would know the color of their vibrations, which would intuitively register in our mind the sort of character. I have had men ask me to tell them what their faces looked like, and have been able to pretty well give them the facial contour and general characteristics of their nature by an examination of their hand. Thus, the handshake, together with the voice, gives us a fair and working idea of the person presented.

Time and again, during my public life, I have intuitively said, "Friend," or "Foe," and have through careful observation of later developments found that my impression was correct. There are so many little variations in the human voice that to the highly sensitive ear is a telltale. Then, too, upon this line, the seeing are at a great disadvantage, because they have trained themselves to pass the inspection of the eye; they dress for the eye. They assume attitudes and characteristics which through practice have come to pass the inspection of the eye. They learn to express or give off no expression through the face, so that the eye can not tell whether they hold a pair of deuces or a full house, but they have had no thought of the inspection of the ear. The voice records the vibrations of the soul, and the soul will not lie, and like a delicate instrument indicates. The seeing have this faculty, yet not having been forced to rely upon it do not use it individually. But when congregated in mass, the eyes being sated and the ears becoming the connecting medium, it unconsciously develops as a group faculty, and it is this judgment that accepts or refuses the actor or speaker on the basis of his truth or falsity. This

will explain why the connoisseur or critic of music, of acting, or public speaking will unconsciously close his eyes to get the true impression.

In the practice of law, and I understand that to be the ambition of many of you, you will find that your sensitive ears will give you the key to the winning of many lawsuits, for cases are often lost or won through cross-examination. Therefore, it is a great problem in the mind of the practicing lawyer to know when to cross-examine and especially to know upon what part of the testimony to direct his attack. Time and again you will hear a lawyer remark, "If I hadn't cross-examined that fellow I'd have been all right," or, "I wish I had continued my cross-examination until I made him reveal what I feel sure he was concealing." If in your opinion a witness is telling the truth, it is a pretty good formula to follow to let him alone, except as to straighten some little point that may not be vital. If you are convinced that he has lied, and his lies are vital to the point at issue, you had better go in and take him over the road of cross-examination, and you will find that your keen ear will give you the point in the witness's testimony that is fabrication. For, almost all witnesses, in the main, are telling the truth, and it is only upon those points that may be vital wherein they will attempt to back and fill. Take a given number of people witnessing a happening, their versions, though honest, will not be alike, and an unscrupulous witness may attempt to profit by this well-known fact, and you will be able to more easily put your finger upon the place where he begins to deviate, for the ear will tell you what the eye had failed to disclose; also you will find that your hearing will stand you in good stead in dealing with the seeing lawyer.

Lawyers are very much human. They are a great bunch of bluffers and will bully and tenaciously fight each other, even sometimes becoming personal over their respective clients' claims, while outside of business they may be very good friends. My business in the main since the loss of my sight has been the handling of personal injury claims and has thus brought me in contact with highly paid corporation lawyers in the trial of these cases or their amicable adjustment. If your client has a visible injury, such as an arm or a leg off, where it is impossible to deny to the eye the injury, there is very seldom in their opinion any liability. If a client happens to have an internal injury there will be no injury, and they can prove it by seven or eight of the best doctors, as well as no liability. Of course the above is the general rule, as exceptions prove. But with their opinion being that of absolutely no liability and little or no injury, still they are willing, representing such magnanimous open-hearted and humane corporations, to talk settlement if you will be reasonable. And having prided myself on being reasonable, and afterwards having proved it by doubling the amount in verdict, I have been able to get together and settle many worthy cases with these greater legal lights of my State, and in many of these settlements I have been able to secure more approximately the value in money, as far as that can compensate, of the injury of my client because my hearing was very good and because I have been able to read, in their voice, that they had not reached the limit in their offer and that they would no doubt pay seven instead of five thousand before they would go to court. Thus your accurate hearing, boys, will help, when you get to the practice of law, for with it you will be able to detect the weak point of the seeing opponent.

But to get back to our assigned subject. At 12 I could not read, for I had been too busy earning my living. I could pick out the words on signs or headlines in newspapers when there was to be a circus, a horse race, or a baseball game, or a prize fight, but I could not write. I was always interested in things political. When Blaine ran for President, Dad always having been a Republican, I was; so I marched in the procession, carried a torchlight bigger than myself, and kicked up a hurrah with the rest of the crowd. When the speech was over I was one of the first to scramble onto the platform. Men tried to push me away, little dirty ragamuffin that I was, but great-hearted, democratic Blaine, holding firmly my dirty little hand and looking earnestly in my eager eyes, said, "When I shake hands with the boys of America I am shaking hands with her future great men." "Great men." The words stirred the first germs of ambition. I treasured them in my heart and often pondered them.

I came up, earning my way through common school and high school and university and law school. I blacked shoes, sold newspapers, gathered buffalo bones on the prairies of Minnesota, picked up old iron, sold books, sold clothes, cleaned furnaces, milked cows, hoed potatoes, herded cattle, broke bronchoes, worked in the harvest field, drove oxen on the farm, put in one whole summer raising onions on a piece of rented land, and the profit, after expenses and board were paid, for my whole summer's work amounted to 15 cents—so I understand something of the problems of the farm—cleaned spittoons in a saloon, sawed wood with a bucksaw at 75 cents a cord, ran a hand laundry, an ice-cream stand, worked in a brickyard, did janitor work, sold bath cabinets, played bush-league ball, for which I was well paid, and which gave me my first taste of a gentler life. In 1899 for 18 intercollegiate games of baseball I won the bat with an average of .526, which to any baseball man is a proof of the condition of my sight at that time. I won $25 and a cow in a prize fight at Ortonville, Minn., against a pugilist of some repute.

I also captured some money through prizes won at wrestling. Anything to help me toward the goal for which I was aiming. For the sake of the money, I entered and won prizes in every oratorical contest that came off during my time at the University of Minnesota. Three times I represented my State in interstate oratoricals, winning a third, a second, and a first at these larger contests. Life was one hard, grim struggle for daily bread. I never had time to play as a child or as a lad in school. Even to-day I never feel the chill of twilight, the gray hour when lights begin to gleam and people are hurrying home to their hot dinners, without a homesick feeling, a memory of the days when I had no home and no dinner to go to.

How I used to long for the time when, my education completed, my profession attained, I should be able to take my ease, invite my soul, enter the fellowship of men of attainment, see the world, enjoy the fruits of my toil. At last the time seemed at hand. I was succeeding. Clients had begun to seek me out. I was taking a place and holding it among the lawyers of my State. We had saved enough money with which to buy a home of our own. My office was well stocked with books of law and I was about to form an advantageous law partnership, which would have brought me in contact with clients of means. Just about the time when it seemed I could reach out my hand and take the success I had toiled all my life to attain, like a bolt from the blue came the electric shock that seared out my sight. I wanted to quit, and if it had not been for the love, the tender understanding of my brilliant little classmate and life mate, of me and my passing ordeal, I think I would have quit. Morning after morning when I could sleep, I wakened, as I realize many of you who are young in blindness are doing, opened my eyes, wondering if it was still dark, heard the sounds and felt the atmosphere but saw not the light of day, then, with the terrible rush of consciousness that day would never dawn again for me, the battle had to be fought all over. At each new waking I was overwhelmed anew, shocked anew.

I felt as I have since found the greater part of the unreflecting world to think, that a blind man is useless and only a burden upon the seeing world and that therefore I had a right to wrap the drapery of my couch about me and lie down to pleasant dreams, for the unrestrained independence of my whole life revolted at the bondage. I had always been able to make things go, to drive them to my will and conclusions and ultimate purpose, and now, to be led, to have to wait, to be kept from accomplishment by trivial material fetters, to have to form conclusions received through eyes in whose judgment I had no confidence—to be held of slight consequence by those whom I but a short time ago dominated, physically and mentally, to have the same men who but yesterday hailed me with delight and enthusiasm, avoid me. Sympathy? Yes, but who the hell wants sympathy? We want acknowledgment of merit. It is not how far you can see but the chemistry of sight that counts; it is how far your vision, how sound your judgment, how deep your understanding of the human heart. Not in getting and spending is our merit shown, but the goal we set ourselves, as the instrument of God in its attainment, and irritated by what to me then seemed to be an incurable resentment, I seriously pondered whether it was nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune or to take arms against a sea of troubles and by opposing end them, and I reasoned that I would be doing those dependent upon me a service by ridding them of an insurmountable burden. However, I felt it my duty to be sure there was no hope of sight returning and so began the round of doctors and cures. I went all over the country and all "gave the thing they could not cure a name" and I paid and paid and paid until the reserve of our earnings had been exhausted. I sold my library, borrowed money of friends. The game seemed to me to be up and I pondered feasible means to leave my memory, for the sake of those I loved, untarnished by such an act, when an eminent doctor in Milwaukee examined me and gave me the way. He said, "I can perhaps cure you. I have successfully performed a similar operation where a man was struck by lightning. It will be necessary to go down between

the lobes of the brain to do it. If I get through, without injury to the brain, I am confident I can restore your sight. But the chances are strongly against it, perhaps one, two, three out of ten that I will get through safely."

It would, no doubt, seem strange to the seeing, but you who sit there in the darkness, I know, will understand when I tell you that his diagnosis was a great beacon light of hope to me. I had found an honorable way out or the way back to sight. I told the doctor I would think it over. I went back to Minneapolis and held council with my pal and I said to her, "What are we going to do? Shall I sell lead pencils?" and she retorted, "I should say not, Tom. We're going to practice law. I will be your eyes. You have your profession. You can try a lawsuit as well without your sight as you could with it, in a short time, I am sure. People will trust a blind man, if he has the ability, with their business just as quick as a man with sight." We had great confidence. We did not yet know how instinctively the seeing man distrusts a blind man's ability. He gets most of his impressions through his eyes, and can not comprehend how understanding can be arrived at in any other way. The seeing person, as a rule, carries his knowledge in books or notes. The blind person may not be so formidable in a free-for-all scramble, where he can not take advantage of a situation the eye develops, and thus must await the ordered opportunity, but, as that great poet, blind Milton, has well put it, "he also serves who only stands and waits," so it was decided that we would go back and try the practice of law. Secretly I felt a great calm, for I had in reserve two options, one, the return of my sight with which I knew I could succeed; the other, an honorable discharge.

A lawyer friend who had an office lately vacated told me the amount of rent, phones, and stenographer and said to move in and pay when I could. So I went back to the practice of law, broke—worse than broke—in debt, and blind. It was a weary road. It was like learning to walk all over again. I worked along in darkness a good deal harder than when I had my sight. I had to. In fact, a blind man's mind rests only when he sleeps, since he must feel with it and see with it, ever on guard, alert, for the little indirect thing that will guide him to the true conclusion that he must have in order to cope with the seeing. I never realized what a weak flabby thing the seeing brain is. I was normal, perhaps a little above normal, having taken honors in my class. But, like every other seeing person, I had always depended upon my sight, not my memory, and when I had to rely upon my memory I found it was like a muscle that had atrophied from lack of use. I would say to Mrs. Schall when I was preparing a case, "Read that again." And she would read it again, and I would try to gather the essential parts so that I would know them, not merely know where they could be found, but I would have to ask her to read it again, and again, and again, until at last, after stupendous efforts, the flabby old brain tissue strengthened until it could stand alone.

Some of the courts, feeling friendly toward me, appointed me at the State's expense to defend persons charged with crime. Among these were some spectacular cases which I succeeded in winning which brought me other clients of the same sort, and my revenue increased rapidly, so that at the end of the third month I was able to give to my friend who had so kindly staked me my office rent. Confidence began to return, for in the trials of these criminal cases I again secured my hold, learning how to make my way before the court and juries though blind. But there was no future in this criminal practice, and I decided that I must take up some other branch of the law and make myself proficient in that. I realized no moneyed concern would pay good fees to a handicapped lawyer, so therefore I knew that were I to succeed as a lawyer my clients must be of the common folk. Thus God, again, regardless of my ambitions replanted me among the common people, where He meant me to serve. I saw great corporations paying large retainers to our most able lawyers for the defense of personal injury cases, and I said to myself that I shall match the ability and understanding of the law of these men in this one specific branch and take up the fight for the laboring man who would understand me and I him, for we have come the same way. And I laid for and got hold of some personal-injury cases that other lawyers had rejected, and by diligent and constant application to the facts and the law prepared these cases for trial and won them. Other personal-injury cases soon began to come, and my success with juries was extraordinary—securing some of the largest verdicts and settlements in the State. I may not be a profound all-around lawyer, but when it comes to personal-injury law and getting the verdicts I take my hat off to none, and the corporation lawyers of my State I am sure will bear testimony as to my having relieved their corporations of hundreds of thousands of dollars for the benefit of injured employees; therefore you can understand at the outset why I was so very popular with the vested interests and corporations, who did not leave a stone unturned to keep me from Congress.

That is why, outside of the fact that I had not been anointed by the gang, in my first race for Congress the daily newspapers, as your chairman mentioned, never even published my name. One of them on one occasion got so magnanimous as to state that there is also a Progressive running. And to-day, no matter what I do or say, the great press of my State, with the exception of a friendly scribe here and there who occasionally gets something by, despite the policy, is silent, unless they can give a slant to my doings or sayings that they think will hurt me; for they suspect, as your chairman has suggested, that should the common folk of my State become acquainted with me and my work, that the more powerful office of Senator might fall within my jurisdiction; so every effort is exerted and is being exerted since they can not unseat me from where I am, to see to it that I acquire no further leverage by coming into the more powerful office of the Senate of the United States.

But despite the attitude of the press I have steadily grown in the confidence of my constituency. In 1914, over the machine candidates Republican and Democratic, I won only by a plurality of 1,407 votes. As your chairman said, I had no newspaper support, nor organization, all the speeches made in my behalf were made by myself, amounting in number to 237. If I had not had an iron constitution, a chest like a keg, been totally blind and absolutely insane, I never could have done it. Insanity is only a question of majority. But after the votes were counted I became tolerable and with each succeeding election have become more sane until judging by majorities I should have become not only sane but safe and sound.

In 1916, having been a Republican all my life, I tried to file on the Republican ticket, but the secretary of state under orders of the gang refused to allow me to so file, having had the insufferable audacity to offer myself the election before as an Independent Progressive Republican. But despite my nonparty affiliations, my district returned me over the two old machine candidates by a plurality of a little better than 9,000.

In 1918 I was urged by my friends to become a candidate for the United States Senate, and opposition to the senior Senator offered inducement if I would announce myself as a candidate for that high office. I, of course, had no idea of taking such a step, feeling sure that outside of the people of my district whom I had been able to reach by speech I was little known since the papers had kept me and anything I had done carefully repressed. I wondered at the time why a delegation of men whom I knew had vigorously opposed me during my last two elections had come all the way from Minneapolis to my office in Washington and seemed suddenly so friendly. They avowed that I had made good and that they had never understood me before; and they wanted to see that I got a chance to get back into the Republican party where I belonged. I retorted that I would not be allowed to file on the Republican ticket, for the same situation existed now as existed two years ago, and if there was any foundation to the refusal to let me file two years ago it was certainly of the same vital effect to-day. They replied that they could fix it so that the secretary of state would accept my filing. But I insisted that it was my understanding that the supreme court would have thrown me out had I insisted on filing on the Republican ticket, to which they suavely replied that they thought it could all be arranged. I can see now what I could not believe then, that they were determined to keep me from filing for the United State Senate and were making the path so smooth and straight for the regular Republican nomination to Congress in my district that the line of least resistance would naturally lead me to the acceptance of that nomination, and I finally consented to offer my filing, which I found with no little surprise was accepted with alacrity. My millionaire opponent, whom they evidently had not taken into their confidence of manipulation frothed over at the mouth, and believing that he knew something of the attitude of the supreme court, immediately proceeded to have the supreme court erase my name as a Republican candidate. But the best-laid plans of mice and gang candidates gang aft agley, and behold the supreme court decided that I was a Republican, thus giving me the distinction and honor of being the only Republican in the State vouched for as such by the highest lawgiving power of that State.

I never knew who it was defended my cause before the supreme court, but I do know that it was done well and that I became the Republican candidate without open or violent opposition by the gang, for had I been defeated in the primaries for

the nomination I would then have been at liberty to run independent for the United States Senate. It was therefore, in the opinion of the gang, of vital necessity in being assured of my not being a candidate for the United States Senate to see to it that I secured that Republican nomination for Congress in the tenth district, which I did almost unanimously.

I was elected by a majority of over 26,000. In 1920 I was returned on the Republican ticket (though a vigorous fight was put up against me by the same gang that were so anxious to see to it that I was a regular Republican two years before) by over 40,000, and I make no doubt that my way will be made smooth for the return to my present seat in Congress this coming election, since the other United States senatorship is up for the decision of the people, for it is no secret that a great host of friends are urging me to make the run. Upon the thought of the possibility of that terrible catastrophe, well-authenticated proffers have been made to me from those who know how to handle conventions of the indorsement to my present seat of the Republican preprimary convention, a shrewd bit of legislation passed by the last State legislature to regain the slipping reins of control back into the hands of the manipulators.

In our State we have a direct primary, and the bosses well knew that they could not get away with its out-and-out repeal, which they would have gladly done and gone back to the good old days of conventions, which produced amenable candidates, though too often mediocre, newspaper-made heroes, headliners, wherein you are told of the wonderful fights they are putting up in State or Nation, when in reality the only struggle that takes place consists in arranging the type and deciding the momentous question of how large it should be—"Safe and sane, a big man for a big job"—you know the sort of stuff; but they carefully refrain from adding, "for big business." They were forced to content themselves with a preconvention, wherein they could name their candidates as the particular choice of the party and have his name go on the ballot of the direct primary as the party's loyal candidate, thus giving such a candidate a decided advantage before the unsuspecting voter, in the direct primary to be held later, because it gives a rallying point for the basis of publicity.

Thus with my friends and my enemies both for me, I anticipate no struggle in securing the Republican nomination in June, but after that, when the doors to the Senate nomination are closed, I make no doubt I shall have an opponent well supplied with campaign funds, who will take the field against me, not in the hope of defeating me, but to have a pretense from which to distribute the maligning, tearing-down propaganda that it is hoped will singe, retard, or stunt the sprouting wings of ambition, for in 1924 another United States senatorship is at stake. But I am not ambitious. I am perfectly well content to stay where I am, for the salary of the United States Senator is no more than I receive in the House. True, if I am of good in the House, I would be twentyfold that service in the Senate, because a Senator is a large animal in Washington, while a mere Congressman is of slight consequence in comparison, and his power for good or evil thereby measured. I am not anxious to get into a state-wide campaign, where the only offset I have to an unfriendly press is my own voice. For what would years of an honest, consistent progressive record in Congress avail could it not be known to the people, while if I stay in my own district it is not so large but what I can by extended effort reach the people through speech and correct the well-fed opposition continually and vigorously at work distorting and undermining.

The plain people of my district believe in me because for eight years I have fought their battles, and they know that I have a standing offer of $1,000, and it has never been challenged, to anyone who can point out in my record one place where I voted against labor or farm, or have failed to champion the cause of the ordinary fellow.

In my present position, as the fellow says, "I'm sitting pretty," not only because of the overwhelming approbation of my course expressed by the voters of my district, but in the House I am ranking Republican member of the Flood Control Committee, one of the regular standing committees of the House. Our present chairman, Congressman Rodenberg of Illinois, will not be a candidate for reelection, therefore I shall be in my fifth term chairman of the Flood Control, if seniority is the rule, and I make no doubt it will be.

I am also a Member of the Rules Committee, the nozzle through which legislation gets before the House. Three times I have been elected to this powerful committee by a majority of the Members of the House. The membership of this committee is most carefully picked since through its deliberations the administration must, to a large measure, shape its policy, and only men who have strong influence back of them, who have been tried and not found wanting, who have developed through years of service a leadership ability and are known to be soundly conservative, are so fortunate as to be elected to this most powerful committee, none of which qualifications secured my membership. But through the providence of circumstance my vote had become a strong factor in the organization of the War Congress. Twice before the House had been so evenly divided, and on these occasions it took weeks and weeks to organize and put it in condition to transact public business. As the time drew near for the Congress to convene the war clouds grew darker and heavier. The grey hordes were overrunning Europe. There was no time to be lost. I went up to New York to consult my friend Theodore Roosevelt. He said to me, "SCHALL, I think the people would resent my advising you. I don't like to suggest what I think you should do, for it is clear to me what a sacrifice it would mean politically, what ostracism, distrust, and disappointment would flow from it, what courage it would require. But I doubt the wisdom of giving the Democrats a chance to make the Republicans scapegoats in this war. They inherited it. They should have the praise or bear the onus. It's just to the administration that he be not interfered with. His movements should be definite and quick, not hindered by party opposition."

The Senate was Democratic, the President Democratic. Should the House go Republican, while it would mean the loaves and fishes, the coveted chairmanships for my friends, my Republican colleagues who had been kind to me, yet with that would go the chance of delay in getting the great war machine in motion.

Selfish and personal interests pointed me to support the Republican candidate. But I felt that they should weigh nothing against my country's necessity. If the Democrats lost the organization of the House, it meant the disruption and overhauling of all the House committees, while if they kept it, the machinery was set, oiled, and ready for immediate action, composed of the administration's own party, men upon whom he should rely for counsel, instead of men of an opposing party, whose policies might clash, and give the spark that in the charged and heated atmosphere would explode the magazine of war against us instead of the enemy. It was no time for petty politics, no time to consider the loaves and fishes. The time of great things was upon us. Whether a man was a Republican or Democrat was of no consequence. Champ Clark was a clean, square, fair-dealing Speaker. He would preside over a House nonpolitical, dealing with war questions.

I had to pray God to help me get upon my feet and raise my voice and do this thing I knew should be done. It was hard. I hated to do it. If I had been able to look into the indignant eyes and accusing faces, and seen the grief, surprise, disappointment, and dislike of my Republican colleagues, I doubt if I could have had the courage to do it. But when the time came, with God's help, I nominated and cast my vote for Champ Clark for Speaker, thus putting the machinery of a Democratic House back of the Democratic President and Senate, and thus, as your chairman has indicated, helping to land our boys at Chateau Thierry in time to save Paris. With the political complexion of my district as it was, I thought at the time it was putting a noose around my neck, but it was a slight thing to offer up a political carcass, when we were about to call to the sacrifice upon the field of battle the best of our youth.

And in the outcome, Chateau Thierry proved I was right. I say this not to boast or vaunt, but because I realize you young men back there in the dark, some of whom were in that great world decisive battle, who have proven your loyalty by your great sacrifice realize that it is right to stand for what you believe, to die for what you believe.

Most of the Republicans in Congress at the time could not construe my action as anything but deep-dyed party disloyalty, for they did not know that I owed nothing to the regular Republican organization of my State. Rising in indignation, they left the space all around me empty, so I sat alone, a thing scorned and apart, the earlier months of that session, except for a few bigger Members who by an occasional word or friendly touch would indicate they understood.

Among these was the one who personally lost most by my vote—that fearless, just, strong, and brilliant leader of men, the most able parliamentarian the House has known, a true friend, a resourceful and relentless opponent, but with a heart of understanding, that knew instantly right from wrong, the Republican candidate for Speaker, Jim Mann.

Another who understood, and had the courage to let me know—and it brought me no little consolation—was that big-souled, big-hearted, big-minded American—Martin Madden,

of Illinois. Later man after man came to me and said, "SCHALL, you saw farther sightless than we did with our physical vision. You were right to stand by your country, regardless of party."

To show me that I was right, the following Republican Congress reelected me to the Rules Committee, where the Democrats had placed me in recognition of my action in the organization of the War House; and to further cement the proposition that it pays to stand for what you believe to be right regardless of what the environment of the present indicates to your own best good, the Republican majority again elected me to this coveted committee the following Congress, and I make no doubt that the next Congress, if Republican, will again assign me to this powerful committee. Thus, as a member of the Rules Committee and the chairman of a regular standing committee, the Flood Control, I could not, if I were permitted to choose my committees, place myself in a more advantageous situation. I am therefore quite naturally very content to remain secure in the backing of the voters of my district as a Member of the House, and am not particularly desirous, as your chairman's remarks might have led you to believe, to try for the greater office of United States Senator unless it is in some way pointed out to me by the Divinity of Circumstances that it is my duty as an instrument of that Force to make the attempt; for no one knows better than I the double rocky road over which I would be forced to travel to that end. The gang of the fat boys who from instinct have always fought me will certainly not have their opinion changed through a search of my eight years' record.

A few of the leaders of the lean boys in control of the policies of their great press, whose ultimate radicalism privately adhered to carries them beyond my conception of reform, for I am not a socialist, but whose publicly advocated policies are in the main wholly feasible, and have throughout my record received my hearty indorsement, should publicly be for me if they are sincere in their principles advocated to the people.

But though they know that my labor record is 100 per cent, that I have by voice and vote always battled in the interest of the farm, and have consistently stood for real constructive progressive legislation, for a square deal to all, along the lines they publicly advocate, yet because of socialistic bias are barely lukewarm, "damn me with faint praise," or only use me to help their position. They know that the fat boys have not handled me and can not handle me and they have good reason to believe that they can not.

For they know that I came to Congress without the aid of gang or organization and that I have remained in Congress in spite of the most powerful, selfish opposition. That no one has a 5-cent piece invested in my congressional seat, that no gang, clique, organization, man, or corporation has any strings on me, for no one ever thought it possible for me to get to Congress, in the first place, and so paid no attention to me. After I did get there my opponents were very sure it was a mistake which they could easily rectify in the next election and that I had won through sympathy. But I have not noticed that Congress is an eleemosynary institution and I have never in any way, shape, or form asked a vote upon that consideration, for I can make more money at the practice of law. Thus, through the providence of circumstances, I came into Congress as its most independent Member, as my record will bear out, and so long as I remain in Congress I shall continue that independence with the light that God gives me to see the right, regardless of consequences as foreseen by the petty vision of men, and I believe that if I am to be the instrument for further and higher service in that same Congress that I shall in some way be given the sign, and the way provided for a part in that higher work, as free and independent from selfish control or manipulation as I have been in my present position.

For I can now understand, after years of darkness, that God had in His mysterious way preserved me from the road of materiality. I believe that I am peculiarly fitted to carry out some mission. For I know the common man's burden, having come up with him through all the vicissitudes of life. I have exceptional ability of public speech. The foolish may think this a boast, but I assure you that I am very humble in its assertion and only make it in explanation of why some of the things have happened to me, which may be of service to you, for I realize that such ability is no credit to me, but is only an equipment with which I came into the world. I have a high dome in the roof of my mouth, which serves as a fine sounding board for speech. My jaw is hung on loosely, so that it waggles easily. My education is sufficient with which to get over the message, provided my understanding and intuition is delicate enough to receive it. There is no credit, my friends, personally in the kind of an instrument we are. The bulldog should have no credit for being a bulldog any more than the hunting dog should have credit for having a fine nose. It is only a question of the fitness of the instrument for service designated.

In the first place, I know that without God's guidance and help I never would have succeeded in reaching Congress. I know that when I attempted to turn the natural ability of speech that had been given me into the troughs of personal gain, I was hindered, struck down by a handicap that seemed to me then insurmountable. But when proper humility and a desire to serve had taken the place of arrogance and selfishness, I found myself the champion of the humble folk, the cobbler, carpenter, mechanic, and laborer in general, in factory and on railroad, instead of the wealthy employer or corporation, as had been my ambition, and in their defense I recaptured my young ideals and again understood why the simple garments of Dorcas had outweighed material gain.

For most natures harden, deteriorate under wealth, prosperity, and ease. Mine had been no exception. When material circumstances improve men fail spiritually. Instead of showing higher traits when bodily comforts increase, they degenerate, become greedy, indifferent, hard, and thereby dwarf their soul and limit the possibility of its development.

Man has greater possibilities than he knows; completer realization comes out under trial. It taps his subconscious and superconscious powers. All have latent qualities of strength, unguessed till drawn against. We are not here to be selfishly happy, but rising higher the more bitterly we are tested we reach at last, if we are strong and endure, the heights of unselfishness and nobility.

The removal of the sight throws a determined man back upon his mind or his understanding, and through the mind he will come in contact with his soul, and through its feeling with the breadth of the Infinite, and he will see and hear and understand the things that are denied to mere sight. For his mind reaches into solitude, whence comes meditation, contemplation, insight, and inspiration, for he is so used to adversity that he knows how to bear disappointment and make the best of life, which in its best is disappointment. The plan of the universe in the redemption of us all is adversity. It is not on flowery paths of ease nor in the smile of the world in material prosperity that the soul in man or woman is carved, but on the rough and sharp stone-strewn road, where we are forced to walk with unprotected feet, that we learn life's lessons and blessings, which gives us intuition to draw upon the greater and cleaner thoughts that are among us, but too often not of us.

God, no doubt, and I say this in all simplicity, has some mission for me to perform, as he has for all of us. It may be small or it may be great, but it is in proportion as we have the strength to carry the cross assigned to us. If we have a little, weak, spindly pair of legs we have a little load. If we have a good strong back and a good stout pair of legs we have a load in proportion to our strength. Each of us thinks that ours is the hardest. Even the Son of Mary prayed, "Oh Lord, if possible take this cup from me," but immediately added, through the strength of spirit, "nevertheless, Thy will, not mine, be done."

I stand to-day disciplined by such teachings, as willing and as ready as I can, to take on and do to the best of my ability whatever may seem best under the plan of God in the interest and progress of mankind. I have lost my sight, but through that loss I have gained my soul, and I would rather have the understanding thus acquired than all the eyes in the world. For the inward sight more than compensates for the outward loss. Of course, I would like to see, but I would not trade back on the same basis—for the things of earth are temporal, the soul is eternal.

To those who stand for reform, if they are sincere, my record in Congress should be all that they require, and much more to the point of principles advocated than mere promises.

Thus I stand on No Man's Land between the great press guns of warring factions, each intent on substituting in public office men who will work out the selfish ideas and drive under the reins of a few bosses, either fat or lean. Then, too, I insist on staying in the Republican party, and believe that reform can quicker come about by the people taking control of that party, which they can easily do under the direct primary law in our State if they did not allow manipulators to arraign them against one another, causing them to strike down, in their confusion, their friends. If the fight is between a Progressive and a Reactionary, the powers that be will see to it that one or more other Progressives file, driving a majority into a minority.

Thus you can understand how utterly hopeless a state-wide campaign appears to me, for Minnesota is a very large State

and I have no way of reaching the ear of the people but by my voice. If I had lots of time I might be willing to try, but with Congress steadily in session, as has been the case since I have been a Member, such a campaign would be impossible, so the allusion of your chairman to the United States senatorship as ever coming my way seems to me at this time to be far remote.

But who can tell? Perhaps two years from now, when the senior Senator will again be up for election, the people may have come to understand, for they are fast driving in that direction, the unreliability of newspapers in the guidance of their vote except to indicate whom they should vote against, and in that case I ought to have the best of it and may decide to get in, for they will all be after me, which ought to insure my election.

As I told you at the outset of this talk, I am a firm believer in the Divinity that shapes our ends. I believe that we are all instruments in the hands of the Great Intelligence to work out not only our individual advancement, through adversity, sorrow, and pain, but the betterment of our brethren along the way, and that, according to our fitness, God uses us to carry forward His plan.

For history is only the handwriting of God and men and women merely the instruments with which He writes. It has taken centuries through the clumsy instrument of weak mankind for Him to have brought the conditions of the world to where the development of the individual could be accomplished in great numbers. It is only about 150 years ago that God, through the instrumentality of the human being was able to get together enough hardier and nobler souls, upon whose understanding He could impress the idea of a government where the development of the individual would make for the development of the soul.

He gathered here on a land wonderfully prepared and stored for all emergencies, reserved and kept apart for the special purpose, the braver souls of all the world, for fearlessness is an attribute of God and all his teachings are of independence of the soul. For the purpose of the development of that independence he left mankind free to choose between good and evil. It took us nearly 2,000 years with the guidance of the Carpenter's Son to come to the conception of a government for the people, by the people, and of the people.

The patriotic and noble men of the Revolutionary days, simple in faith, simple in life, hence able to catch through their greater intuition the conception of the great purpose for the existence of humanity upon this earth, wrought finer than they knew that inspired instrument, the Constitution of the United States. It may not be perfect, no human work is perfect, but the instruments of humanity through whom God is working out his plan are coming more and more to understand, more and more to strive for perfection, for it is the desire that builds and ever holding fast to that which is proven good, we must work our way out, little by little, step by step, as we enlarge to souls capable of receiving the greater and greater light. The Constitution of the United States is the bulwark of individual liberty, giving scope to initiative and desire, to the development of independence, to the carrying out of God's plan.

This Government, built upon the teachings of the lowly Nazarene, has gone forth to the governments of the world as His lessons spread among mankind. Over forty republics have already followed our example; and in the fulfillment of that God-given purpose the world, through the influence of the United States, will come to understand that through protection of the inalienable rights of the individual, "echoes will roll from soul to soul and grow forever and forever," to the ultimate completion, "Peace on earth, good will towards men."

NOMINATION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT BY THE PEOPLE.

I think that I have perhaps complied with your chairman's request to tell you how I got to Congress and how I have stayed there, and to a limited extent what I have seen there and something of my hopes and ambitions.

But I have not, as I remember his instructions, told you what seems to me to be the great thing to preserve this greatest country in the world, the instrument of God's plan of government for the people, by the people, and of the people. I have always felt from the time my mind was trained enough to grasp the wonderful conception of our form of government a profound reverence for it, and in my early manhood was unable to figure out why it was not functioning as it seemed to me it should, why principles advanced by a party who were successful at the election were not put into effect, why it was that outside of some squabbling over tariff it did not seem to matter if one party or the other were at bat. The same old injustices and flagrant disregard of the people's interests or rights was rampant. The party of Lincoln or the party of Jefferson seemed to amount in the sum total of its administration to the same old thing. I gladly hailed Theodore Roosevelt's leadership in 1912 in his fight for progress, and with aching heart by the manipulation of the powers that be I saw his leadership relegated. I did not then understand, as I now do, what it was in our form of national government that made possible this ruthless trampling of the peoples' wishes; and I could not at that time understand, but I do now, the import of his attempted assassination at Milwaukee of that same year.

When I was in France in 1918, many underground passages having been revealed during the war shake-up, I learned that both Roosevelt and McKinley had been decidedly unpopular as President with all the European nations. Time permits to cite but one striking illustration.

I talked with a Frenchman whose daughter had been engaged to the son of a man within the inner circle of the German Empire and I was astounded at the revelation that in 1912 the Kaiser had given orders that under no circumstances should Theodore Roosevelt ever again be President of the United States. The foreign policy of President Taft was perfectly acceptable. The promised foreign policy of Woodrow Wilson was also satisfactory. All assistance should be given to Wilson, since he seemed the most likely to defeat the terrible Teddy, whose America first policies had more than once thwarted his ambitions and had outwitted him when he was about to seize by force the ports of Venezuela and found that Admiral Dewey and his fleet were there under orders of the President to prevent it and protect inviolate our American Monroe doctrine.

This news greatly shocked and wrenched my complacency in our Government, and I was forced to contemplate how it could be possible for a President of the United States to be in any way bound to another country that might involve the welfare of the Nation that has chosen him its Executive, and I naturally went back in my mind through all the original processes that go to make Presidents.

In my earlier thoughts I had surmised that different conflicting selfish interests had striven to secure their man for this high office, but had felt that they would neutralize each other in a tolerably healthy result. But I had had no idea that selfish foreign interests had been able to take a hand in our conventions for the nomination of our Presidents.

The new light of danger roused me and I began to study the situation, analyzing the history of our Presidents, fitting together this thing and that that before I had not known how to catalogue or explain, and the revelation was borne in upon me that selfish imperialism and the slimy ooze of international commercialism had found the weak place in the dike of personal liberty and from its great pressure was forcing its way through at a rate that threatens the submergence of our institutions.

As I studied further I began to realize that these great national conflicting interests that had formerly neutralized each other, now in spite of laws in restraint of trade unenforced because of stultification of the different arms of the executive, had combined into monster trusts, reaching into every line of commerce and, unsated in their greedy feeding upon the Nation's people and resources, had become international and were a part of the flood adding to the pressure whose purpose is to control our Presidents, lay out their policies, foreign and domestic, appoint their Cabinet, name members of our Supreme Court, who have already in many instances usurped the functions of Congress, thus giving evidence of their power, if made up of the right personnel, to override Congress and even the Executive himself who may have made them, and like Louis XIV declare themselves the State.

To the millions of any nation on earth across the seven seas, this is the promised land. This the land and these the homes we love so well. "Lives there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, this is my own, my native land."

But where virtue is there vice will stain her spotless purity, where liberty reigns there tyranny and sordid treason seek to undermine her stability and trail her fallen emblem in the dust. Foes within and foes without threaten. Foreign jealousies, greed, and the corruption of our trusted servants, vice, social discord are endangering through this rift the dike of our liberty.

But as surely as the sun rises will it shine upon millions and millions of her defenders, upon hearts ready to pour out the last drop of devoted blood that the name of freedom's home may be perpetuated. But it is not in the offering of blood that remedy can be wrought. We must reach the heart and understanding of those willing to give that blood that they may, through their votes, compel their Senators and Congressmen to amend the Constitution, doing away forever with the

outworn, obsolete, antiquated convention for the nomination of our Presidents that makes possible through preconvention obligations, promises, and trades, this ever-widening gap. We must in the way ordained by that sacred Constitution, amend it to fit the needs of the present glaring danger and make safe the rule of the people through their chosen representatives by giving to them the power of nomination of their executive officer. Through such nomination they will reach their choice, not the choice of the anointed few. The people's choice will be responsible to them while the choice of international money-maddened industry will be responsible to it. It is only a question of time, if amendment is not had, until the growing unrest of the people will have us so divided in theories of remedy that some strong foreign imperial potentate will rear his throne upon our impotence to control and guide our destiny. Already there is a strong, virulent, steadily growing, never-dying propaganda, because engineered and guided by a definite never-relinquishing patient policy consistently adhered to through all the various ramifications of a mighty Nation, well nourished to that end by great massive fortunes, the interest of which, by specific bequest, is being used for that very purpose. The people have long and patiently been asking why something can not be done. Their voices are becoming more and more petulant and they are fast losing confidence in the form of our Government, for they can not understand why there has grown up in this country a commercial feudalism equal to that of the Middle Ages. Why a class levy tribute from the people to pay enormous fortunes on fictitious values in watered stocks, and through privileged chicanery, gambling, and distorted laws, have acquired untold wealth; why great reveling palaces cast their darkening shadows over hovels of poverty and despair? Why to-day in countless homes there is nothing but weariness and want, nothing but crusts softened by tears? Why writhing, wretched men and women, mournful, deformed children, blighted and hopeless in agony, cry for justice; why millions of crippled bodies, pitiful, unkempt little children, despondent, despairing American citizens, are asking in vain for relief in the most plentiful land in the world; why great combination power controlling mines, mills, forests, fisheries, food products of the world, and the highways of traffic over which they are carried are allowed to strangle everything deserving the name of competition? Why five great packing companies fix the price of every ox and every pound of steak in the United States? Why the great coal combination is allowed to charge three times the value of their product, when everybody knows that coal is produced in the car at the mouth of the mine from $1.75 to $3.25 per ton? Why we have continually presented to us the wonderful spectacle of farm products raised at an actual loss while their price to the consumer is as dear as when a greenback dollar was worth 20 cents?

Why are these combinations allowed to develop schemes for the forcing up of prices and the forcing down of earnings of labor and farm; why is this invisible, irresistible, unconvictible tyrant allowed to appear, in the eyes of the people, greater than the Government, and through the discontent generated increase the socialist idea by the thousand? Why is it that good, sane, sensible, honest business men because of their fear of socialism are forced to support in politics the men controlled by such manipulation, which in the end only means the swallowing up of their business, little or big, the destruction of their country, or the taking of it over by a foreign imperial power, or revolution and anarchy? Why is the poor devil of a farmer to-day unable to pay his taxes on soil the most fertile in the world? Why is it cheaper for him to burn the products of his farm instead of buying coal? Sympathy, brotherly interest, fair dealing, men have to and for one another, but these great monster combinations have nothing to do with these things for they can be run without sentiment.

What was it Theodore Roosevelt meant when he said: "We here in America hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years, and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed and we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men. If we merely build upon this new continent another nation of great but unjustly divided material prosperity we shall have done nothing, and we shall do as little, if we merely pit the greed of envy against the greed of arrogance and thereby destroy the material well-being of us all."

What matter it if children and women do starve and freeze and helpless babes moan out their lives in misery? Let the barons of food and coal through their interests in great combinations add to their millions and increase the inventory of their luxuries.

I heard a great coal baron in Chicago, whose daily expenditure is enormous, on being asked why coal was so high, reply "That he had the coal and if the people wanted it they'd pay what he asked, regardless of what it cost him." These are the kinds of fellows that dictate the nomination of your Presidents.

The people are asking what shall be done? Shall they be answered, nothing? Shall we tell them there is no law for the emporer? But, boys, we have on our statute books, passed by Republican legislatures, laws to handle just that kind of fellows. In response to the peoples' demands, the Sherman Anti-trust Act was passed. The Supreme Court, the majority of whom were appointed by President Taft, after long and laborious study, interpolated into this just law the poisonous word "reasonable," thereby rendering it perfectly harmless.

But the Representatives in Congress in carrying out the demand of the people, followed with the Clayton Act, which fixed up the ravages of the Supreme Court and again made manipulators in restraint of trade criminals under the law. But the Supreme Court were so finicky as to what constituted evidence to convict that the law practically became useless. Meanwhile the years were going by and the gouging of the people continued, and Roosevelt, as President, conceived the idea of forming a Federal Trade Commission by an act of Congress, whose duty it would be to make investigation, and under the law such investigations should be competent as evidence before the court. But Roosevelt's effort along this line met stubborn resistance from the controlling stand-pat element in Congress, so that his dream of bringing these vampires to earth was never realized. Because Roosevelt brought to the people in his campaign of 1912 this pressing need, the first Congress of the Wilson administration put through such an act. After years of investigation the Federal Trade Commission had succeeded in securing convincing evidence of the most inhuman and damning combinations in restraint of trade for the purpose of robbing the people that ever the mind of man conceived. Coal, oil, wool, shoe, packer, and other industries were among the indictments, and I wish I had the time to further enumerate, but for illustration I will use only the packers, and content myself by saying that they are not sinners above all Israel. It was shown they controlled 762 industries besides a great number in which they held less than the majority of the stock. Attorney General Palmer was forced to admit the evidence sufficient to convict, but what happened to this gang of criminals? Why, they were called in and slapped on the wrist and the matter was amicably settled by what is known as the consent decree, whereby the packers gave up ostensibly 10 lines of foodstuff in which they could only own 49 per cent of the stock, and if they wanted to own more they would have to be put to the extreme trouble of organizing another corporation or manipulating their control through banking directors sitting with the directors of the corporation. Thus, after a fight of years, the people have on the statute books a law, and they have in the archives in the Federal Trade Commission the evidence that will bring these criminals to their knees. Then, why in God's name is it not done? To enforce laws you must have one of the arms of the administration, which is a member of the Cabinet, the Attorney General.

Great combinations in restraint of trade or war profiteers would be greatly interested in who the personnel of this office are to be. Those interested in our foreign policy will be greatly concerned in the personnel of the offices of Secretary of State and Secretary of Commerce.

I was a delegate from my State to the Chicago convention, and I use this convention because I know about it. That convention, if the rank and file had had voice, would have nominated either Senator JOHNSON or General Wood, for wherever the rank and file of the party had expressed their choice it was overwhelmingly for one or the other of these two progressive Republicans. The convention at San Francisco was undoubtedly attended by the representative of the same interests at work, though perhaps they were more plentiful at Chicago, it being a foregone conclusion that no Democrat could be elected two years ago because they were irrevocably committed to the League of Nations and the people had been well sounded out by the great interests that make it their business to look after these things.

It does not matter what party name attaches to the convention, the same influences are at work to see to it that the nominee is the man they want, and the people can afterwards fight as hard as they please over which one of the chosen it will be.

I was requested by Senator JOHNSON to second his nomination at that Chicago convention and I know something of its internal workings because of my interest in him.

I have only the highest regard for President Harding. Personally, I am charmed by his gentleness and good-fellowship and in his easy-going way; I think he is a man of great ability and I believe him to be sincere in his attitude upon public questions, but I reserve the right to differ from him very materially twixt his conception and mine. My record in the House is very different, and, in a great part, absolutely opposed to his in the Senate. I have consistently spoken and voted upon the theory that prosperity should begin with the people and work up through, for history indisputably discloses that no reform has ever come about except through the people; his theory has, it has seemed to me, been that prosperity should begin from above and trickle down through.

Therefore when he became the nominee of the Republican convention, not with my vote, for I cast my vote every time for Senator JOHNSON, I could not have consistently supported him from the domestic standpoint, but I felt so deeply the far greater issue of whether we should continue our independence as a nation or be submerged in an entangling international plot, from which I could see nothing but trouble and war in the future, that I, with all the power I had, by voice and vote supported him for the Presidency of the United States, and in 47 speeches I told the common people of my district and elsewhere that I thought it was their duty to cast aside for the purpose of the election their views of domestic affairs and decide forever against entangling alliances with governments who could not and would not understand us, and that I believed that we could be of more service to the world by keeping intact our institutions, ideals, and liberty.

The one big issue was our country's independence, and after that was irrevocably settled, which I thought the election would do, we could then take up our domestic affairs and thrash them out. The Republican platform, engineered through Senator BORAH, in constant touch with Senator JOHNSON, was a garment made to fit Senator JOHNSON and represented his attitude upon international affairs and was straight out against entrance into the league, and declared again for our Nation's independence through the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine and insisted upon our Nation's right to control her internal affairs. President Harding was elected upon that platform by the most overwhelming vote ever given any President because there was no other place between that platform and the Democratic platform for the voter to go. The peoples' mandate was practically unanimous to keep away from entangling alliances.

It was rumored during the convention that there was enough foreign money represented at Chicago to pay off the German indemnity and that undoubtedly the object of such representation was the securing of the possibility of getting us some way, by back or side door, into the League of Nations, but the Republican platform was so clear upon this question that I could not believe it.

Rumor had it that we could easily make its entrance by means of The Hague tribunal, which under the jurisdiction of the league would amount to practically the same thing.

I, therefore, later watched with no little surprise the development of the four-power pact. We entered the war with no desire of gain. England secured a third of the face of the world; Japan got her arms full; France filled her pockets, and Italy overloaded her lap. We got prohibition. Then why should we underwrite the spoils of the war for these nations? I gravely fear for the people of this country the future results of that war alliance. The Republican platform declared again for free tolls through the Panama Canal to our coastwise trade. In 1912 the Republican, Democratic, and Progressive platforms all declared for free tolls to our coastwise trade through this canal and Congress, in response to the unanimous demand of the people, passed such a law practically without opposition. Why was it that a short time afterwards President Wilson came to Congress and asked the repeal of that act, saying, "that if they did not repeal it, he hardly knew how to handle the delicate diplomatic situation that might arise." Coastwise trade is nothing more or less than interstate commerce, and for any nation to tell us that we could not use the Mississippi or the Potomac for trade between our different States would be at once resented by the people of the country. Then why is it not just as much foreign impudence when only the name is different? We own the Panama Canal because Roosevelt came into the President's chair unbound by preconvention, foreign interference.

After a man is President he is in a great deal better shape to contract for the good of his country than before he has secured the nomination, and a system of election that makes possible this dilemma certainly should be corrected at the earliest possible time. Think of it, boys. Had the Sterling-Graham sedition bill, which had already passed the Senate at the instigation of Attorney General Palmer, and which I, as a member of the Rules Committee, had a part in preventing getting before the House, become a law, men could have been hung for daring to advocate a change in our Government. They would have me up to-morrow.

Free speech and an unbridled press is one of the very bulwarks of our Constitution and must be maintained if we are to preserve in this world the rights of the individual. For it is the conflict of opinions that keeps steady the heartbeat of our Nation. It is a peculiar anomaly that it is through this very freedom of speech opportunity is given for anyone, either domestic or foreign, to spread propaganda by press, pulpit, or lecture platform, against our national life and prosperity. But we must meet it by better argument and we will be better prepared to meet it if the jury is all the citizens of the United States, working out their will and conclusions by the exercising of their citizenship in party nominations where at a general election the two schools of thought can fight out their differences for supremacy. For then it would be a matter of education for all the people and as Lincoln well put it, "you can fool some of the people some of the time, all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time."

It was American money and American perseverance and ingenuity that built the Panama Canal. Why is it that we can not to-day even row a canoe through it without paying for it just like any other Nation and why are our people taxed for the benefit of foreign nations? Senator BORAH has tried, without avail so far, to restore this right of the Nation. The nomination of our party candidates by the people would forever do away with foreign intrigues in our internal affairs, except so far as they could influence through propaganda.

Where there is so much talk of ship subsidy it may not be inappropriate to call attention to the fact that during the last part of the Wilson administration a Republican Congress and Senate passed a ship subsidy act, giving 10 per cent discount of duty to foreign goods coming into this country in American bottoms. This is a law to-day, was a law during a considerable part of Wilson's term. It has never been enforced, though it is a similar law to the one that has made Britain's merchant fleet the greatest in the world. Our recently acquired four billion dollar merchant marine, it seems to me, could be well occupied under the operation of this law, without waiting for Congress to take further action at a profit instead of our sustaining a great loss through its deterioration at the docks, and the dream of McKinley and Roosevelt to make us a maritime Nation, furnishing outlet for our surplus products, started upon its fulfillment despite the manipulations of any competing nation in the world.

I have often wondered, for I have never been satisfied with the theory of the newspapers of the assassination of President McKinley, what motive was back of the act. President McKinley, after the Spanish-American War, had outlined and was putting into effect a world-wide trade for the United States. He was in the act of enunciating to the Nation in his speech at Buffalo this plan of his to make us one of the great nations of the world when he was struck down by an assassin's bullet. Between the era of the clipper-built yacht and the time of McKinley we had taken little interest in the development of world trade. McKinley, because of our surplus production, was rightly setting us upon a new era, and his death might have been thought to end such ambitions, but Theodore Roosevelt, then the Vice President of the United States, who had been placed by the powers that be in that office to get rid of him forever from being a candidate for the presidency of the United States, was ushered into that great office unbound and unconnected by preconvention promises and took up the fight where President McKinley had left off, in standing for America first, in enforcing the Monroe doctrine, and in seeing to it that our citizens were respected the world over.

You all remember his ringing declaration to Morocco: We want our American citizen alive or your bandit dead; and we got our American citizen alive, you bet. But Theodore Roosevelt was greater in his administration than President McKinley, for he also took up the fight of the ordinary fellow in our domestic affairs, for through his influence the people of the country again began to realize hope, from the standpoint of the preservation of our personal liberties and economic rights and not as a partisan of any class of people, but for a square deal to all regardless of affluence or poverty.

He inaugurated a new vision of public life, shook the apathy of the cultivated class and the ingrained corruption of party politics; and by the sheer force of a masterful personality,

unshackled by preconvention promises, compelled respect for our Nation at home and abroad. He sent a thrill of electric energy throughout our own country which at one time saw in politics only a sordid career without honor or ideals. Like Lincoln, who came into the Executive chair under a great national passion, too big for preconvention interference, he was left free to use his best judgment as the issue presented itself.

Such a policy by Taft or Wilson in Mexican affairs would have settled things. Such a policy by Wilson at the beginning of the World War might have saved this country 125,000 of its youth, untold suffering, and billions of dollars. We must have, if our country is to endure, our Executives free to act as God gives them the light to see their duty when the crisis comes, and not be tied down by any promises to any clique, organization, man, or foreign policy; and you will never be sure of this freedom of action in your Presidents until those Presidents are made responsible to the people and relieved from those obligations which of necessity they must accept to insure their nomination upon any party that has a chance of electing its candidate; and we are asking too much of human ambition to subject it to such temptation, and a Federal law should be had that will put a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, by making it a serious crime, beyond the reach of such bickering, double-crossing, skullduggery, crooked dealing, and offering of money and trading of offices by way of patronage or otherwise, as is the rule in vogue in our national conventions to-day.

Our national convention is beyond the jurisdiction of State government and is without the jurisdiction of Federal Government. They therefore meet upon a strip of No Man's Land over which there is no law or authority and the delegates are free to do anything their conscience will permit them to do. It is no crime in these national conventions to admit you got the money, openly show it, and boast of it. How can the people ever expect real representation of them through bodies of this kind where the desires and wishes of the people are relegated and put to rout through determined selfish interest with unlimited resources at their command and where party platforms are too often made for election only, and too seldom carried out; where men who adopt the profession of political bosses, whose services are for sale as any other profession, manipulate the delegates of their respective States? The majority of these delegates are good American citizens, who feel it a great honor to be elected delegate to these national conventions but who, engaged in the conduct of their own affairs, know little or nothing of the issues at stake and are easily delivered to this candidate or that by the boss who has brought them to the convention, paying their railroad fare, hotel bills, and so forth. They come to these conventions entirely without preparation on the issues there to be decided. To them it is only a holiday or a lark.

Then there are other delegates who come only for the purpose of actual cash or the development of a selfish scheme through which the people will later pay, in one way or another. A delegate to these conventions should be a Government officer, subject to the laws of the country as well as to a law regulating these conventions and who prepares himself at least in some degree to understand the issues which he is to decide. The delegates to a national convention, whatever the party name under which they are gathered, are, in the great majority, merely a bunch of sheep, whose leader, having jumped over a stick, the rest will follow as rapidly as they approach, though the stick has been removed so that the control of these conventions is merely the securing of a good boss from each State, furnish him with plenty of money and he will see to it that the delegates brought in from that State are men that will go in the dirction he indicates, for through a careful study of his men he will know exactly what to do in any instance to bring them into line.

The makers of Presidents were very much scared that the running mate of Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 should become the Republican candidate in 1920, so they set about to thwart him as the choice of the people and General Wood was brought into the race and millions, without General Wood being conscious of it, were spent in his behalf. Not that they wanted or intended to nominate such a character, but through him, in the States where the rank and file had a chance to express their choice, he could be used to offset Senator JOHNSON; thus they would split the choice of the people and with his delegates at Chicago voting for Wood keep Senator JOHNSON from securing the nomination until the chessboard had been manipulated to suit their purposes.

You can not secure reform or permanently mend the breach in the wall of our independence and liberty without fixing this hole in the Constitution. You can form new parties with principles of the highest resolve. But they will avail you naught, for the moment your party becomes big enough to have a chance of electing its candidate, the same sinister influence will creep in and nominate that candidate. I am not speaking against the Republican party or its officers. I am not speaking against the Democratic party or its officers. I am calling attention, as I believe it my duty as a citizen and as a Member of Congress, to a great gap in our system which is bound to wreck us, if it is not mended, just as sure as the months and years go on, and it is high time that somebody should speak.

Four years ago, as I told you, this flagrant weakness in our system was called so vividly to my attention I immediately began the search for a remedy and after persistent study I came to the conclusion that the amendment of the Constitution was the only way in which it could be perfected. I have introduced such an amendment and I find it to be the first amendment so introduced in Congress. Senator JOHNSON has since introduced such a resolution and I believe that Senator NORRIS expects to soon introduce one; thus beyond all doubt this great weakness in our Constitution will become, I believe, in the next campaign, a national issue. It certainly ought to be an issue before the people at the earliest date. My resolution introduced in the last Congress received no consideration by the committee to which it was referred, and that resolution, reintroduced this session, I presume will meet the same fate, but the time is coming and very soon when people understanding the situation will demand its consideration and passage. I have followed up my resolution of constitutional amendment by a bill wherein I incorporated what seems to me, and I have no pride of authorship, but merely want to secure the consensus of the brains of Congress applied to this point, to meet the situation for the control of our nominations and elections of the Presidents of the United States, Vice Presidents, Senators, and Congressmen, under which the people can nominate their Presidents and eliminate Newberryism in Congress, and I offer it as a point of departure or attack.

The amendment provides that the President and Vice President of the United States shall be elected by the direct vote of the people, and that the Congress shall have legislative powers to control Federal elections and the nomination of candidates for elective Federal offices, which includes, of course, the power to regulate party activities, in so far as they ought to be regulated to assure the voters of the parties an honest expression of their will.

The bill, which, as I have already said, will no doubt need the adoption of the amendment to bring it within the constitutional powers of Congress, provides that the Republican and Democratic parties are now recognized as existing political parties; that five hundred or more of the electors of any congressional district may form a new party by filing the proper petition; that when a new party shall have been organized in a majority of the districts of any State it shall, ipso facto, be deemed as organized throughout the State, and when so organized in the 12 or more of the States it shall be deemed to be organized throughout the United States. It provides that every party must elect, by the direct vote of the electors, a congressional district chairman in each congressional district, and a chairman of a senatorial committee in each State, and that these officials shall constitute the senatorial committees in the States. It provides for national committees by making the chairmen of the senatorial committees of all the States, ex officio, members of the national committee. All of these men are public officials amenable to the laws of the United States and directly responsible to the people who elect them. These men, together with the Representatives and Senators in Congress of the several parties, constitute the delegates to national conventions of their respective parties, and national conventions are limited to a promulgation of a party platform and an expression of the opinions of the delegates as to the merits of presidential and vice presidential candidates seeking the party nomination.

The bill provides that all party candidates for elective Federal offices shall be nominated at primaries by the direct vote of the electors, and that candidates not affiliated with parties may file as such after the primary.

One of the most important provisions of the bill is the provision for the creation of a Federal Elections Commission to supervise and execute the law. The commission is to consist, at its organization, of three members, two of whom shall be chosen by the Senators and Representatives of the party having the majority of those offices, and one by the Senators and Representatives of the minority party, and when any new party shall have elected at least one Senator and five Repre-

sentatives, it may choose an additional member, provided the total membership of the commission is not increased to more than five. The commission is charged with many duties and obligations which are set out in detail in the bill. It will be sufficient to say here that it is the official political representative of the United States in all matters pertaining to Federal elections.

No attempt has been made to hamper or in any way interfere with legitimate party activities. On the contrary, an earnest attempt has been made to keep from such interference. Both the amendment and the bill are drawn with the sole purpose of assuring to the people of the United States a square deal in registering their actual will in all Federal elections. They have never from the formation of the United States had the opportunity of doing so, and will not until an amendment to this end of the Constitution is had and some such a law put upon the statutes for the regulations of nominations and elections.

Every word of the convention proposed under this law must be taken down, transcribed, and printed for free distribution to any citizen of the United States upon request, where he can see every argument made, by whom proposed, and its final result, wherein he can hear what the prospective candidate has to say and what his ideas are should he become President of the United States, thus giving any voter of the United States opportunity to know the exact truth of the proceedings of that convention. Even if the cost of it should amount to a substantial sum it would only be a drop in the bucket to the taxpayers as compared to the ocean of gouging they now endure under the present system.

The vote of the convention upon candidates shall do no more than to classify the choice of the delegates as to first, second, third, and so forth, which will give the voters the benefit of the best opinion of their Congressmen and Senators and of their duly elected delegate from their own congressional district and State. The opinion of Congressmen and Senators of their party ought to be valuable to them, since their work and entire time is given to the study of such questions as may be there presented. The delegate of each congressional district known as congressional district chairman and the delegate elected at large in the State known as chairman of senatorial committee will come into the convention from every part of the United States, fresh from the people, knowing their desires, sentiments, and needs, giving to the convention the elements of understanding necessary to create a platform upon which the people are represented in their particular school of thought and insure the issues thus advanced being protected by practicality in view of our established institutions of government under the Constitution. The delegate from district and State, having been duly elected by the voters of his party in the regular election of their State preceding the convention, will have had time to know something about his duties in the coming convention. The Government will pay his railroad fare and his hotel bills, and give him a reasonable amount of compensation for his time and trouble, which I have set in my bill at $500, and will relieve him from any obligations to selfish interests paying his expenses and time.

Thus, my friends, I have given you in response to your chairman's request what I consider to be the great weapon, not only in our domestic economic robberies but foreign piracy, that is to-day threatening the very foundations of our Government, and the remedy offered it seems to me is absolute if our country is to endure as a representative Government and the people continue to enjoy their inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

REPORT OF THE NEAR EAST RELIEF COMMISSION.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of the Near East Relief Commission to Congress, which expired December 31, 1922.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform the House how lengthy the article is? Why not have it available in the form of congressional documents?

Mr. FISH. There is one copy at the desk. I think it is about 10 pages. This was incorporated under act of Congress and it is a report that must be filed with the Congress. It is typewritten, not printed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not have it printed as a document?

Mr. FISH. It is too late to do that; that is the trouble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The report is as follows:

REPORT ON THE NEAR EAST RELIEF TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1922.

To the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

SIRS: In accordance with the act of incorporation of Near East Relief, approved by the President August 6, 1919, we submit herewith report for the year ending December 31, 1922, in the form of:

1. Report of the executive committee to the board of trustees for the calendar year 1922, as presented at the annual meeting of the board of trustees February 27, 1923.
2. Treasurer's report for the calendar year 1922.
3. Auditors' report for the calendar year 1922.
4. Report of the general secretary for 1922, as submitted at the annual meeting of the board of trustees February 27, 1923.
5. Committee organization of Near East relief within the United States, giving the names and residences of the officers and members who have served on the board of trustees during the year 1922.

In behalf of the executive committee.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES V. VICKREY,
General Secretary.

NEAR EAST RELIEF REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, HELD ON FEBRUARY 27, 1923.

I.—EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS.

Since the last annual meeting of the board of trustees the executive committee has had 12 regular meetings, on the following dates: January 10, 1922; February 9, 1922; March 20, 1922; April 7, 1922; May 17, 1922; June 8, 1922; September 20, 1922; October 21, 1922; November 21, 1922; December 12, 1922; January 12, 1923; February 2, 1923.

The minutes of these executive committee meetings have been sent regularly for information to all members of the board of trustees, together with accompanying financial statements, cablegrams, and reports from the field, and are herewith submitted to the board as part of the report of the executive committee.

II.—SUBCOMMITTEES.

At the first meeting of the executive committee, January 10, 1922 (or at subsequent meetings), various subcommittees were organized, including finance, personnel, nominations, editorial, justice and good will, loan and industrial relief. Minutes of these subcommittees are likewise submitted herewith and are available for reference and for any detailed information that may not have been incorporated in the minutes of the executive committee.

III.—CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND COMMITTEES.

With deep gratitude we note that during the past year there have been no changes occasioned by death, resignation, or other cause in the membership of the board of trustees or committees of Near East Relief.

IV.—METHOD OF TRANSACTING BUSINESS.

To facilitate the work of the executive committee and insure clearness and accuracy in the transaction of business the executive officers have prepared in advance of each regular executive committee meeting a docket, including:

Minutes of previous meeting.
Treasurer's report.
Latest cablegrams and reports from relief areas.
Proposed appropriations.
Proposed votes to be submitted to the committee.

These dockets, containing from 30 to 100 pages of advance information, are sent to each member of the executive committee before the committee meeting in order that the members of the committee may acquaint themselves with the reports and proposed votes before coming to the meeting. In this way every vote taken represents some preliminary consideration on the part of the committee as well as clearly formulated action at the meeting.

Copies of these dockets have been sent to members of the board of trustees in order to keep the board of trustees in as close touch as practicable with the detailed work of the executive committee.

The official dockets for the committee meetings of the year are submitted herewith and are available for examination by any members of the board that may be interested.

V.—MEETINGS OF THE OVERSEAS ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES.

At each of the overseas administrative centers—Constantinople, Alexandropol, Beirut, and Tabriz—administrative committees are appointed and organized under the direction of the executive committee. These committees consist of leading American residents in these centers, and have regular meetings for the supervision of all Near East Relief work in these areas. The minutes of these regular meetings of the administrative committees are forwarded to New York, duplicated, and bound into the docket of the executive committee for the information of each member of the executive committee preliminary to the committee meetings.

These minutes of the overseas administrative committees, incorporated in the dockets for the executive committee meetings, are submitted herewith as part of the more detailed report of the executive committee.

VI.—AUDITS.

Messrs. Hurdman & Cranstoun, certified public accountants, have continued throughout the year a continuous audit of all accounts in our New York office, and Messrs. Russell & Co., chartered accountants, of London, Cairo, and Constantinople, have rendered a similar service in a continuous audit of accounts overseas.

A summarized report of these audits will be submitted with the treasurer's report. The detailed reports are available for examination of trustees and contributors.

VII.—SUMMARY OF RELIEF OPERATIONS.

A more detailed report of relief operations will be presented by the chairman of the board of trustees, the treasurer, and the general secretary, but as chairman and in behalf of the executive committee I call attention to the total of our relief disbursements for 1922 as $12,280,325, compared with $9,961.27 for 1921, showing an increase

of $2,319,418.73 for 1922 over 1921. The receipts for 1922 have been $10,214,070.61, compared with $7,285,247.05 for 1921, an increase of $2,928,823.56 for 1922 over 1921.

Normally we would have expected a decrease of possibly 25 per cent in the disbursements of 1922 as compared with 1921. The increase in relief disbursements has been rendered necessary by the Smyrna fire and subsequent disasters and emergencies incident to the evacuation of the Christian populations from Asia Minor. While the year's operations show an increase rather than the desired decrease in relief operations, we have the satisfaction of knowing that many thousands of lives have been saved for future usefulness because Near East relief workers were on the ground with necessary supplies and ready to give their lives as well as their strength and supplies in order to save the lives of others.

VIII.—THE PRESIDENT'S NEAR EAST EMERGENCY FUND COMMITTEE.

We are under deep indebtedness to the President for his sympathetic cooperation and leadership in appealing to the American public in behalf of the Near East emergency fund, and to Hon. Will H. Hays for his chairmanship of the President's Committee of Sponsors and the Special Coordinating Committee named by the President to direct the appeals in behalf of the American Red Cross and Near East Relief. To Mr. R. J. Cuddihy large credit is due for courageous initiative in providing immediate relief at a time when minutes meant life. The example of personal devotion given by Mr. Hays as chairman of the committee, and by Mr. Cuddihy through the pages of the Literary Digest, has been of inestimable value in challenging chairmen of State committees and editors of publications throughout the United States to render like assistance. Without such voluntary leadership and cooperation, the life-saving service of the Near East Relief would be impossible.

IX.—COOPERATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The cooperation of Armenian, Greek, Syrian, and Assyrian residents in America has been a large and inspiring factor in the work of the executive committee. The contribution from Armenians and Greeks this year have been even larger than in preceding years, approximately $1,000,000, through our treasury, exclusive of sums sent through other channels.

X.—COOPERATION OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.

Near East Relief is dependent upon the cooperation of many other organizations, and one of the inspiring features of the work is the heartiness with which societies and individuals respond to the appeal of suffering.

Churches and Sunday schools continue to be a major source of support. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews give generously. Practically every ecclesiastical organization in America—North, South, East, and West—have passed cordial resolutions of indorsement.

Public and private schools have been large contributors to the relief fund during the past year. Increasingly principals and teachers are recognized in the relief appeal and in the response of the children to that appeal an indispensable factor in the education and character development of children.

Near East Relief is receiving the cooperation of practically all of the great fraternal organizations of the country—lodges, rotary clubs, Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., and Knights of Columbus; of chambers of commerce, agricultural organizations, labor organizations, and milling associations; of Government departments—State, War, and Navy; of innumerable commercial concerns, who are contributing commodities, free advertising, and other invaluable cooperation; and of newspapers and magazines—secular, religious, and fraternal. Without this cooperation the life-saving achievements of Near East Relief would be impossible. Our indebtedness and the indebtedness of the people of the Near East to all these collaborating agencies is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) EDWIN M. BULKLEY,
Chairman.

TREASURER'S REPORT.

RECEIPTS.

During the year 1922 income from all sources amounted to $10,714,070.61. This amount, added to the balance of $1,894,643.55 carried over from 1921, made available for disbursement during the year $12,608,714.16. Disbursements during 1922 amounted to $12,280,325, leaving a balance on December 31 of $328,389.16.

The income during the past year, mentioned above as $10,714,070.61, was in excess of the income of 1921 by $3,428,823.56. This is accounted for by the fact that, although the contributions for the preceding months were small, they increased during January, February, and March, and continued satisfactory throughout the year. During the latter part of the year a special appeal was made for funds to meet the Smyrna emergency. The total amount specially contributed or otherwise credited to this fund was $579,148.98.

DISBURSEMENTS.

The disbursements during the year exceeded disbursements for 1921 by $2,318,418.73. This excess in spite of a 25 per cent reduction in appropriations is directly attributed to the emergency caused by the Smyrna disaster and the exodus from Anatolia and Eastern Thrace. The Constantinople area shows a considerable overdraft and the Syrian balances are reduced, both due to the tremendous increase in the work of the respective areas in caring for the refugees and transferring the orphans.

The disbursements also exceeded the income for the year by $1,566,254.39, thereby further reducing the reserve which now amounts to $328,389.16. However, it should be remembered that a considerable part of the disbursements was for supplies which are now in our warehouses overseas and will be available for relief work during the coming year. There is well over $1,000,000 in these supplies now in our warehouses overseas.

AUDITS.

There are attached hereto certain exhibits and schedules which explain in detail the condition of the accounts. Exhibits A, B, and C, and schedule A were prepared by Hurdman & Cranstoun, certified public accountants, auditors of our domestic accounts, and are covered by their official statement preceding the exhibits.

Schedules 1, 2, and 3, showing details of sections of work which are not given any space in the very condensed report of Hurdman & Cranstoun, were prepared by our own accountants in order that the board of trustees might have this additional information.

Schedule 2, "Comparison of individual remittance contributions," is of special interest because of the unusual growth in number of items handled. Armenians and Greeks in this country in greater numbers are taking advantage of our facilities and are helping their destitute relatives and friends in the Near East through this department.

Schedule 3, "Statement of the industrial department." In December of 1921 a retail shop was opened in a section of the national office for the sale of Near East Relief industrial products, the work of our orphans overseas. During the year of 1922 the sales in this department amounted to $30,094.85.

Russell & Co., chartered accountants of London, Cairo, and Constantinople, who conduct and supervise throughout the year a continuous audit of all foreign stations, cable as follows:

"In auditing the Near East Relief accounts of the Constantinople and Caucasus areas, we have to report that the relief funds and supplies are economically and efficiently administered both by headquarters and district stations and that an effective system of accounting is in force. Full reports on these areas will follow shortly."

The report when received will be submitted to the executive committee for their approval.

Respectfully submitted.

CLEVELAND H. DODGE, *Treasurer.*

HURDMAN & CRANSTOUN,
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,
350 Madison Avenue, New York City, February, 21, 1923.

Mr. C. V. VICKREY,
Secretary Near East Relief, New York City.

DEAR SIR: We have audited the financial records of the New York headquarters office of the Near East Relief for the year ending December 31, 1922, and submit our report in the accompanying statements and the following comments:

A statement of receipts and disbursements for the period is given under Exhibit "A."

A cumulative statement to December 31, 1922, including all receipts and disbursements covered by our previous reports, is submitted under Exhibit "B."

A statement of appropriations for relief operations in the Near East, authorized by the executive committee in New York, will be found under Exhibit "C."

The following is a summary of relief contributions, appropriations, and payments:

	Total.	General relief.	Individual relief.
Relief contributions (net)	$61,844,525.89	$58,968,919.97	$2,875,605.92
Relief appropriations	59,578,605.23	56,702,999.31	2,875,605.92
Relief payments in excess of appropriations	1,311,589.50	1,313,832.50	[1] 2,243.00
Relief payments	60,890,194.73	58,016,831.81	2,873,362.92
Relief fund balance	954,331.16	952,088.16	2,243.00

[1] Balance of relief appropriations.

The amount of appropriations shown above includes $625,000 for use in the Near East during the months of January and February, 1923.

Since our financial examination and audit of your accounts in the Constantinople, Caucasus, and Syria areas, conducted during 1920, we have exercised no control over your foreign accounts except as represented by your New York books, nor have we in any way conducted an audit or supervised the financial transactions of the local or branch treasuries established by the Near East relief in New York and other cities throughout the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

HURDMAN & CRANSTOUN,
Certified Public Accountants.

Near East Relief.

EXHIBIT "A."

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS—JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1922.

Balance, Dec. 31, 1921			$1,894,643.55
Receipts:			
Contributions—			
General relief (net)	$10,002,344.58		
Individual remittances	480,376.37		
		$10,482,720.95	
Expense funds—			
Private contributions for expense	151,820.23		
Interest on bank balances and income from securities	72,735.18		
Interest on loans and advances	6,794.25		
		231,349.66	
Total receipts (net)			10,714,070.61
			12,608,714.16
Disbursements:			
Relief payments—			
General relief	11,169,725.45		
Individual relief	479,969.87		
		11,649,695.32	
National headquarters expense—			
General administrative expense	86,284.53		
Publicity expense	91,630.87		
Field expense	452,714.28		
Total expense		630,629.68	
Total disbursements			12,280,325.00
Balance, Dec. 31, 1922			328,389.16

Near East relief.

EXHIBIT "B."

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS TO DECEMBER 31, 1922.

	Total.	Relief funds.	Expense funds.
RECEIPTS.			
Contributions:			
General relief (net)	$58,968,919.97	$58,968,919.97	
Individual relief	2,875,605.92	2,875,605.92	
Expense funds:			
Contributions for expense	1,693,150.57		$1,693,150.57
Refunds of freight and transportation charges	170,521.17		170,521.17
Interest on bank balances and income from securities	751,556.50		751,556.50
Interests on loans and advances	6,794.25		6,794.25
Total receipts (net)	64,466,548.38	61,844,525.89	2,622,022.49
DISBURSEMENTS.			
Relief payments:			
General relief	58,016,831.81	58,016,831.81	
Individual relief	2,873,362.92	2,873,362.92	
Total relief payments	60,890,194.73	60,890,194.73	
Administrative and general expense (net)	3,247,964.49		3,247,964.49
Total disbursements (net)	64,138,159.22	60,890,194.73	3,247,964.49
Balance Dec. 31, 1922	328,389.16	954,331.16	[1] 625,942.00

[1] Deficit.

Near East relief.

EXHIBIT "C."

RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS TO DECEMBER 31, 1922.

	General relief appropriations.	Individual relief.	Total appropriations.
Caucasus	$16,220,495.46	$318,477.68	$16,538,973.14
Constantinople	19,063,101.30	1,312,468.72	20,375,570.02
Syria-Palestine	7,993,460.72	606,389.24	8,599,849.96
Mesopotamia-Persia	6,959,507.20	579,468.58	7,539,065.78
Egypt	18,474.00		18,474.00
Greece	35,914.31		35,914.31
Japan	9,000.00		9,000.00
Switzerland	13,000.00		13,000.00
GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS.			
Industrial relief	50,000.00		50,000.00
Personnel, warehouse, and general relief expense	1,178,369.89		1,178,369.89
Cargoes, general relief	4,466,865.72		4,466,865.72
Special (for loans)	15,000.00		15,000.00
Miscellaneous	679,720.71		679,720.71
Miscellaneous individual relief		56,558.70	56,558.70
Total		2,873,362.92	
Individual relief unadvised		2,243.00	2,243.00
Grand total	56,702,999.31	2,875,605.92	59,578,605.23

Appropriations for use during January and February, 1923:	
Caucasus	$150,000
Constantinople	300,000
Syria-Palestine	135,000
Mesopotamia-Persia	40,000
Total	625,000

Near East relief.

SCHEDULE "A."

BALANCE OF CASH, SECURITIES, DEFERRED EXPENSE AND SUSPENSE DECEMBER 31, 1922.

Cash in bank:			
Bankers' Trust Co., New York City		$160,694.64	
Columbia Bank, New York City		6,685.25	
Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., New York City		61,218.93	
Guaranty Trust Co., New York City		2,429.77	
Guaranty Trust Co., Paris		4,694.64	
Morgan, Harjes & Co., Paris		840.49	
National City Bank, New York City		117,129.12	
			$353,692.84
Securities:	Par value.	Book value.	
U. S. Liberty bonds (various issues)	$212,650.00	$212,650.00	
U. S. war savings stamps	60.00	60.00	
Associated Congregation in the city of Philadelphia, third mortgage 6 per cent	100.00	100.00	
Midwest Gulf & Oil Corporation, preferred stock	100.00	1.00	
Midwest Gulf & Oil Corporation, common stock	100.00	1.00	
	213,010.00		212,812.00
			566,504.84
Less unpaid drafts drawn by agents in the Near East			594,947.62
Net deficit in cash and securities			$28,442.78
Add real estate		$9,000.00	
Advances and suspense items:			
Expense fund—domestic field solicitors and others	$70,819.14		
Deferred expenses—domestic field solicitors	16,924.67		
Sundry suspense items	260,088.13		
		347,831.94	
			356,831.94
Balance, Dec. 31, 1922 (Exhibits "A" and "B")			328,389.16

SCHEDULE "1."—ANALYSIS OF INCOME, BY MONTHS, WITH COMPARISONS WITH 1921.

1921.		1922.	
January	$282,919.07	January	$304,199.09
February	829,655.25	February	1,032,349.32
March	532,675.72	March	384,597.58
April	614,392.33	April	1,320,337.09
May	429,599.64	May	563,225.55
June	2,671,634.89	June	2,871,661.94
July	183,636.99	July	232,188.64
August	272,910.52	August	211,730.82
September	160,389.97	September	342,164.87
October	162,831.51	October	728,213.48
November	280,044.88	November	903,184.62
December	567,697.21	December	1,588,867.95
	6,988,387.94		10,482,720.95

SCHEDULE 2.

NEAR EAST RELIEF COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL REMITTANCE CONTRIBUTIONS.

1921			1922		
Month.	Amount.	Items.	Month.	Amount.	Items.
January	$55,149.44	281	January	$23,844.75	338
February	68,426.31	280	February	26,055.55	369
March	41,684.30	289	March	25,633.08	468
April	57,798.13	258	April	29,013.35	423
May	25,502.92	188	May	56,648.82	479
June	26,814.78	251	June	33,240.98	467
July	21,996.84	206	July	32,667.58	497
August	22,446.58	275	August	44,953.82	559
September	22,071.14	273	September	34,361.60	497
October	22,899.65	320	October	79,081.24	672
November	26,747.55	347	November	67,961.36	857
December	18,963.66	295	December	50,341.99	769
	410,501.30	3,263		503,804.12	6,395

Schedule 3.

NEAR EAST RELIEF.

STATEMENT OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEPARTMENT, DECEMBER 20, 1921—DECEMBER 31, 1922.

Cash sales to Dec. 31, 1922		$30,094.85
Cost of sales:		
Invoice value of goods	$55,666.04	
Customs, freight, insurance	24,307.04	
	$79,973.08	
Less inventory Dec. 31	60,373.18	
Total cost of sales		19,599.90
Gross profit		10,494.95
Expenses:		
Rent	$1,200.00	
Salaries	2,123.00	
		$3,323.00
Net profit, Dec. 31, 1922		7,171.95

NOTE 1.—In addition to inventory December 31 there are goods en route amounting to $30,736.46.

NOTE 2.—It should be noted that a profit of 10 per cent is added to the cost of the goods before they are shipped from Constantinople. This is necessary to conform to customs ruling.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY OF NEAR EAST RELIEF COVERING THE CALENDAR YEAR JANUARY 1, 1922, TO DECEMBER 31, 1922.

The year has been marked by unforeseen radical changes in the political, racial, and military maps of the Near East.

War has not ceased. Races have been transplanted and more or less interchanged.

Political stability has not been secured.

Peace conferences have failed.

Refugees remain in exile.

Families and communities that were regaining economic self-support and independence have become refugees through the enforced mid-winter evacuation of their ancestral homes.

Thousands of new orphans have been created by the death or loss of parents and relatives in the interchange of populations.

Instead of the anticipated normal decrease of relief work, the demands for relief have been greatly increased, if not multiplied, by the military victories and disasters, devastating fire, and heartless interchange of populations that have characterized the year 1922 in the Near East.

I.—The Smyrna disaster and evacuation of the Christian populations of Anatolia.

The one outstanding event of the year that has most seriously affected our relief operations was the Smyrna disaster with the resultant evacuation of practically the entire Christian population from Turkish nationalist territory.

Before evacuation an effort was made to secure from the nationalist government assurance of safety for the children in our orphanages,

but failing to secure such assurance there seemed no alternative but the removal of all Christian orphans from Asia Minor. This has involved a large and unforeseen emergency expenditure for transportation and reestablishment, and will involve yet further expense in providing proper housing and accommodation in their new locations.

Every week seems to bring new evidence that the removal of the orphans was not only inevitable, but that in the end it will prove a blessing in disguise, making possible the earlier development of self-support on the part of the orphans and more satisfactory facilities for industrial education, development, and independence.

Financially, the Smyrna fire, with the accompanying panic and the later evacuation of Christian refugees from Thrace, from the Black Sea coast of Anatolio, and from the Mediterranean ports of Cilicia was far more of a drain upon our treasury than the transfer of the orphans.

Near East relief workers were on the ground at the time of the fire. They immediately provided food supplies from our Constantinople warehouses and cooperated in securing and handling ships that took the panic-stricken, fire-swept refugees to safety.

It has been impossible to secure complete reports of all the relief work done in the confusion that accompanied and followed the Smyrna fire. Near East relief work had been inaugurated among the refugees in Smyrna before the fire. Supplies had been shipped from our warehouses in Constantinople and relief headquarters established on the water front at Smyrna. This Smyrna relief base, with a considerable quantity of supplies, was destroyed in the fire. Other supplies were quickly brought from Constantinople or secured locally.

Hundreds of pages of typewritten reports submitted from different stations, islands, and refugee centers are at hand, but they represent such a rapid interchange of populations and shifting of supplies as to make an accurate summarized report extremely difficult. Such details, however, as that contained in the report from the island of Mitylene, showing that during the period immediately following the fire 2,173,022 rations of bread, flour, and hard-tack, were issued; 33,220 rations of milk issued to babies; 10,550 persons supplied with old clothes and shoes; 11,000 hospital and clinic treatments administered, suggest the magnitude of the work, not only on the island of Mitylene but in Smyrna itself, at Chios, Brusa, Samos, Crete, Salonika, Rodosto, Western Thrace, and numerous other relief and refugee centers.

The Bishop of Smyrna is quoted as saying that within the area of his observation alone he is convinced that the American relief workers were responsible for the saving of at least 200,000 lives. Premier Gonatas, the Armenian patriarch, and other high officials, both in personal interviews and by public pronouncement, have recognized the prompt, self-sacrificing, efficient service of American relief workers in saving many thousands of refugees from death in connection with the Smyrna fire or from starvation during the period of exile and reestablishment that followed the fire.

Later similar service was rendered in the embarkation, feeding, and handling of shiploads of refugees from the Black Sea ports of Samsoun and Ordu and from Mersine in Cilicia. The expense of this service, while in some measure borne by the Greek Government, has none the less made large inroads upon our treasury. We also have a heavy unavoidable emergency obligation for the remainder of the winter, especially in connection with the Armenian refugees, many of whom are stranded on or near the border line of north Syria and elsewhere, and all of whom are both without home and without country.

The one fact that stands out clear in our financial records is that as a result of these various emergencies the disbursements of Near East relief in these areas during the period of the emergency in 1922 are $3,020,631.81 larger than for the corresponding period of the preceding year, while the budget for this period had been fixed at approximately 25 per cent less than the preceding year, making a total net increase in disbursements occasioned by the emergency of $3,475,631.81 over the normal budget.

II.—Resurvey of relief field—Geographical.

1. THE CAUCASUS.

ARMENIAN REFUGEES FROM TURKEY.

While large sections of Near East Relief work have been transplanted distances of from 100 to 500 miles, our largest single unit of relief work is in the Armenian Republic of the Russian Caucasus and has remained undisturbed. It is important to remember that the major portion of relief work being done in this area is among Turkish subjects in Russia. They are Armenian refugees whose ancestors for centuries had resided in Turkish Anatolia, but who in 1915 fled for safety across the Russian border into the Russian Armenian Republic of the present day. They have sacrificed their lands and their homes, and a large percentage of the able-bodied adults have perished from persecution and famine since 1915. There are to-day approximately 1,300,000 Armenians in this area.

"A NATION OF ORPHAN CHILDREN."

Aside from general relief work we now have in this area approximately 25,000 orphans, many, if not most, of whom were born in Turkish Armenia. So far as we know they have no responsible, living relatives upon whom they have any moral or legal claim for support. They are wholly dependent upon American philanthropy and would soon perish or disappear if American relief were withdrawn.

COOPERATION OF GOVERNMENT.

The Russian Soviet Armenian Republic, with serious and economic problems of its own, is giving every possible cooperation in the care and support of these visitors from across the Turkish border. The Soviet Government has placed at the command of Near East Relief, without charge, four large systems of military barracks, containing approximately 250 substantial stone buildings, which could not be reproduced for less than $5,000,000. The Government has also placed at the command of Near East Relief some 36,000 acres of land, rent free, on which to develop agricultural colonies and establish as rapidly as possible self-support for these orphans.

INTRODUCTION OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

Near East Relief now has 22 American farm tractors and other American agricultural machinery at work on these farms, producing as largely as possible the food supply for the orphanages. Four expert agriculturists from our American agricultural colleges have been sent to supervise this work and teach better methods of farming.

DOUBLING FARM PRODUCTION.

During the summer of 1922 one tract of 1,000 acres planted with wheat was made to produce double the usual yield per acre, greatly to the astonishment of native farmers. The secret was in deep plowing, made possible by the American tractors, as compared with the surface plowing done by the native oxen. From the standpoint of economics and the introduction of American agricultural implements and supplies, and the peaceful development of trade through these thousands of orphans—future leaders—the investment in relief work would pay many times over. Though the economic development of the country is in no sense a motive for relief work, it may in future years prove a blessing to both America and Russian Armenia by promoting mutually helpful and friendly trade relations.

ORPHANAGE DAIRY FARM.

The Soviet Armenian Government has placed at the command of Near East Relief 16,000 acres of grazing land formerly the property of the sister of the late czar. The fertility of this hay and pasture land is suggested by the fact that one of our workers last spring in less than one hour's time gathered 47 varieties of wild flowers. Our American experts are endeavoring to produce from this 16,000 acres of grazing land the milk, butter, and cheese with which to supply the orphanages and also the little item of 5,000 head of cattle required annually in order to provide meat only twice a week for the children in these orphanages.

SELF-HELP REQUIRED.

The whole policy of the orphanage work in the Caucasus, as elsewhere, is to bring the children as rapidly as possible to self-support and to productive industrial leadership. Every child of sufficient age and strength in the orphanage is required to work at least one half of every day, the other half being devoted to studies and self-development. In one of our buildings 2,000 children may be seen every week day making the clothes, shoes, and, as far as practicable, all the necessary dormitory and orphanage supplies. Naturally, however, children can not or should not be required to earn their entire support, and material assistance from America in gradually diminishing volume will be required for these Armenian orphans in Russian territory for at least a few more years. This is doubly important if we desire to conserve the heavy investment already made in saving their lives and have them go forth as productive citizens, industrial leaders, and ambassadors of friendship, good will, and peace to all men.

10,000 ORPHANS REFUSED ADMISSION.

During the inspection of this work the past summer the official representative of the Government formally requested the Near East Relief management to receive into our orphanages another 10,000 children who were declared to be without protection and in danger of starvation during the coming winter. The committee felt that our present resources did not justify the expense of this additional responsibility though recognizing the seriousness of the need.

GENERAL RELIEF.

We have earnestly endeavored to discontinue all general or adult relief, but the country as a whole is not as yet economically self-supporting. War, famine, and civil strife have removed and made impossible the replacement of an adequate number of oxen with which to cultivate the fields. The ravages of famine and breakdown of transportation systems has at crucial periods deprived the country of the necessary seed grain with which to plant the fields. Supplies of grain which even in normal times is imported from the Volga Basin and other portions of Russia were, of course, cut off by the Volga famine. The importation from Persia was impracticable because Persia demanded gold, which the people did not possess. Added to this, in the summer of 1922 an unprecedented plague of locusts swept the entire Zangezour district as clean as a threshing floor, leaving the people wholly without food just on the eve of their anticipated harvest.

To avoid the recurrence of wholesale starvation Near East Relief was again obliged to give out general relief. This, however, was given out either—

(a) In return for labor employed in constructing roads and rebuilding irrigation ditches, or

(b) In the form of seed grain, with provision for the return of the grain in connection with the next year's harvest. The value of seed grain thus distributed was $61,000.

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIVE CARLOADS OF AMERICAN CORN GRITS.

The extent of the feeding operations in the Caucasus may be inferred from the fact that during the past year we shipped from the port of Batoum to Tiflis and Alexandropol a total of 2,565 cars of American corn grits, which if placed end to end would make a railway train something more than 12 miles long. Most of this corn grits was contributed in the form of corn by the American farmers, ground by American mills, almost without expense to Near East Relief, transported freight free to the seaboard by American railroads as a matter of charity, stored temporarily in Government warehouses, thence shipped at low rates on Shipping Board vessels, and finally delivered in the port of Batoum at a total cash expense from relief funds of less than 1 cent per pound of food.

CONSERVATION OF SEED GRAIN.

A considerable portion of this corn grits was given to people as food in exchange for seed grain in order that the seed grain might be safely stored in our warehouses, kept from direct consumption, and issued at the proper time as seed for the season's planting.

SEEING IS BELIEVING.

Many of these activities, including the work of the American farm tractors and industrial and orphanage activities, were photographed during the past summer, and may be seen in a more graphic pictorial report in the form of a three-reel motion picture called "Seeing is Believing," or "Uncle America Sees it Through."

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE.

The administrative work of the Caucasus area has been greatly strengthened during the past year by the organization of an administrative committee to guide the work of the managing director. This committee has frequent meetings, submitting its minutes to the executive committee in New York for approval, and giving close supervision to the various departments of relief administration.

EFFICIENCY SURVEY.

During the past summer a thorough efficiency survey of the Caucasus work was made under the direction of the executive committee. The survey was chiefly for the purpose of studying methods of developing self-support, industrial training, and early financial independence. The result of the survey, embodied in an 86-page report, is available as a supplementary document.

A HALF MILLION LIVES SAVED.

The Catholicos, head of the ancient Armenian Catholic Church, residing at Etchmiadzin; the president of the Armenian Republic, and all other authorities, in deep gratitude declare that at least a half million, if not a full million, of residents in this area would have perished of sheer starvation had it not been for American relief.

This area is in no way seriously affected by nationalist military operations.

2. PERSIA AND MESOPOTAMIA.

In connection with the persecution and deportations of 1915, thousands of Armenians fled for safety from their ancestral homes in Turkish Armenia across the borders into northwest Persia. There they cast their lot with other resident Armenians and with the Nestorian and Chaldean Christians, who for centuries had occupied the plains around Urumia.

The late forced and tragic exodus of these Christians, driven by the Turkish-Kurdish sword from their ancestral homes southward across Persian deserts through Hamadan to seek temporary refuge in camps near Bagdad and their later return through Mesopotamia to Tabriz, where they are now striving for rehabilitation, are known to most readers of church and modern history.

Near East Relief has not the resources to grapple adequately with all the relief problems of this area; but by the maintenance of orphans, industries, and hospitals it is at least saving the lives of the children and aiding the adults to regain self-support, thus helping to preserve the remnant of one of the oldest Christian races known in church history.

This area is not directly affected by nationalist military operations.

The administrative committee in charge of the work among Armenian, Assyrian, and other refugees of northwest Persia and Mesopotamia has been reorganized during the year and Mr. Marion F. Rust, the new managing director, installed. Our work has now been reduced to two main, apparently inevitable lines of relief:

(1) Assistance to the exiled remnant of the ancient Assyrian race, 111,000 of whom were driven from their fertile homelands to the west of Lake Urumia into Mesopotamia in 1915 and 1918. Under slightly improved political conditions they are now permitted in limited numbers and under the severest restrictions to return to their former homes, but without oxen, seed, or other facilities for reestablishing their homes, farms, and vineyards. Such relief as the committee is able to give to adults in this area from the limited appropriation of $20,000 per month is doled out in the form of loans to families seeking to regain their self-support.

(2) The larger portion of the work, however, remains with the children and orphans who have no parents or relatives to whom they can look for support or assistance.

A more detailed report of the work in this area, especially among the scattered Assyrians, has been prepared by Mr. Laird Archer, who recently visited this section as a representative of the executive committee. His report is available for examination as Supplementary Document No. 2.

3. CONSTANTINOPLE AND ANATOLIA.

REORGANIZATION.

Early in the year 1922 an important reorganization of our work in Constantinople and Anatolia was effected for the purpose of securing greater economy and efficiency through consolidation. The offices, garage, warehouse, supply base, industrial department, personal service, and shipping operations were all concentrated into one general headquarters at Ortakeuy, Constantinople, on the Bosphorus. This concentration not only gave greatly increased efficiency but resulted in a saving of at least 25 per cent in cost of operation. A new personnel house on the Bosphorus near general headquarters was also secured, adding materially to the comfort and working efficiency of the American personnel.

PROGRESS IN SELF-SUPPORT.

A large measure of self-support had also been developed both through the industrial department and by contributions from native Armenian, Greek, and other citizens of Constantinople. Local support had been developed to the point where, previous to the recent evacuation, one-half of all relief work done in Constantinople, including the support of 15,000 orphans, was paid for by voluntary contributions from Armenian and Greek residents of Constantinople. This generosity has the greatest significance when one considers the disasters and losses through which these Greeks and Armenians have passed and the other heavy demands that are made upon their benevolence.

DISRUPTION BY MILITARY AND POLITICAL CHANGES.

All of this industrial and other constructive work, however, was disrupted by the military and political changes that began in September, culminating in the occupation of Constantinople by the Turkish nationalists in October and the subsequent evacuation of the Christian minorities from the Constantinople-Anatolia area.

EVACUATION OF ORPHANS FROM ANATOLIA.

The work of evacuation from Harpoot began in August, when local government restrictions became unbearable and 4,000 orphans were started over the mountain passes from Harpoot to northern Syria. Since that time practically all of the orphans of this area have been transferred.

The following typical cablegrams tell the story of evacuation:

CONSTANTINOPLE, *December 18, 1922.*

NEAR EAST, *New York:*

All Near East Relief orphanages at Constantinople will be evacuated by Christmas Day. The last to depart will be 1,200 from the Cushman orphanage, embarking December 21. They will spend Christmas on board the ship.

JAQUITH.

—

BEIRUT, *December 12, 1922.*

NEAR EAST, *New York:*

All orphans under American care in lower Anatolia have been brought out safely and taken by boat to Beirut.

ARCHER.

—

RELIEF TO ADULT REFUGEES.

The service stations established by Near East Relief along the routes to sustain children in their march have inevitably been called upon to save the lives of adults also, who would faint by the roadside without nourishment that these kitchens can provide. The following cablegrams tell the story of countless thousands upon the march:

ATHENS, *December 18, 1922.*

NEAR EAST, *New York:*

Exceedingly regret the Angora Government failed to give absolute assurance of safety for the Christian population if they remained. In the absence of such guaranty the Christian population interpreted the Turkish permission to leave as an order.

FOWLE.

—

ALEPPO, *December 14, 1922.*

NEAR EAST, *New York:*

Kemalist instructions all Christians must evacuate Turkish territory has caused general deportation from Anatolia to Aleppo. Fifty thousand Armenian refugees already arrived; thousands on way. All robbed, naked, wounded; girls violated; misery indescribable. Help urgently needed.

PEHLIVANIAN,
President Armenian National Union.

—

CONSTANTINOPLE, *December 16, 1922.*

VICKREY, *New York:*

Extreme cold, snow, and storms aggravate the plight of Asia Minor refugees. Death is overtaking thousands of the children and the aged infirm on the frozen roads of Anatolia, aboard the tossing rescue ships in the Black Sea, and in the camps near Constantinople.

Moving over the worst mud roads in the world, I saw a crowd of broken civilians more depressing than an army in hard-pressed retreat. Women about to become mothers tramped in snow up to their knees. Tired children dropped weary by the wayside, and girls of tender years bore men's burdens.

JAQUITH.

—

LAUSANNE, *November 25, 1922.*

NEAR EAST, *New York:*

Refugees from Asia Minor destitute clothing, shelter, food. Nothing by way of relief can peace conference accomplish for winter. All largely dependent upon American benevolence.

BARTON.

CONTINUATION OF WORK IN CONSTANTINOPLE AND ANATOLIA.

For the present, however, our headquarters are retained in Constantinople and a skeleton organization maintained in most of the relief centers formerly occupied in Anatolia. This is done, first, for the purpose of protecting valuable American property that would be jeopardized if the last American relief workers were withdrawn; second, there are still straggling remnants of women and children who, not being identified with our institutions, did not leave at the time of the orphanage evacuation; third, especially in the wake of the Greek Army retreat there are large numbers of homeless Turkish women and children who are innocent sufferers from military operations; fourth, there is an almost unprecedented demand for medical aid, taxing the utmost capacity of all hospitals, clinics, doctors, and nurses that we can obtain for the interior stations of Turkish nationalist territory.

4. PALESTINE AND SYRIA.

EVACUATION OF CILICIA.

With the French evacuation of Cilicia in the winter of 1921–22 large numbers of Armenian residents of Cilicia, numbering probably more than 100,000, fearing Turkish vengeance, fled from Cilicia to northern Syria, Smyrna, or other places of supposed safety. This military evacuation of former French occupied territory also involved the removal of Near East Relief orphanages from Marash, Ourfa, Aintab, Diarbekir, and Mardin to Syria. Later, in the fall of 1922, it seemed expedient to remove also the 4,000 orphan children from Harpoot to Constantinople by way of Syria, but after about one-half of these children had reached Constantinople via sea from Beirut, the Greco-Turkish military operations blocked further transfer and left about one-half of the Harpoot orphans in northern Syria. Thus a total of 10,017 Armenian orphans from Anatolia are at least temporarily lodged in Syria and Palestine, in addition to the 1,446 Syrian orphans already established in Jerusalem and Sidon.

NEW HOMES IN PALESTINE.

New homes must be found for several thousand of these orphans. Six hundred of them are temporarily established in St. James's Monastery in Jerusalem. Forty-three 12-year-old boys are organized in a trade school in buildings on a hillside of the town of Nazareth. Others are more or less temporarily domiciled in or near such historic centers as Sidon, Jebail, Ghazir, Nahr Ibrahim, Maameltein, Junieh, Beirut, and Aleppo. Another orphanage will soon be opened in especially constructed buildings at Bethlehem. The exact location of these orphans as of January 1 will be found in a supplementary statement in the appendix.

A more detailed statement and letter from Mr. Bayard Dodge, former director for the Syria-Palestine area, concerning the Syrian orphanage situation is available as a supplementary document herewith submitted.

5. GREECE.

The evacuation of the Christian minorities from Asia Minor has forced us to enter Greece as a new area of Near East Relief operations.

ARMENIAN REFUGEES IN GREECE.

Facing the flames and fury, the distress and suffering of the Smyrna disaster, Greece threw her doors wide open to all who were oppressed. Not only did she receive hundreds of thousands of her own race—though of Turkish birth, Turkish language, and Turkish citizenship—but she received likewise tens of thousands of Armenians who did not have the remotest legal claim upon the hospitality of the Greek nation. These tens of thousands of adult refugees are still sharing with the Greek people the limited, overtaxed resources of the land.

GREEK GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS FOR HOMELESS ARMENIANS.

At a time when the doors of all others nations were closed and barred, Greece not only admitted to her shores the thousands of Armenian orphans of Turkish birth and language formerly sustained by Near East Relief in Anatolia but she gave every possible assistance by requisitioning, rent free, the necessary public buildings and private houses for the accommodation of these exiled, homeless children.

At the present time Near East Relief is supporting, with the cooperation of the Greek Government, orphans, mostly Armenian, in Greece at the following centers:

Corfu:	
Kaiser's palace	1,050
Old warehouse	1,400
Old fort	300
Athens:	
Zappeion Exposition Hall	900
Royal palace	470
Oropos	1,300
Loutraki	3,000
Edipsos	6,000
	14,420

INCREASING NUMBER OF ORPHANS.

In spite of all efforts, the number of orphans is inevitably increasing as a result of the heavy loss of life and the separation of families incident to the disasters and forced migrations of the past months. In the loading of a single refugee boat at Ordu our relief workers recently discovered that they had aboard 700 children for whom no parents could be found. Every effort has since been made to discover parents or responsible relatives, but we still have in Constantinople 300 of these 700 children for whom there is no known living relative or guardian. This and similar groups of orphans throughout the Near East are not included in the above totals, but none the less must be given assistance. They are innocent of any crime, and morally are as much entitled to the necessities and comforts of life as are the children of more favored American homes.

GENERAL RELIEF.

The general relief work in Greece is being cared for by the American Red Cross in cooperation with the Greek Government, but as a matter of general information a map, with 13-page typewritten recapitulation, of the location of refugees in the various Greek departments is submitted as a supplementary document.

AN ORPHAN ISLAND.

Nine thousand Armenian orphans, formerly in Constantinople and Anatolia, are at the time of writing this report temporarily housed in summer hotels requisitioned for emergency use by the Greek Government. These hotels, however, must be vacated and restored to their owners before April 1, 1923. Where shall these 9,000 homeless, countryless orphans go?

They are driven out from their native land. The immigration laws of other countries bar the doors. Greece continues her generous hospitality by placing at the command of Near East relief the best available facilities on the island of Syra, central of the Cyclades group, in the Ægean Sea. This island, with Hermoupolis, once the leading seaport of the Ægean, and with widely diversified industries, including agriculture, textiles, iron foundries, and shipbuilding, offers a home and training ground for these children. Buildings, or at least shelter, however, must be provided, and if at all practicable, facilities for workshops and training schools should be added. This island may again become what it was in earlier days—a recognized center from which radiated throughout the Ægean and Near East area the leavening influence of a superior, progressive civilization.

III.—Reapprisal of relief operations, by departments.

1. DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL RELIEF.

EFFORT TO DISCONTINUE ADULT RELIEF.

For more than two years the executive committee has earnestly endeavored to discontinue all general relief, throwing responsibility for adult and general refugee support upon responsible governments or other agencies. The aim has been to confine Near East relief operations to a child-welfare program. Continuous warfare, devastating fires, wholesale famine, and other disasters have, however, blocked our resolutions and forced upon us renewed general refugee relief work of large dimensions. Clearly no American contributor would have had our executive committee turn its back upon the cry of distress that went up from the flames and smoke of burning Smyrna. Certainly every contributor may feel proud to be a shareholder in and patron of the American salvage corps that provided ships, transport, food, and safety for the 400,000 or more who escaped from Smyrna.

CILICIAN REFUGEES.

An equally important though less extensive relief service was forced upon us earlier in the year when, following the French evacuation, 100,000 Armenians from Cilicia fled into northern Syria.

SMYRNA AND ANATOLIAN REFUGEES.

A more widely flung call for the life line came with the precipitate evacuation of Anatolia in connection with the Turkish Government's "permit for all Christians to leave before November 30, 1922."

Our workers had no provision in their budgets for adult relief. They were commissioned only to evacuate the orphans, but with soup kitchens and rest stations established along the line of march for the orphans en route to the sea, what American could refuse a bowl of soup or necessary food for a helpless woman and child likewise fleeing for safety? Untold thousands were thus fed and saved, while others with strength too far gone dropped by the roadside. The able-bodied men who might have helped had either perished in previous disasters or were detained in the Turkish army as men of military age.

PROVISIONING REFUGEE SHIPS.

Perhaps a greater service was rendered in connection with the requisitioning and provisioning of ships and the embarkation and transportation of refugees assembled and waiting deliverance at the Black Sea ports of Anatolia and Mediterranean ports of Cilicia and Syria.

REFUGEES IN NORTHERN SYRIA AND THE BORDERLANDS.

Unfortunately, the demand for refugee relief does not cease with the evacuation from the homeland. At the present time 89,000 Armenian refugees are reported in Aleppo, having been driven out of Anatolia. They do not dare to go back into Turkish territory and they are not permitted to go forward into the Syrian Lebanon, which is under French mandate.

RESUMPTION OF SELF-SUPPORT.

They are industrious, ready for any kind of service, if work is available; but, under existing economic and political conditions, they are helpless. Large numbers are likewise stranded on or near other border lines of the Turkish nationalist territory, driven out from their legal homeland, and forbidden by America, England, France, and other allied nations to establish new homes under the principal allied flags. They are among the most thrifty people in the world. Despite the fact that the refugees are chiefly women, old men, and children, they quickly regain self-support if given the opportunity. Of the 27,000 that reached Beirut, Syria, in 1922, and were established in refugee camps, only 600 are now receiving aid from the relief committee, the remainder having in some way managed to earn their own support in spite of adverse social, racial, and economic environment.

UNFORESEEN EMERGENCIES.

Every effort is being made to reduce general relief to the minimum; but, just as six months ago, no one could foresee the Smyrna disaster, so it is now impossible to tell how soon another eruption may increase the demand for general relief, which we are now trying to eliminate.

Even as this paragraph is being written, a cablegram from Constantinople is laid on our desk, reading:

"Fifteen thousand refugees at Black Sea ports and 25,000 in Constantinople awaiting transportation and permission to enter Greece. Necessary that Near East continue emergency feeding."

More detailed reports concerning circumstances and conditions under which adult relief has been administered are available as supplementary documents. (Document No. 8.)

2. ORPHANAGE AND CHILD WELFARE DEPARTMENT.

The child, the innocent victim of war and racial hatred, the as yet unpoisoned, unprejudiced open mind, the future citizen and arbiter of world destinies, has been and should continue to be the chief beneficiary of American philanthropy as expressed through Near East Relief.

The general character of the child-welfare work has been suggested in the descriptions already given under geographical headings. The total number of full orphans as of December 31, 1922, under the care of Near East Relief, for whom it has been impossible to find responsible relatives or guardians, is 55,883. In addition to this, approximately 60,000 orphans or half orphans are supported under the care of a widowed refugee mother, relative, or other guardian.

INCREASED DEMANDS INEVITABLE.

Unfortunately we face, during the next few months, a period when a slight increase in the number of orphans under our care will be almost unavoidable. The toll of death in connection with the wholesale tragedies of the past months has inevitably left an increased number of fatherless, motherless children, many of whom daily are found or otherwise brought to our orphanage doors; they can not be refused without bringing shame upon our Nation with its known material wealth and reputation for unselfish humanitarian work.

AMBASSADORS OF GOOD WILL.

As has already been noted under the geographical reports, every effort is made to teach industries to the children, to develop as rapidly as possible the largest practicable measure of self-support, to train them for industrial independence and leadership, and introduce them to the larger world as ambassadors of good will, unselfish service, and world peace. Measures that have been and are being inaugurated to this end will be found treated more fully in this report under the heads of Near East Brotherhood, Near East Loan Association, Near East Industries, and International Near East Association.

3. AGRICULTURAL TRAINING.

Reference has already been made in the Caucasus report to the large tract of land allocated to Near East Relief by the Government, the 20 American tractors and other farm machinery operating on this land, and the effort to train a considerable number of the orphans in modern scientific agriculture. Similar successful experiments have been tried in varying degrees and forms in other areas, especially in Harpoot, Marsovan, Sivas, and other orphanages now transplanted into other territory. The purpose is threefold:

(a) To provide food and reduce the net expense of orphanage operation.

(b) To train the students in better methods of agriculture.

(c) To provide an example or standard that neighboring farmers will follow and that will materially increase the productiveness and economic resources of the entire country.

Since the transplanting of the Anatolian orphans to other areas the Greek Government has undertaken to collaborate with Near East Relief by securing lands in Macedonia where orphanages can be located and agricultural training provided. (See Document No. 11.)

4. AGRICULTURAL COLONIES.

No opportunity is lost to get refugees away from the large cities and concentration camps onto any available farm lands where there may be opportunity of attaining self-support. One highly successful agricultural colony of this type was established at Rodosto in eastern Thrace on the Sea of Marmora, manned with Armenians from the refugee camps of Constantinople and equipped with agricultural implements and seed provided by Near East Relief. The first year was decidedly successful, and the year 1922 would have seen the full repayment of all capital invested in the colony had not military reverses thrown eastern Thrace into the military possession of the Turks, with consequent confiscation of the 1922 crops.

Tentative plans for other forms of colonization "when adequate lands and guaranties are available" are submitted in supplementary Document No. 10.

A study is being made of the various proposals with reference to the colonization of refugees and tentative plans drafted, subject to ability to secure suitable lands with adequate guaranties.

5. INDUSTRIAL RELIEF.

Relief is never given to an adult free of charge if there is any possibility of providing any kind of work that can be done in payment for the relief. It is also gratifying to note that as a rule the refugees are eager to get to work, even at a mere living wage. In Constantinople, Beirut, and all the larger centers industries have been established for women under American supervision, and the products of their industry, whether in the form of rugs or needlework, are sold to help meet the cost of relief supplies. Most of the work done by men is local in character, and contributes toward repairs of buildings, roads, and orphanage equipment. The larger part of the work done by the women is absorbed locally in clothing for the children, equipment for hospitals and orphanages, though considerable quantities of needlework are sold through the Near East Relief shops in the local markets of Constantinople, Beirut, and other eastern cities. This needlework has also found a ready market through the offices of Near East Relief in America, the cash sales to date in America having amounted to $32,094.85, while a larger amount is now in stock in process of sale.

6. NEAR EAST INDUSTRIES.

At present Near East Relief has at least 50,000 pairs of hands in various orphanages, exclusive of the far larger number of more skilled workers among the refugees, awaiting simple equipment, raw material, and intelligent direction into channels of useful industry and self-support. It is expected that in connection with most of the orphanages at least one-half of the time will be devoted to industrial training in one form or another. These industries should be organized with a practical view to the training of the child and to the development of those products that will have a ready, profitable market.

While there must be a considerable amount of theoretical training that can have no immediate commercial return, experience shows that many articles can be made with profit by the orphans, with the possible assistance of older refugee instructors who are in urgent need of employment.

SALES DEPARTMENT.

A sales department for Near East industries can be developed in the United States and by Near East associations in other countries that will sell these articles at a considerable margin of profit, thereby helping materially to finance the other industrial and educational work of the orphanages. This kind of work finds an especially ready sale at good prices around the Christmas season, when almost unlimited quantities can be disposed of by the right kind of advance organization.

COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL RELIEF.

The fact that more than $60,000 worth of laces, rugs, and other industrial products have already reached America from relief centers and that we have in our orphanages thousands of children capable of contributing toward self-support and urgently needed industrial training has led the executive committee to appoint a special committee on industrial relief and "Near East Industries." This committee consists of Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Cleveland E. Dodge, Harold A. Hatch, James M. Speers, with Barclay Acheson as secretary, and Messrs. M. Karagheusian, Vartan Malcolm, and K. Thomas Pushman as advisors.

7. MEDICAL RELIEF.

A considerable medical staff and equipment is required for ministry in Near East Relief orphanages, exclusive of general medical work. In the orphanages the medical work is likewise more or less interwoven with other orphanage activities in a way that makes clear statistical differentiation difficult. Moreover, statistical summaries and reports for the year ending December 31, 1922, have not yet reached us from the remote regions of the Caucasus and from the interior stations of Anatolia, with which communication is at best intermittent.

Including hospitals connected with the orphanages, Near East Relief now has and is operating 38 hospitals. All the hospitals in the interior of Anatolia, with the exception of Harpoot, have been continued since the evacuation of the Christian populations. Inasmuch as many of the best native doctors and nurses left with the Christian population, the need for medical ministry to the remaining populations is probably greater than ever, the hospitals being taxed to their full capacity.

In Greece, the medical work of Near East Relief is under the direction of the American Women's Hospitals, which provides personnel and supports the medical work under the supervision of Dr. Mabel Elliott. During the year under revision the American Women's Hospitals has also financed and directed the medical work in the Caucasus.

In Beirut, Syria, as well as in Constantinople, well-equipped American hospitals provide hospital facilities, leaving Near East Relief responsible only for the medical work of the orphanages and clinics connected with the refugee camps.

The magnitude of medical work among children may be inferred by the fact that in the Caucasus alone we have segregated in one place 3,000 children suffering from trachoma. There are similar segregations of children suffering from tuberculosis, scabies, and various other more or less contagious diseases.

NEAR EAST RELIEF LABORATORIES.

As a rule our doctors find themselves far removed from medical supplies and modern laboratory facilities. In the Caucasus this has resulted in the establishment of a bacteriological laboratory that has provided vaccine, serums, and other laboratory products for the trans-Caucasian Republics. The detailed report of this laboratory, as well as a more detailed and extended report of the early medical organization of Near East Relief, are submitted or available as supplementary documents. (Documents No. 12 and 13.)

IV. Organization at the home base.

The ability of Near East Relief to respond promptly to the Smyrna emergency and other calls during the past year and to meet a total budget nearly $3,000,000 larger than the preceding year is largely due to the devoted and self-sacrificing services of volunteer committees, speakers, and workers in every State in the Union. It would be impracticable to name within the limits of this report the thousands of committee members and workers who have had a vital part in the rescue and saving of the 115,000 children and the much larger number of adults in the Near East during the past year.

The following chairmen and treasurers, however, of committees in various States may be mentioned as but typical of the larger number who have served with them on committees:

ALABAMA.

Rev. Henry M. Edmonds, D. D., 2027 Jefferson County Bank Building, Birmingham, chairman; Col. Tom O. Smith, Birmingham Trust & Savings Bank, Birmingham, treasurer.

ARIZONA.

Dean Byron Cummings, 517 Wright & Callender Building, Los Angeles, Calif, chairman; A. T. Esgate, Valley Bank, Los Angeles, treasurer.

ARKANSAS.

M. L. Altheimer, Arcade Building, Little Rock, chairman; Moorehead Wright, Union Trust & Mercantile Co., Little Rock, treasurer.

CALIFORNIA (NORTH).

Judge Curtis D. Wilbur, 333 Mills Building, San Francisco, chairman; George A. Kennedy, First National Bank, San Francisco, treasurer.

CALIFORNIA (SOUTH).

Judge Curtis D. Wilbur, 517 Wright & Callender Building, Los Angeles, chairman; W. W. Gibbs, jr., Guaranty Trust & Savings Bank, Los Angeles, treasurer.

COLORADO.

Gov. Oliver L. Shoup, 413 Chamber of Commerce Building, Denver, chairman; Albert A. Reed, United States National Bank, Denver, treasurer.

CONNECTICUT.

Ex-Gov. Marcus H. Holcomb, 612 Hartford-Conn. Trust Co. Building, Hartford, chairman; Meigs H. Whaples, Hartford-Conn. Trust Co., Hartford, treasurer.

DELAWARE.

Philip D. Laird, northeast corner Broad and Locust Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman; L. L. Maloney, Security Trust & Safe Deposit Co., Philadelphia, treasurer.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

John B. Larner, Washington Loan & Trust Co., 316 Bond Building, New York Avenue and Fourteenth Street, Washington, treasurer.

FLORIDA.

A. A. Murphree, 509 Clark Building, Jacksonville, chairman; A. P. Anthony, Peoples Bank, Jacksonville, treasurer.

GEORGIA.

Eugene R. Black, 409 Georgia Savings Bank, Atlanta, chairman; John B. Wheat, Atlanta Trust Co., Atlanta, treasurer.

IDAHO.

Harry S. Kessler, 722 Peyton Building, Spokane, Wash., chairman; E. W. Tucker, Pacific National Bank, Spokane, Wash., treasurer.

ILLINOIS.

Frank O. Lowden, 19 South La Salle Street, Chicago, chairman; George M. Reynolds, Continental & Commercial Bank, Chicago, treasurer.

INDIANA.

Ed. Jackson, 528 Peoples Bank Building, Indianapolis, chairman; Thomas C. Day, Indiana National Bank, Indianapolis, treasurer.

IOWA.

Gov. N. E. Kendall, 521 Securities Building, Des Moines, chairman; George E. Pearsoll, Iowa National Bank, Des Moines, treasurer.

KANSAS.

Gov. Henry J. Allen, 211 Central National Bank Building, Topeka, chairman; S. E. Cobb, Prudential Trust Co., Tokepa, treasurer.

KENTUCKY.

Dr. R. L. McCready, 724 South Fourth Street, Louisville, chairman; Maj. John H. Leathers, Louisville National Bank, Louisville, treasurer.

LOUISIANA.

Gov. John M. Parker, 2027 Jefferson County Bank Building, Birmingham, Ala., chairman; R. G. Klotter, Interstate Trust & Savings Co., Birmingham, Ala., treasurer.

MAINE.

Judge John P. Deering, 80 Exchange Street, Room 23, Portland, chairman; Harry S. Boyd, Chapman National Bank, Portland, treasurer.

MARYLAND.

Gov. Albert C. Ritchie, 14 West Franklin Street, Baltimore, chairman; John E. Boisseau, National Union Bank, Baltimore, treasurer.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Hon. Augustus P. Loring, 1218 Little Building, Boston, chairman; Kidder, Peabody & Co., Boston, treasurer.

MICHIGAN.

Prof. David Friday, 1106 Stroh Building, Grand Circus Park, Detroit, chairman; John W. McCausey, Commonwealth Federal Savings Bank, Detroit, treasurer.

MINNESOTA.

Gov. J. A. O. Preus, 305 Oneida Building, Minneapolis, chairman; Sumner T. McKnight, First National Bank, Minneapolis, treasurer.

MISSISSIPPI.

P. P. Garner, 2027 Jefferson County Bank Building, Birmingham, Ala., chairman.

MISSOURI (EAST).

C. Bernet, 417 Chemical Building, St. Louis, chairman; W. W. Smith, First National Bank, St. Louis, treasurer.

MISSOURI (WEST).

——— ——— 701 Scarritt Building, Kansas City, chairman; C. M. Vining, Commerce Trust Co., Kansas City, treasurer.

MONTANA.

Ex. Gov. Sam V. Stewart, 732 Fifth Avenue, Helena, chairman; P. B. Bartley, Conrad Trust & Savings Bank, Helena, treasurer.

NEBRASKA.

H. H. Baldridge, 401 Mickel Building, Fifteenth and Harney Streets, Omaha, chairman; John C. Wharton, Omaha National Bank, Omaha, treasurer.

NEVADA.

Gov. Emmet D. Boyle, 333 Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif., chairman; Fred Stadtmuller, Washoe County Bank, San Francisco, Calif., treasurer.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Rt. Rev. E. M. Parker, 805 Amoskeag Bank Building, Manchester, chairman; Willis B. Kendall, Amoskeag Bank Building, Manchester, treasurer.

NEW JERSEY.

Hon. William N. Runyon, 156 Market Street, Room 56, Newark, chairman; Frederick Frelinghuysen, National Newark & Essex Banking Co., Newark, treasurer.

NEW MEXICO.

——— ——— 517 Wright & Callender Building, Los Angeles, Calif., chairman; Citizens National Bank, Los Angeles, Calif., treasurer.

NEW YORK.

Darwin E. James, jr., 151 Fifth Avenue, New York City, chairman; Cleveland H. Dodge, National City Bank, New York City, treasurer.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Hon. Josephus Daniels, Y. M. C. A. Bldg., Raleigh, chairman; Robert A. Brown, Citizens Nat'l Bank, Raleigh, treasurer.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Rt. Rev. John Poyntz Tyler, 110 Broadway, Rm. 12, Fargo, chairman; H. P. Beckwith, Northern National Bk., Fargo, treasurer.

OHIO.

Dr. Chas. F. Thwing, 404 The 1900 Euclid Bldg., Cleveland, chairman; Harris Creech, Garfield Saving Bank, Cleveland, treasurer.

OKLAHOMA.

Rev. Frank Barrett, D. D., 409 Grain Exchange Bldg., Oklahoma City, chairman; L. T. Sammons, Southwest Natl. Bank, Oklahoma City, treasurer.

OREGON.

J. H. Rankin, 613 Stock Ex. Bldg., Portland, chairman; Arthur W. Brookings, Ladd & Tilton Bank, Portland, treasurer.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Chancellor S. B. McCormick, NE. Cor. Broad & Locust Sts., Philadelphia, chairman; Drexel & Co., Franklin Trust Co., Philadelphia, treasurer.

RHODE ISLAND.

Ex. Gov. R. Livingston Beeckman, 56 Washington St., Rm. 204, Providence, chairman; Richard W. Jennings, Industrial Tr. Co., Providence, treasurer.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Hon. A. F. Lever, 1325 Main St., Columbia, chairman; Wm. M. Gibbes, jr., Palmetto Natl. Bank, Columbia, treasurer.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Gov. W. H. McMaster, 419 Western Natl. Bk. Bldg., Mitchell, chairman; S. E. Morris, Western National Bk., Mitchell, treasurer.

TENNESSEE.

John E. Edgerton, Y. M. C. A. Bldg., Memphis, chairman; J. D. McDowell, Franklin Savings Bk., Memphis, treasurer.

TEXAS,

Chas. L. Sanger, 1614 Bryan St., Dallas, chairman; C. W. Belew, Dallas Co. State Bank, Dallas, treasurer.

UTAH.

John D. Spencer, 120 E. 1st So. St., Rm. 1, Salt Lake City, chairman; Ex. Gov. J. C. Cutler, Deseret Natl. Bank, Salt Lake City, treasurer.

VERMONT.

Gov. James Hartness, 805 Amoskeag Bank Bldg., Manchester, chairman; L. E. Wheeler, First National Bank, Manchester, treasurer.

VIRGINIA.

Oliver J. Sands, 312 Amer. Natl. Bk. Bldg., Richmond, chairman; Waller Holladay, American Natl. Bank, Richmond, treasurer.

WASHINGTON (EAST).

C. C. McEachran, 722 Peyton Bldg., Spokane, chairman; A. W. Lindsay, Fidelity Natl. Bank, Spokane, treasurer.

WASHINGTON (WEST).

C. S. Booth, 339 Burke Bldg., Seattle, chairman; J. W. Spangler, Seattle Natl. Bank, Seattle, Treasurer.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Gov. Ephriam P. Morgan, 224 State St. Bk. Bldg., Charleston, chairman; Geo. D. Cochrane, The Capital City Bk., Charleston, treasurer.

WISCONSIN.

H. A. Moehlenpah, 229 Plankinton Arcade, Milwaukee, chairman; Walter Kasten, First Wis. Natl. Bk., Milwaukee, treasurer.

WYOMING.

Gov. Robt. D. Carey, 413 Chamber of Commerce, Denver, chairman; A. H. Marble, The Stock Growers' Natl. Bank, Denver, treasurer.

This includes 10 governors of States, 4 educators, 2 leading merchants, 3 bankers, 4 prominent lawyers, 4 judges, 2 bishops, and 6 outstanding business leaders.

COUNTY COMMITTEES.

In addition to the State chairmen and treasurers referred to above, Near East Relief has volunteer committees in 980 counties, with 1,088 other counties represented on the State committees by a county chairman, making a total of 2,068 counties organized or represented by county workers.

COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS.

Under the direction of these State and county committees local community campaigns are conducted. In these community efforts chambers of commerce, banks, business men's clubs, lodges, industries, and practically every institution has given its assistance. The railroads of the country have saved us thousands of dollars by affording free transportation for carload lots of grain and clothing.

COOPERATION OF CHURCHES.

Conspicuous mention should be made of the churches for their unfailing and substantial support. The pulpits of every denomination have been opened to our speakers. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish congregations have not only contributed with unstinted liberality but quite often have furnished volunteer committees of workers for a community effort.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S COMMITTEE.

The organized women of America also deserve great credit for what they have done. Last Easter when it was found necessary on account of insufficient resources to make a drastic cut in appropriations, threatening the death of thousands of children, the women of the country undertook to raise the needed funds, and largely through their efforts the necessity of turning out these thousands of orphans was averted. Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker is chairman of our National Women's Committee.

PUBLIC SCHOOL COOPERATION.

The cooperation of principals and teachers in public schools has doubtless been instrumental in saving the lives of hundreds of children in the Near East, while at the same time inculcating higher ideals of service and international brotherhood in the lives of many thousands of boys and girls in America. In New York City alone 316 public schools have cooperated.

SPEAKERS' DEPARTMENT.

The national speakers' department, working through State bureaus, has commanded the cooperation of a strong corps of speakers in practically every State. These have included returned relief workers from the Near East, most of whom continue loyally to serve the work which gripped their lives during their period of resident service in the Near East. Pastors, lawyers, teachers, national officers of women's clubs, and fraternal organizations have given themselves freely and effectively to the presentation of the message on the platform when once they have fully grasped and appreciated the need.

COOPERATION OF THE PRESS.

The $10,000,000 response from the general public during the past year would have been utterly impossible had not newspapers and magazines, secular and religious, cooperated by presenting to the public information concerning the need. An up-to-date photographic department, with perhaps one of the best collections of photographs of the Near East to be found anywhere in the world, has been one of the forms of effective service in presenting conditions graphically to the public through the cooperating press.

FOREIGN DEPARTMENT.

The effectiveness of the administration overseas is in some measure due to the organization and effective cooperation of the foreign department of the New York office.

In the personal service division during the year there have been handled 3,171 "searchers" of refugees or others seeking relatives in America, and in 31 per cent of these cases we have been able to secure sums of money for transmission to the refugees with which to meet their needs or in many instances pay their expenses to America. The department has made out over 500 affidavits for relatives and handled over $100,000 of traveling expense, involving the writing of over 1,500 letters and 1,300 personal interviews.

The personal service department, with the cooperation of our orphanage managers overseas, has made a complete card record of all the orphans, with special reference to their nearest known relative, and wherever a child in an orphanage is found to have a relative or a friend in America that friend or relative is at once asked to assume financial responsibility for the child.

Our foreign shipments during the past year have amounted to 52,000,000 pounds, or approximately 26,000 tons, shipped as per the following schedule. This, of course, includes only commodities shipped from America and does not include the large food purchases made locally in Anatolia and other areas, where transportation problems make local purchases for orphanage purposes more advantageous than importation.

Foreign shipments, year 1922.

Date of sailing.	Steamer.	Foodstuffs.	Equipment and machinery.	Medical supplies.	Clothing and textile.	Total.
1922.						
Jan. 10	West Campgaw	54,534	4,423	.....	1,971	60,928
Feb. 1	King Alexander	4,732	.....	.....	.....	4,732
Do	Sagaporack	192,500	95,730	.....	.....	288,230
Feb. 24	Clontarf	315,913	101,000	.....	172,886	589,799
Mar. 4	Satartia	3,730	4,437	.....	273	8,440
Feb. 15	Negalis Hellas	.....	2,880	.....	.....	2,880
Mar. 8	West Mahomet	.....	5,114	.....	.....	5,114
Apr. 5	Ossa	168,000	.....	.....	75,641	243,641
Apr. 22	Deepwater	13,456,724	.....	.....	.....	13,456,724
Apr. 26	Coeur d'Alene	2,258,554	210,375	.....	71,268	2,540,197
Apr. 28	Leise Maersk	5,912,557	59,430	486,867	182,994	6,641,848
May 13	Themistocke	.....	498	.....	.....	498
May 27	Higho	11,446,590	.....	156,056	66,402	11,669,048
June 10	New York	2,730	.....	.....	.....	2,730
June 13	Sabotawan	42,808	.....	.....	571,430	614,238
June 19	Saugus	820,192	67,502	147,127	74,507	1,109,328
July 10	Acropolis	11,932	.....	.....	.....	11,932
July 20	Coeur d'Alene	218,572	11,894	10,693	865,630	1,106,789
Aug. 8	Conejos	463,409	.....	594	634,016	1,098,019
Do	Casey	911,586	.....	220	193,505	1,105,311
Aug. 19	Sagaporack	141,530	5,824	230,744	49,850	427,948
Do	West Mahomet	.....	120	.....	4,401	4,521
Sept. 9	King Alexander	.....	.....	.....	46,746	46,746
Oct. 9	Saugus	285,561	3,366	22,726	204,320	515,973
Oct. —	Orient	2,740,220	.....	.....	.....	2,740,220
Do	Ossa	1,119,860	.....	.....	.....	1,119,860
Nov. 10	Clontarf	3,408,420	.....	.....	.....	3,408,420
Do	Hog Island	1,594,600	.....	.....	.....	1,594,600
Dec. 9	West Gotomska	70,500	7,486	8,053	86,366	172,405
Dec. 20	Ossa	224,000	.....	.....	109,595	333,595
Dec. 23	Sangamon	27,494	.....	.....	430,559	458,053
Dec. 27	Sabotawan	2,081,195	.....	6,279	582	2,088,056
	Total	47,978,443	580,079	1,069,359	3,842,942	53,470,823

OVERSEAS PERSONNEL.

At the present time there are 255 American personnel on the field. During the year 1922 there were enlisted 56 new personnel, and during this same period 83 have returned from the field. Of the returned workers, 14 are being used as speakers by the national speakers' department and an indefinite number, scattered throughout the United States, are being used separately by the State directors.

Relief workers on the field, divided into lists of doctors, nurses, and relief workers, are distributed as follows in the different areas:

Area.	Doctors.	Nurses.	Relief workers.	Total.
Caucasus	5	9	78	92
Constantinople	6	5	60	71
Syria	6	.....	34	40
Greece	1	11	35	47
Persia	.....	.....	5	5
Total	.....	.....	.....	255

THE PRICE OF SERVICE.

The supreme price of service has again been paid this year by Near East Relief workers, who count not their lives dear unto themselves. To the ever-lengthening list of martyrs is this year added the names of Miss Annie Allen, who died of typhus while en route in midwinter on an urgent mission from and in behalf of our orphanage work at Harpoot to the Nationalist Government at Angora; Lester James Wright, who was shot dead from ambush, and his traveling companion, Enoch R. Applegate, wounded, as they were nearing Aleppo in connection with their relief work; and George St. John Williams, who, in directing a convoy of orphans from Sivas and Marsovan over the snow-covered roads and mountain passes to Samsoun, was laid low by rain, snow, exposure, cold, pneumonia, death. These three workers could all have saved their lives had they not placed service for others above personal interest.

There are dozens of other Near East Relief workers to-day who are equally willing to give their lives for the saving of these children and the reclaiming of the Near East. The price that has been and is being paid by these American comrades overseas puts to shame the biggest financial offering of the American public, but they do it gladly, for they have the thrill and the joy of service, and there is not one of them who would trade jobs with their friends in America who may have larger material and social advantages but not so large a field of service.

V. International cooperation.

THE BATTLE GROUND OF THE CENTURIES.

For 40 centuries the Near East has been the battle ground of the nations, and to-day the world has nothing but ruins and bitterness to show for centuries of strife. There will be no permanent world peace until good will and stable government are secured in the Near East.

THE INTERNATIONAL NEAR EAST ASSOCIATION.

Marked progress has been made during the past year in the organization and development of the International Near East Association, the object of which is "to promote cooperation and increased efficiency on the part of all organizations and individuals who are seeking to relieve suffering, provide for the care of orphans, or otherwise promote the social, economic, industrial, and educational development of the Near East."

ASIA AND EUROPE JOIN WITH AMERICA.

Near East associations or kindred societies have now been formed in 10 countries and are cooperating in an effort to solve by humanitarian relief work and peaceful methods the problems of the Near East. Asia joins with Europe and America in this endeavor. The Japanese committee, with Baron Shibasawa as active chairman, has during the past year sent to the Near East for relief more than $10,000. China and Korea have sent substantial contributions. Australia has assumed the entire support of one of the largest orphanages in Syria, to be known henceforth as the Australasian Orphanage, and the contributions reported thus far during the year from Australia amount to approximately $100,000, with regular monthly shipments of food from Australia's surplus food supplies via the Commonwealth Line of steamers direct each month from Sidney to Port Said, thence to Syria. The Philippines, with a committee headed by Governor General Wood, a member of our own board of trustees, has contributed $18,000. Hawaii renews her annual gift of approximately $26,000. Sweden and Denmark have accepted full financial support for an orphanage in Syria. Switzerland and other nations of Europe are cooperating, while England, Canada, and the British dominions continue their substantial contributions and ministry.

A VOLUNTARY CONSTRUCTIVE PEACE-TIME PROGRAM NOW OR DESTRUCTIVE WARFARE LATER.

During the Great War 23 nations, under dint of necessity and in self-defense, united in a program of destructive warfare with the Near East as one of the chief areas of conflict. They poured forth in that conflict the lifeblood of at least 8,000,000 men and hundreds of billions of treasure. Unless peace, good will, and sound government can be established in the Near East, this conflict will be renewed. But if the so-called Christian nations have enough prudence to get together voluntarily in times of peace on an unselfish constructive program of education, industrial training, and good will, we may prevent the otherwise inevitable expenditure of other millions of lives and billions of treasure in future warfare, with its vicious circle of renewed bitterness and strife.

That which battleships and battalions have failed to accomplish and can never accomplish the magic power of love, unselfish service, and world brotherhood may yet achieve.

Respectfully submitted. CHARLES V. VICKREY,
General Secretary.

NEAR EAST RELIEF ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

The following persons named by Congress in the act of incorporation, or later duly elected, have served during the year 1922 as members of the board of trustees:

James L. Barton, chairman; Cleveland H. Dodge, treasurer; Charles V. Vickrey, general secretary; John H. Finley, vice chairman; Frank L. Polk, general counsel.

Executive committee: Edwin M. Bulkley, chairman; James L. Barton, John H. Finley, Cleveland H. Dodge, George A. Plimpton, Harold A. Hatch, William B. Millar, Henry Morgenthau, Walter George Smith, Charles V. Vickrey, Stanley White.

The following committees are appointed under authority of Article 5 of the by-laws by the executive committee:

Finance committee: Edwin M. Bulkley, chairman; ex officio members, George A. Plimpton, Cleveland H. Dodge, Harold A. Hatch, Charles V. Vickrey.

Nominating committee: Robert J. Cuddihy, chairman; Albert Shaw, Talcott Williams.

Committee on personnel: Stanley White, chairman; Robert J. Cuddihy, Talcott Williams, William I. Chamberlain, William B. Millar.

Editorial committee for new Near East: Talcott Williams, Hamilton Holt, Frederick Lynch, Albert Shaw, Charles V. Vickrey.

Industrial committee: Henry Morgenthau, Cleveland H. Dodge, Harold A. Hatch, James M. Speers.

Membership of the board of trustees: James L. Barton, Boston, Mass.; Charles E. Beury, Philadelphia, Pa.; Arthur J. Brown, New York City; Edwin M. Bulkley, Englewood, N. J.; John B. Calvert, New York City; Robert J. Cuddihy, New York City; William I. Chamberlain, New York City; Henry Sloane Coffin, New York City; Charles R. Crane, New York City; Josephus Daniels, Raleigh, N. C.; Cleveland E. Dodge, Riverdale, N. Y.; Cleveland H. Dodge, New York City; Charles W. Eliott, Cambridge, Mass.; Abram I. Elkus, New York City; John H. Finley, New York City; James G. Harbord, Washington, D. C.; Harold A. Hatch, New York City; William I. Haven, New York City; Patrick J. Hayes, New York City; Howard Heinz, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Myron T. Herrick, Cleveland, Ohio; Hamilton Holt, New York City; Frank W. Jackson, Montclair, N. J.; Harry Pratt Judson, Chicago, Ill.; Henry Churchill King, Oberlin, Ohio; Frederick Lynch, New York City; Charles S. Macfarland, Mountain Lake Park, N. J.; Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg, Pa.; John H. T. Main, Grinnell, Iowa; William T. Manning, New York City; William B. Millar, Montclair, N. J.; Henry Morgenthau, New York City; Frank Morrison, Washington, D. C.; John R. Mott, Montclair, N. J.; Frank Mason North, Madison, N. J.; George A. Plimpton, New York City; Frank L. Polk, New York City; Wm. Cooper Proctor, Cincinnati, Ohio; Philip M. Rhinelander, Philadelphia, Pa.; Franklin D. Roosevelt, New York City; Elihu Root, New York City; Oliver J. Sands, Richmond, Va.; William Jay Schieffelin, New York City; George T. Scott, New York City; Albert Shaw, New York City; Walter George Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.; Robert E. Speer, Englewood, N. J.; James M. Speers, New York City; Anson Phelps Stokes, New York City; Oscar Straus, New York City; William Howard Taft, New Haven, Conn.; Charles V. Vickrey, New York City; Harry A. Wheeler, Chicago, Ill.; Stanley White, New York City; Ray Lyman Wilbur, Palo Alto, Calif.; Talcott Williams, New York City; Stephen S. Wise, New York City; Leonard Wood, Manila, P. I.

SALARIES OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 425.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 425) authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to fix the salaries of United States attorneys and United States marshals of the several judicial districts of the United States within certain limits.

Be it enacted, etc., That the salaries of the United States attorneys and United States marshals for the several judicial districts of the United States shall be fixed by the Attorney General, beginning July 1, 1923, at rates not less than $3,000 nor more than $7,500 per annum for attorneys and at rates not less than $3,000 nor more than $6,500 per annum for marshals, the amount to be based in each instance upon the business transacted during the four years ending June 30, 1923: *Provided*, That the salaries of the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, the northern district of Illinois, and the District of Columbia may be fixed at rates not exceeding $10,000 per annum for each of said districts.

The Attorney General may increase or decrease any of the salaries fixed, as aforesaid, within the limits prescribed in the foregoing section if, upon investigation, he finds that there has been a material increase or decrease in the volume of business transacted: *Provided*, That no salary fixed under the provisions of this act shall be changed more than once in any four years.

All laws or parts of laws, in so far as they are in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-three gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Elliott	Lazaro	Rose
Anderson	Ellis	Lee, Ga.	Rosenbloom
Anthony	Faust	Linthicum	Rucker
Arentz	Freeman	Lowrey	Ryan
Bird	Garner	Luhring	Sanders, N. Y.
Blakeney	Garrett, Tex.	McClintic	Scott, Mich.
Bowers	Glynn	McCormick	Sears
Bowling	Gould	McDuffie	Shelton
Box	Graham, Pa.	Maloney	Slemp
Brennan	Griffin	Martin	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Hardy, Colo.	Michaelson	Snell
Brooks, Pa.	Hayden	Montague	Snyder
Brown, Tenn.	Hays	Moore, Ill.	Stiness
Browne, Wis.	Hogan	Morin	Stoll
Bulwinkle	Hudspeth	Mudd	Sullivan
Burke	Hukriede	Nelson, J. M.	Sweet
Burtness	Humphrey, Nebr.	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Ark.
Carew	Jacoway	O'Connor	Thomas
Chandler, N. Y.	Johnson, Miss.	Oliver	Thorpe
Chandler, Okla.	Jones, Pa.	Olpp	Tillman
Clark, Fla.	Kahn	Overstreet	Timberlake
Classon	Keller	Paige	Treadway
Clouse	Kelley, Mich.	Park, Ga.	Upshaw
Codd	Kennedy	Patterson, Mo.	Webster
Connolly, Pa.	Kindred	Patterson, N. J.	Wheeler
Copley	King	Pou	White, Me.
Crowther	Kitchin	Rainey, Ala.	Williams, Ill.
Cullen	Kleczka	Rayburn	Williams, Tex.
Davis, Minn.	Kline, N. Y.	Reece	Wingo
Denison	Knight	Riddick	Wise
Drane	Langley	Riordan	
Drewry	Lanham	Robsion	
Dyer	Layton	Rodenberg	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hundred and ninety-eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the salaries of the United States attorneys and United States marshals for the several judicial districts of the United States shall be fixed by the Attorney General, beginning July 1, 1923, at rates not less than $3,000 nor more than $7,500 per annum for attorneys and at rates not less than $3,000 nor more than $6,500 per annum for marshals, the amount to be based in each instance upon the business transacted during the four years ending June 30, 1923: *Provided*, That the salaries of the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, the northern district of Illinois, and the District of Columbia may be fixed at rates not exceeding $10,000 per annum for each of said districts.

The Attorney General may increase or decrease any of the salaries fixed, as aforesaid, within the limits prescribed in the foregoing section if, upon investigation, he finds that there has been a material increase or decrease in the volume of business transacted: *Provided*, That no salary fixed under the provisions of this act shall be changed more than once in any four years.

All laws or parts of laws, in so far as they are in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there a second demanded?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I demand a second.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] will take their places as tellers. Those who favor ordering a second will pass between the tellers and be counted.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 137, noes 1.

A second was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas has 20 minutes.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, some 28 years ago a statute was passed fixing the salaries of district attorneys and marshals for the various districts of the United States. Since then there has been practically no change in that statute. In only a few districts has there been any change. Of course, as new districts have been created statutes have been passed fixing the pay in those districts. Attempts have been made to readjust salaries by special bills designed for that purpose, but there has seldom been any possibility of securing legislation along that line.

Some years ago—I think it was in 1919—a bill was passed giving to the Attorney General the power to fix the salaries of the clerks of court. It is believed by the committee that this way of dealing with this matter is a good deal better, more economical, and fairer.

Here is the situation: When you undertake to change by statute the salaries to be paid these officers it becomes a matter of log rolling, and besides it is impossible for any standing committee of Congress to devote the necessary time to determine definitely what the salary should be in each instance. In the end Congress must depend on the Attorney General for the information upon which to base them.

We are following, as I have just suggested, a precedent that has been established by Congress by authorizing the Attorney General to fix the salaries of clerks. We have pursued this same policy in other lines. The Attorney General now has the power to fix the salaries of the different assistant attorneys and the deputy marshals.

In the city of New York there are some forty assistant attorneys. The salaries of those are fixed by the Attorney General. Of course, we have a large number of deputy marshals. Their salaries are also fixed by the Attorney General. It is also a common practice to fix salaries in that way in other departments. Many of the employees have their salaries fixed by the heads of the various departments. Whenever we make a lump-sum appropriation for carrying out a policy the head of the department fixes the salaries.

To make it certain that there is not to be an excessively high salary the Senate put a limit on the amount that can be allowed. It is not to be less than $3,000 for either the marshal or the district attorney, but it must not exceed $7,500 for the attorneys nor more than $6,500 for the marshals except in three cities. In the city of New York, under existing law, we pay $10,000 to its district attorney. The same sum is paid at Chicago, because of the large number of men employed and the vast amount of work done at those two places. There is one other where the attorney is to receive $10,000; that is for the District of Columbia. Eight attorneys are employed in this district at the present time. The work that is being done in this district is unusually large. The war has brought to this district a great deal of work, and it is believed that the salary of the district attorney here ought to be $10,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. What authority does it give the Attorney General to reduce the salary of a marshal that is now under appointment?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The Attorney General can reduce as well as increase salaries under this bill, but it is not believed that this will make any very large charge upon the Treasury.

Mr. SNYDER. What I mean is this: Does it give the Attorney General the right now to take a marshal who is already appointed and reduce his salary?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It might, if his salary was disproportionate to the salaries of other marshals.

Mr. SNYDER. The bill does give him the power to reduce the salary that a marshal is now drawing?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes; to reduce and to increase.

Mr. SNYDER. It also gives him the right to raise it?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Only once in four years.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. As I understand, the policy embraced in this bill is identical in substance with the policy embraced in the bill of 1919 with respect to the salaries of clerks.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I also understand that the act of 1919 has been very conservatively applied.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It has been.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have heard the total increase under that act is only some $27,000 or $30,000.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. A little over $20,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And it is estimated, I believe, that this measure would result in an increase of something less than $50,000?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is very important that some increases should be made, because some cities have grown immensely, and the business with it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It is a fact, is it not, that in a great many cases the salaries that now obtain have been in effect since the early nineties; that there has been an enormous increase in the volume of business?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Except in a few instances, the salaries were fixed many years ago, since when the business has greatly increased.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Did I understand the gentleman from Minnesota to say that the Attorney General now has authority to fix the salaries of all deputy United States marshals?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. My understanding is that he has that power within certain limits fixed by statute.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. In other words, he has some latitude but not full power?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes; and the same power with reference to assistant district attorneys.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. That would apply to the first assistant and chief deputy marshal.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. How much does the bill increase the salaries here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think some $2,000; it does raise it some.

Mr. HUSTED. I think that is a reasonable increase; I think the salary should be increased. The business of the district attorney here in Washington does not amount to as much as the statistics would lead one to believe, because in many cases which are instituted in the Department of Justice the papers are all prepared by the department and the case is actually carried on by the Department of Justice.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is a large amount of business here.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that within the past 20 years the business in the United States attorneys' offices has increased

ten times, and they are getting the same salary they have had for years?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I do not know just what the per cent of increase has been. It has increased greatly.

Mr. HILL. In the district of Maryland it is ten times beyond what it originally was.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. Has there been a schedule prepared showing the proposed increase and decrease of salaries of the United States marshals?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Not by the committee or the department, so far as I know.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. How about the United States attorneys and marshals in the outlying districts like Alaska; is it to be based on the business of 1923, or is it a flat rate?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is to be based on the business for four years. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman from Minnesota consumed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, listening to the discussion here reminds me of one of my early experiences as a lawyer. We were trying a case in a justice's court. The fact of contributory negligence, we felt, had been fully established. When the argument was concluded the jury retired to a room near by. Everybody could hear what was said. The question of contributory negligence was never mentioned. One juror moved the election of a foreman and another said, "Well, fellers, how much do you reckon we ought to give him?" We are discussing here a legislative proposition that reaches to the fundamentals of our system of government All that seems to be considered is whether the salaries being paid are high enough, the inference being that if they are not, we should shirk a constitutional duty and surrender a congressional power and discretion to one of the executive officers.

The questions asked during the interruptions seem to be a reflection from letters received from the officer to be affected.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield? I want him to know that the questions I asked were not based on any such assumption whatever, as I have had no letter from anyone.

Mr. FOSTER. And you might exclude me also.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If it is going to cause any trouble, I will make a blanket exclusion for you all. [Laughter.] Now, what is this proposition? Marshals of the district and district attorneys are nominated by the President of the United States, and their nominations are confirmed by the Senate of the United States. It is said that the clerks' salary is fixed by the Attorney General, and therefore he should fix the salary of these other officers. I am not going to discuss very much the difference between the relationship which the clerk of the court sustains to the administration of the law under our plan of government and the relationship which the marshal and the district attorney sustain, but there is an important difference. The first is purely a ministerial officer. I am not sure we should have enacted a law giving the Attorney General the power to fix the salary of clerks. But they are purely ministerial officers. The marshal is an executive officer. The district attorney is an executive officer. Each of these offices is created by the same authority and power which creates the office of Attorney General. They get their commissions from the same source. This legislation is bad from two angles—and I mean no reflection upon the man who is now Attorney General or the man who may come after him—but it is axiomatic in our system of government that whoever controls the purse strings controls the Government, whoever controls the salary controls the office. This bill gives to the Attorney General the control of the purse strings. That control belongs with the Congress. The Attorney General has now all the power which it is safe to lodge with that official or with any other official not directly responsible to the people.

I repeat that whoever can fix the salary of an officer, if he desires to do so, can largely control that officer's discretion. Under our plan of government it is contemplated that the district attorneys of the several districts shall be responsible to the authority which created them. It is violative of a fundamental principle of our Government to permit the Attorney General to fix the salaries within the limits fixed in this bill of the district attorneys of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Does not the gentleman think that this kind of a system, with the right kind of an Attorney General, would in a measure tend to efficiency in the service and better results?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If you had the right kind of a czar, always wise and just, that kind of a government would be the most efficient government on earth, but we are supposed not to favor that system, first, because the experience of mankind has shown that tyranny is the child of arbitrary power; and second, we just naturally prefer to do the governing ourselves.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think I had better complete my statement first. I am unwilling to have the legislative branch of the Government confess its inability to function in the discharge of its constitutional duties. It is our duty to fix these salaries; our duty under the Constitution, and would be our duty under any wise plan of government. Whatever information the Attorney General of the United States has, whatever information the judges have, the district attorney, or the marshals, ought to be given to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, or the proper committee. That committee could sit down with the Attorney General of the United States and go over any schedule that he might desire to submit, and if the proposed schedule should appeal to the judgment of the Committee on the Judiciary, then let that committee make its report in due order, with such modifications as it might agree on, and in proper process of legislation the Congress of the United States could enact the proper legislation.

The statements made by the distinguished chairman of this committee illustrate just what comes from this sort of legislation. We started in with the clerks and then with the deputy marshals, and now we are up to the marshal himself and to the district attorney himself. It is now proposed to turn over to a Cabinet officer the fixing of those salaries. I say that it is violative of the fundamentals of our plan of government.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. In the reclassification bill that we have in conference the Senate inserted a provision permitting the board, notwithstanding the schedule of salaries fixed in the bill, in certain cases to fix another salary. The House conferees refused to agree to any such proposition, taking the same ground that my colleague takes—that Congress itself ought to fix all of the salaries.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right; but I want to impress upon the gentlemen who are going to vote on this question that this is a very different proposition from that. It is very different from having the head of a department fix the salaries of administrative agents in his department. There he is responsible; but here it is proposed that one officer shall fix the salary of many other officers who are commissioned by the President and the Senate, just as he is. This shifts control to the Attorney General, because he is given control to a great degree over their salaries. Think of the situation: The Attorney General is nominated by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate. The district attorneys of the several districts are nominated by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate; and here this Congress in the closing hours of this session proposes to say to the Attorney General of the United States that we can not determine what compensation they should receive, and that we will turn over to him the matter of fixing the salaries of these officers who come from the very same source that he comes from. I do not think we ought to do it. I am willing to take all of the time necessary with the Attorney General. I am willing to take all of the time necessary with the district judges and the district attorneys and the marshals, and hear their complaints, and bring in here a bill that will represent the judgment of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, but I shall never cast my vote for a measure that turns over the discharge of a legislative duty to one of the officers of the Government, as is proposed here.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Assuming that the Attorney General should exercise this discretion up to the maximum amount, what would be the increase entailed on the Treasury of the United States under this bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I could not answer the gentleman except to say that I am quite sure that it would run to $100,000 per annum, perhaps much higher than that. I have not examined that, because I do not care if it would not take a cent. I am not going to discuss the question of dollars in a bill as fundamentally objectionable as this.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DOMINICK. What difference would there be between this plan and the plan now in vogue in respect to the fixing of the salaries of postmasters? The Postmaster General is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The postmasters are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. As I understand it, the Post Office Department fixes the salaries of the postmasters upon the basis of their receipts. I understand that these salaries are to be fixed upon the proportionate basis of work done.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. In the first place, the postmaster is a purely ministerial officer, and in the second place there is a basis upon which his salary can be fixed with practical accuracy. It is fixed, practically automatically in most cases, I believe. But I say that if we are doing somewhere else that which is wrong, and I am not going to discuss whether or not we are, it does not justify us in doing that which is wrong this afternoon. A bad act, a bad precedent, never excuses another bad transaction. The only consistency which I think anybody ought to try to adhere to is that each time when he comes to act he use his latest and best judgment with regard to the matter being dealt with.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Do I understand that the bill provides that the salary is to be fixed by the Attorney General according to the amount of business done?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not think so.

Mr. HUSTED. What is the language used?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The bill provides that the salaries of the United States attorneys and United States marshals for the several judicial districts of the United States shall be fixed by the Attorney General, between certain figures ranging from $3,000 to $7,500 per annum, the amount to be based in each instance upon the business transaction during the four years ending June 30, 1923.

Mr. HUSTED. How is that to be determined? Is that to be determined by the number of cases, by the amount involved in the cases, by the amount of time actually engaged, or by the return from the cases? Does it not practically leave to the discretion of the Attorney General to a very large extent what the increase in any individual case may be?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Certainly it does. That must be the effect of this bill. How is he to arrive at his conclusions and who is to question or exercise any check upon his discretion?

The effect of this bill would not be changed if it were to provide in its terms that within the wide range of salaries carried in the bill the Attorney General is authorized to fix the salaries of district attorneys and marshals. No such power ought to be surrendered by the Congress.

Now, the question of the gentleman from New York shows that that must be so.

Mr. HUSTED. I think so.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Of course.

Mr. HUSTED. And, as I understand, then the gentleman's objection runs only against the major officers; it does not run against the deputies?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is all we are discussing here; that is all this bill provides.

Mr. HUSTED. It certainly would not be practical to have Congress fix the salaries of deputies. It might be practical to have the Congress fix the salaries of United States attorneys in different districts, and of the marshal's office, and clerks of court, but it certainly would not be practicable to have the Congress fix the salaries of deputies, except within certain limits.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. We spend more money for that purpose.

Mr. HUSTED. Very much more; vastly.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I was only trying to discuss what is carried in this bill and in fixing the salary of marshals and district attorneys.

Mr. HUSTED. I am very much inclined to agree with the gentleman, so far as the clerk's office, marshals, and United States attorneys are concerned. It certainly would place in the hands of the Attorney General very great power and control if he had even within a limited discretion the right to fix the salary of every marshal.

Mr. DOMINICK. The clerks are already there.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. SNYDER. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Dyer	Knight	Riddick
Anthony	Ellis	Knutson	Rodenberg
Arentz	Fairfield	Lanham	Rose
Bacharach	Faust	Layton	Rosenbloom
Barkley	Frear	Lazaro	Rucker
Bird	Freeman	Lehlbach	Ryan
Blakeney	Garner	Linthicum	Scott, Mich.
Bland, Ind.	Garrett, Tex.	Luhring	Sears
Brennan	Gensman	McClintic	Shelton
Britten	Glynn	McCormick	Slemp
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	McDuffie	Smith, Mich.
Brown, Tenn.	Gorman	McFadden	Smithwick
Browne, Wis.	Gould	Maloney	Stiness
Buchanan	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Stoll
Bulwinkle	Griffin	Mead	Sullivan
Burke	Hardy, Colo.	Michaelson	Tague
Burtness	Hardy, Tex.	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hays	Moore, Ill.	Thomas
Chandler, Okla.	Hogan	Morgan	Thorpe
Clague	Hukriede	Morin	Tillman
Clark, Fla.	Jacoway	Mott	Treadway
Classon	Johnson, Miss.	Mudd	Vinson
Codd	Jones, Pa.	Nelson, J. M.	Walters
Connolly, Pa.	Jones, Tex.	O'Connor	Wheeler
Copley	Kahn	Olpp	White, Me.
Crowther	Keller	Overstreet	Williams, Ill.
Cullen	Kelley, Mich.	Paige	Williams, Tex.
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Park, Ga.	Wilson
Denison	Kiess	Patterson, Mo.	Wise
Drane	Kindred	Patterson, N. J.	Wood, Ind.
Drewry	King	Rainey, Ala.	Wright
Dunbar	Kitchin	Rayburn	Wyant

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). On this roll call 298 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SNYDER. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent the House stand in recess for 30 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes) the House stood in recess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Gentlemen of the House, a quarter of a century of intelligent, honest, painstaking public service marks the record of our distinguished leader, now about to retire from the House, which he does voluntarily. That record is filled to overflowing with brilliant achievements. Coming from a State for which land laws must be enacted to meet the needs of the sturdy pioneers, he applied himself to a study of the problems of the West and made himself the leading authority in the Nation on that subject. His industry carried him into every field of legislation and he was soon recognized as a walking encyclopedia on every subject coming before the Congress. He possessed the courage of his convictions. He never trimmed sail to meet the passing breeze. He stood foursquare against every wind that blew. He has been a real force for good in the House. He has earned the right to retire from his arduous labors here. We regret to see him go. His devotion to the cause of good government has been steadfast, so steadfast that it has known no turning. We will miss his influence and eloquence in the next Congress. He has been a matchless leader. He has earned the love and confidence of all who have been associated with him. A stalwart Republican, he nevertheless was always fair in his dealings with the Democrats. His word was never doubted, once given it was sacred. He has been unselfish, and patriotic, always for America. Men like Mr. MONDELL [applause] have helped to make America great. He had no personal ax to grind—his was a service for the people, and for them alone. He had opinions and the courage to express them. He is a common everyday citizen, not too proud to listen to the humblest citizen on the most unimportant subject. Big enough to meet the most exhalted on the paramount questions of the day. He is the ideal public servant. His clientele has been the Nation—his mind, his heart, his soul, has been given to the Nation's cause. His colleagues here pour out their love to him as he is about to leave us. We rejoice that he is not to leave the public service, but his great ability and knowledge and experience is to be retained and utilized in the War Finance Corporation, where we are all proud to think he adds to the glory he has achieved as a legislator. My dear MONDELL, your colleagues take pride in presenting you this beautiful tribute of their affection. This chest of sterling silver is presented because it is emblematic of the purity of your life and the lasting

quality of our devotion. Accept it in the spirit in which it is given, and as you and your good wife look upon its beauty think of the love the donors bear you. God bless and prosper you and your family, and bring that happiness into your home which your labors here have brought into thousands of homes throughout the land. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Presiding Officer and Mr. Majority Leader, this is an hour of deep emotion.

I shall not attempt in any way to review the long and distinguished record which the majority leader of this House has made as a legislator. His activities in behalf of the great State from which he comes and in behalf of the great western country are written in imperishable words in the history of the Nation. [Applause.] I have, of course, known him as a legislator for 16 years. For four years I have known him as the titular leader of his party, and for the last two years circumstances have caused me to come in closer touch with him than have, perhaps, many other Members of the House. The gentleman said "no" a good many times when I wanted him to say "yes." He said "yes" a good many times when I wanted him to say "no," but he has always had the courage to say either "yes" or "no" according to his own convictions of what should be said. [Applause.] And that is what we need in public men. Living in a conspicuous position, one of the most conspicuous positions in the world, the leader of a great party in a great era, in a period fraught with difficulties, saturated with troubles, the gentleman from Wyoming measured up to the highest standard of American citizenship, and has been true to American traditions and has preserved unsullied the honor of that great position of leadership which he held. [Applause.] No hint has ever been thrown out by anyone which cast the slightest reflection upon his integrity of purpose, his character, his honor as a legislator or as a leader. Oh, I know he has passed through trying times, his responsibilities have been tremendous, and he has met them with honor, with courtesy, with credit to himself and with credit to his party, and with honor to the whole House of Representatives. [Applause.] So, for you and yours, Mr. MONDELL, and those who are to come after you, those who down the generations will look back to the honor you have made for your name, I wish you and yours and those who are to come all the good things you and they can have. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a somewhat trying occasion. I have attended many ceremonies in this House in which gentlemen have euologized their departed colleagues. I am thankful to-day that I have had the opportunity of being here present and hearing said the kindly things so many of our colleagues have had said about them when they no longer could hear them. I appreciate more than I can say the kindly, considerate, the very generous words uttered by the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Tennessee.

I hope that in some measure, at least, I am worthy of their kindly expressions, and I hope that it is true that I have measured up, partly at least, to the high standard of their generous expressions, to the high praise which they have been kind enough to utter here in the presence of my colleagues.

I am leaving the House voluntarily after a service of more than a quarter of a century, and while the severance is voluntary, it is nevertheless with the keenest regret, for in 25 years of service this Chamber has become a very familiar place to me; this service has come to be a large part of my life, and I realize what a loss it will be, how great a change it will be, when I am no more entitled to respond to the roll call.

I came here as a comparatively young man, and I remember when Uncle JOE [applause], when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], in moments when I was inclined to be just a little insubordinate and turbulent, would lay his kindly hand on my shoulder and say, "Now, my boy, let us talk it over." It was "my boy" then; but as the years have passed Uncle JOE and I have grown nearer of an age, and we are both going out older than we were, but still young. [Applause.]

I came here a stranger to all the country east of the Mississippi River, and with all the appreciation of the grandeur and glory of this Capital of the Republic and the high honor of this service that one can possibly have. I am leaving after 26 years, with the novelty worn off, but with an even higher regard for the dignity of the Nation and the honor of this service than I had on the day I came. [Applause.]

I leave the House, as I have said, with very great regret. I can not say that of the service as floor leader. There are some things of which any reasonable man may have enough. [Laughter and applause.]

And I hope I am at least a reasonable man. If I were to remain in the House I would much prefer to remain the Member from Wyoming, looking after her interests, and in a position to give undivided attention to that interest, viewed in the light of the national interest, rather than with the great responsibilities that have been upon me for the past four years.

Gentlemen have been kindly and considerate and all that, and I appreciate it more than I can say. I have not been an ideal floor leader; I know that. A man to be an ideal floor leader should not have any temper at all. [Laughter.] He should not allow himself to get ruffled. He should not disagree with folks, and he should not cultivate the habit of saying "No." What a lovely time he could have of it—to agree with all the gentlemen on that side and all the gentlemen on this side!

In my next incarnation, should I again be in political life and have the fortune, good or ill, as you may view it, of rising to a position of such responsibility, I shall hope that I may be able to agree with everybody in all things. [Applause.]

That has not been possible. Unfortunately a position of responsibility in a House like this—with 435 splendid, virile, forceful Members, each and all of them quick and earnest in the interest of the people and of the Nation; all anxious to do those things which they think should be done in the way they believe it should be done—all this presents a tremendous problem to one who to a greater or less extent must suggest what shall be done, how it shall be done, and when it shall be done.

I leave here with the most profound appreciation of the kindness and the courtesy of the Members of this House. You have borne with me and with my faults with Christian grace and charity, and you have in a very fine way aided in carrying on the work of Congress.

I want to pay tribute to the minority and to the minority leader. [Applause.] Of course, we have not always agreed. But that is not to be expected and would not be possible so long as we represent opposite parties. But I have found him always square, honorable, straightforward, a man who did not make a promise quickly or easily, but one who when he made it always kept it to the letter. [Applause.]

I want to thank the minority. They could have made it much more difficult than they have done if they had been pleased to. I want particularly to express my appreciation of those of them, including their leader, who are real stalwart Democrats. [Applause.] If there is anything we need in this country and in this House in these days as an anchor to that courage which is above all things the first essential, it is sincere belief in and an honest and unswerving adherence to the principles of the party to whose standards and beliefs we give our allegiance. [Applause.] It will be a sad day for the country when party principle shall be obscured and forgotten and when men shall no longer realize the tremendous importance of standing by party policies and upholding party principles.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Republican side. There have been various occasions when a number of the brethren have not been inclined to view things my way. I hope that through it all and out of it all we have still remained good friends. I know that many of the men who have differed with me the most—all the men who have differed with me, and with what I was inclined to consider party policies—did so because they were very earnest in the views they held. I am rather hoping that in the not distant future the brethren on this side will come to look at things in a little more united way. [Laughter and applause.] I think it will be a very good thing for the country if that should happen.

Mr. Speaker, may I speak a word in regard to this House as an institution of Government, as I have known it for 26 years? In my opinion the fate of the Republic, its future, ill or good, rests more with this House and its membership than with any other part of our Government. [Applause.] What the future shall bring to America, what we shall be in the future, will largely depend on what you gentlemen who are to remain, and those who are to serve with you, and after you shall decide and determine. We all realize that in these days when the world is properly moving forward in government, in legislation, as it is in all other things, there is just a little temptation—Ah! there is great temptation—to forget the fundamentals, to lose sight of the basic principles, to forget whence we come, the road we have traveled, and the attitude and position we must maintain if here in America we shall continue a Government of the people, for and by the people, of States dignified and independent within their sovereignty, and a Federal Government armed and

equipped to do all these things necessary to be done within the jurisdiction provided for it within the four corners of the Constitution. [Applause.]

I have served here with many men, some very wise, some not so wise; with many men that I have agreed with and with many men that I disagreed with. I have had a very great pleasure in the latter days of my service in serving with four delightful, charming, and splendid women. [Applause.]

And of all these I am prepared to say that while I thought some of the men folks were a little odd in their views and some not overwise, they have practically, without exception, been men and women whose one purpose, whose one desire, was to serve their constituency and their country to the very best of their ability. [Applause.] The membership of this House has been honest, well intentioned, and faithful during all my service. Would it be kindly, after having said all this, to say that I think we have sometimes just a little lacked in courage? I think, of all things we need here, we need courage most—courage to withstand the onslaughts of active minorities. [Applause.] Courage to stand against manufactured propaganda; the courage to stand against minorities well organized, who know what they want and how to get it; courage to stand for those things and by those things we believe in, though the heavens fall. [Applause.]

My dear colleagues, as the time approaches to leave you I greet you as splendid, stalwart, faithful representatives of the American people, and in so doing I pay my tribute to those who sent you here. If this House were not the honest, faithful, conscientious body of men that it has been during my service, then the fault would be of the American people; but the heart of the American people is sound, sane, and honest. [Applause.]

If I were to express a wish for you and your successors, above all others it would be that your constituents, having sent you here, would leave you to do your best according to your own judgment and without overmuch advice or urging from them. You have in your hands the destiny of the greatest nation on earth, and the destiny of the greatest nation on earth is in a considerable degree the destiny of all the world, for as America goes, as America stands, so stands the world. [Applause.]

Our moral influence is almost limitless. It extends to every corner of the globe wherever men live, so that what we do here not only affects the people of this land but the people of the entire globe. The American people can leave these great interests in the hands of the American Congress, confident that you will perform your duty to those whom you immediately serve, to the Nation to which you have sworn allegiance, and to the world which is affected by your deeds, with confidence in your honor and your integrity. [Applause.]

I accept this chest of sterling silver and this silver service on behalf of Mrs. Mondell and myself with very great appreciation of the kindness of my colleagues who have donated it. These articles of sterling silver will remind us continually and always of the good friends with whom I have served and whose kindly regard we shall always cherish.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House, at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes, was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess from 6.30 this evening to 8 o'clock this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that at 6.30 o'clock this evening the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know when the conference report on the agricultural credits bill will come up.

Mr. MONDELL. We hope to take it up immediately after we reconvene. In the meantime there are some matters on the Speaker's table.

Mr. WINGO. I have had that hope for about four hours.

Mr. MONDELL. We are all as anxious to dispose of that matter as is the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. Why can not that be taken ahead of these other matters? What is the trouble?

Mr. MONDELL. No trouble at all, except that we have some measures that must go to the Senate and be acted upon there. It will take a little time. We have been trying to dispose of them first.

Mr. WINGO. This conference report is going to take some time in the Senate.

Mr. MONDELL. I think we ought to get it over there quite early in the evening, but I am perfectly willing to take it up after our return.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand the recess is to be from 6.30 o'clock until 8?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it quite sure that the conference report on the so-called rural credits bill will be taken up immediately upon reconvening?

Mr. MONDELL. We will take up nothing else that will take any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can not the majority leader give us positive assurance that that will be taken up upon reconvening?

Mr. MONDELL. We may have some little thing on the Speaker's table. It will be taken up approximately the first thing. If there is a bill on the Speaker's table that ought to be sent to the Senate, of course, we ought to send it there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALARIES OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEYS AND UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, when interrupted we were considering the Senate bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to fix the salaries of district attorneys and United States marshals. During the past six years the salaries of all Government employees have increased excepting those of district attorneys and United States marshals. Bonuses have been paid and are being paid. Not only have Government employees received increased compensation but the same condition has prevailed throughout civil life, not alone in America but throughout the entire world, to meet the increased cost of living conditions superinduced, perhaps, by an inflated currency.

Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEAL. The gentleman will excuse me; I have not the time. The salaries of district attorneys and United States marshals have not been increased, although the burden of work that has been placed upon them has increased generally, and in many instances has been tripled and quadrupled. Since the enactment of the prohibition laws we all know that the work of the courts has been very great, so that the labor which has been placed upon these men has been doubled and in some instances tripled and quadrupled. For more than 10 years their salaries have not been increased. We have provided that the clerks of the courts shall have their compensation increased in the discretion of the Attorney General. This bill provides that the same plan may apply to district attorneys and United States marshals, within the limits, however, of not less than $3,000 nor more than $6,500 for marshals or $7,500 for district attorneys. I am advised that throughout the Union the district attorneys and the marshals have been overcrowded with work. Certainly within my own district this has been the case. Over 1,100 cases were placed on the docket and tried during the past 12 months in the eastern district of Virginia. We have a long stretch of seacoast, one of the largest and most extensive harbors perhaps in the world, certainly including its tributaries. It is, therefore, very difficult to prevent smuggling and violation of the prohibition laws. This has increased the work of our district attorney many times. The Government activities within that district have embraced aviation fields, Shipping Board cases, the naval station at Yorktown, the naval base at Hampton Roads, the Army bases, navy yards, and many other activities of the Government. Many cases that have been on the docket have involved several hundred thousand dollars, and the fact remains that the district attorney under these circumstances has been unable to have an increase of his salary for more than 10 years. Assistants are receiving larger salaries than the district attorney, and in some cases the marshal.

Mr. RICKETTS. What is the salary of the assistant United States marshal, or the deputy marshals, as we call them?

Mr. DEAL. I am not prepared to say.

Mr. RICKETTS. The fact is that they get a salary of $1,000, with a bonus of $250. That has been the salary for a number

of years, and while I am heartily in favor of increasing the salaries of the district attorneys and of the marshals, I think the deputy marshals ought to have their salaries increased also.

Mr. DEAL. I agree with the gentleman, but it is not within my power to have these salaries raised. The only thing I can do is to indorse the bill that we have before us to-day. This is a step in the right direction.

Mr. RICKETTS. It makes no provision for the deputies?

Mr. DEAL. None, as I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. The debate has shown heretofore that the increase of their salaries is in the discretion of the Attorney General now.

Mr. DEAL. I am not posted on that. I know it is in the discretion of the Attorney General to increase the salaries of the clerks, and in some instances the clerks are to-day receiving larger salaries than are the district attorneys.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, just as sure as we pass this bill the salary of every district attorney will be increased almost automatically to $7,500 a year, and the salary of every marshal almost automatically will be increased to at least $6,500 a year.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROACH].

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I introduced a companion measure to this bill in the House, and the House bill was thoroughly considered by the Judiciary Committee. This bill is not an attempt to raise the salaries of the district attorneys, as stated by the Representative from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], but merely corrects the existing inequality of salaries of United States district attorneys and marshals. Those who are at all familiar with the situation well know that under existing law there is an inequality of salaries of our district attorneys and marshals that should be corrected by Congress without delay. This bill merely authorizes the Attorney General to regulate and fix the salaries of United States attorneys and marshals within certain minimum and maximum amounts in accordance with the volume of work done in their respective districts. Without a doubt such a measure is a wise one. In some districts the volume of work for both of these officers is quite heavy, while in others very little work is required, and it is nonsense to say that the pay, where such inequality exists, should be the same. This measure corrects that evil. I do not have in mind any other way by which this situation can be better corrected than is proposed in this bill. The measure has the approval of the Department of Justice, and so far as I know is approved by the district attorneys and United States marshals. At least, that is true to some extent, for I have had this matter up with some of them and have no hesitancy in stating that the measure meets with their approval. I hope the House will realize the importance of the measure and not confuse it with some of the chaff that has been going through the hopper in the closing hours of this session and fail to give it the consideration and deliberate judgment that it deserves. I am sure that if you will give it sober and thoughtful attention that you will vote for the bill.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the statement made awhile ago, before we were interrupted in this magnificent proceeding in honor of our floor leader, in the statement that was made by our distinguished Member from Texas that it is not a safe policy to give the salary-fixing power to an executive officer, and especially if he has the power to make a maximum and minimum. But that is not the case here. The law here fixes the minimum and also the maximum. I am not in agreement with my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] who has just now spoken, who says that where you have any leeway that you always make the minimum the maximum; or, in other words, if you fix the limit it will be the maximum rather than the minimum. Of course, we must give credence to those who are responsible for the department of which they are the head, and the very fact that we make a fair leeway of $3,000 minimum and $7,500 in one case and $6,500 in another the maximum shows the vast stretch of variety of the amount of the work that is done in one section in contrast with the work that is done in another section. In other words, if we examine the records we will see that in one section the work is arduous, very comprehensive, much enlarged over other sections. The salary can not be uniform unless no distinction is to be made for different degrees of work. We recognize this lack of uniformity. We have a $3,000 minimum and a $7,500 maximum for the office; that presupposes that there is a variety of work to be done. It is simply impossible for the Congress to fix the salary scientifically that will be adequate to the amount of work where the difference or the stretch is from one to two, like from $3,000 in one case to $7,500 in the other; and gentlemen have made that very clear that certain increased work in a section of eastern Virginia that has come about in recent years has so much enlarged the work of that place that to make the salary of a person who is there in control the same as it was before it expanded, or the same as in another district, is not scientific. It is not sensible, and the fact that the work increased in one section constantly and decreased in another section constantly should allow the Attorney General to accommodate the salary to the amount of work. It can not be regulated in a legislative body like this. Ministerial work, it is true, does not require the same discretion that the policy-fixing function of the officer requires.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

RECESS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of 6.30 having arrived the House will stand in recess until 8 o'clock.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, at 8 o'clock p. m. the House was called to order by Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas as Speaker pro tempore.

SALARIES OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The debate on the bill having been concluded, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I understood that there were three minutes remaining, and of that three minutes I yielded one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], which left two minutes remaining to me.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; the gentleman from Texas has two minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] had given to his colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] the remainder of his time, and his colleague used the three minutes, so that the debate is exhausted.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood the gentleman yielded to me one minute.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Unfortunately, I was not the timekeeper.

Mr. SISSON. I think, Mr. Speaker, under the rules a mistake has been made at the desk by not charging up time to the man who had control of the time, so that it was just a matter of mismanagement.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am under agreement to yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], but I believe he is not in the Hall. The Chair has been so gracious in waiving the ordinary rule in my behalf that I will not insist on exacting the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 425) authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to fix the salaries of United States attorneys and United States marshals of the several judicial districts of the United States within certain limits. As many as favor the motion will answer "aye." Those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this a very important bill. I think we ought to have a roll call on this bill. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] to suspend the rules and pass the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 70, not voting 162, as follows:

YEAS—195.

Abernethy	Evans	Lehlbach	Robertson
Ackerman	Fairchild	Lineberger	Robsion
Anderson	Fairfield	Little	Rodenberg
Andrews, Nebr.	Faust	Luce	Rossdale
Appleby	Fess	Lyon	Rucker
Atkeson	Fitzgerald	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Focht	McKenzie	Sandlin
Barbour	Fordney	McLaughlin, Mich.	Shaw
Begg	Foster	McPherson	Shreve
Benham	French	McSwain	Siegel
Bixler	Fuller	Madden	Sinclair
Bland, Ind.	Funk	Magee	Sinnott
Bland, Va.	Garrett, Tenn.	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Boies	Gensman	Martin	Smithwick
Bond	Gernerd	Mead	Snell
Bowers	Gifford	Michener	Snyder
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Mass.	Miller	Speaks
Burdick	Greene, Vt.	Mills	Sproul
Burtness	Griest	Mondell	Stafford
Burton	Hadley	Moore, Ohio	Stephens
Butler	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Va.	Strong, Kans.
Cable	Hawley	Moores, Ind.	Strong, Pa.
Campbell, Kans.	Hayden	Morin	Swing
Campbell, Pa.	Hersey	Murphy	Taylor, N. J.
Chalmers	Hickey	Nelson, A. P.	Temple
Chindblom	Hicks	Newton, Minn.	Thompson
Christopherson	Hill	Newton, Mo.	Tilson
Clague	Himes	Nolan	Timberlake
Clouse	Hooker	Norton	Tincher
Cole, Iowa	Huck	O'Connor	Towner
Colton	Hukriede	Ogden	Underhill
Cooper, Ohio	Humphrey, Nebr.	Parker, N. J.	Valle
Coughlin	Humphreys, Miss.	Paul	Vestal
Crago	Hutchinson	Perkins	Volk
Cramton	Ireland	Perlman	Volstead
Crisp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Petersen	Walters
Curry	Johnson, Wash.	Porter	Wason
Dale	Kelly, Pa.	Pringey	Watson
Dallinger	Kendall	Purnell	Webster
Darrow	Ketcham	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Deal	Kissel	Rainey, Ill.	Williams, Ill.
Dickinson	Knutson	Raker	Williamson
Dominick	Kopp	Ransley	Wilson
Dunbar	Kraus	Reber	Winslow
Dupré	Kreider	Reed, N. Y.	Wurzbach
Dyer	Lazaro	Reed, W. Va.	Wyant
Echols	Lea, Calif.	Rhodes	Young
Edmonds	Leatherwood	Ricketts	Zihlman
Elliott	Lee, N. Y.	Roach	

NAYS—70.

Aswell	Doughton	Lampert	Steagall
Bankhead	Dowell	Lankford	Stedman
Barkley	Driver	Lee, Ga.	Stevenson
Beck	Fields	Logan	Sumners, Tex.
Bell	Fulmer	Lowrey	Swank
Black	Gilbert	Nelson, J. M.	Sweet
Blanton	Goldsborough	Oldfield	Tague
Bowling	Graham, Ill.	Oliver	Ten Eyck
Box	Hammer	Parks, Ark.	Tucker
Brand	Hoch	Quin	Turner
Bulwinkle	Huddleston	Ramseyer	Tyson
Byrnes, S. C.	Hudspeth	Rankin	Upshaw
Byrns, Tenn.	Hull	Rayburn	Vinson
Cantrill	James	Riordan	Voigt
Collier	Jeffers, Ala.	Rouse	Weaver
Collins	Johnson, Ky.	Sanders, Tex.	Wingo
Cooper, Wis.	Kincheloe	Schall	
Davis, Tenn.	Kline, Pa.	Sisson	

NOT VOTING—162.

Almon	Drewry	Kahn	Michaelson
Andrew, Mass.	Dunn	Kearns	Montague
Ansorge	Ellis	Keller	Moore, Ill.
Anthony	Favrot	Kelley, Mich.	Morgan
Arentz	Fenn	Kennedy	Mott
Beedy	Fish	Kiess	Mudd
Bird	Fisher	Kindred	Nelson, Me.
Blakeney	Frear	King	O'Brien
Brennan	Free	Kirkpatrick	Olpp
Briggs	Freeman	Kitchin	Overstreet
Britten	Frothingham	Kleczka	Paige
Brooks, Ill.	Gahn	Kline, N. Y.	Park, Ga.
Brown, Tenn.	Gallivan	Knight	Parker, N. Y.
Browne, Wis.	Garner	Kunz	Patterson, Mo.
Buchanan	Garrett, Tex.	Langley	Patterson, N. J.
Burke	Glynn	Lanham	Pou
Cannon	Goodykoontz	Larsen, Ga.	Rainey, Ala.
Carew	Gorman	Larson, Minn.	Reece
Carter	Gould	Lawrence	Riddick
Chandler, N. Y.	Graham, Pa.	Layton	Rogers
Chandler, Okla.	Green, Iowa	Linthicum	Rose
Clark, Fla.	Griffin	London	Rosenbloom
Clarke, N. Y.	Hardy, Tex.	Longworth	Ryan
Classon	Haugen	Luhring	Sabath
Codd	Hawes	McArthur	Sanders, N. Y.
Cole, Ohio	Hays	McClintic	Scott, Mich.
Connally, Tex.	Henry	McCormick	Scott, Tenn.
Connolly, Pa.	Herrick	McDuffie	Sears
Copley	Hogan	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shelton
Crowther	Husted	McLaughlin, Pa.	Slemp
Cullen	Jacoway	MacGregor	Smith, Mich.
Davis, Minn.	Jefferis, Nebr.	MacLafferty	Steenerson
Dempsey	Johnson, Miss.	Maloney	Stiness
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Mansfield	Stoll
Drane	Jones, Tex.	Merritt	Sullivan
Summers, Wash.	Tillman	White, Me.	Woodyard
Taylor, Ark.	Tinkham	Williams, Tex.	Wright
Taylor, Colo.	Treadway	Wise	Yates
Taylor, Tenn.	Ward, N. Y.	Wood, Ind.	
Thomas	Ward, N. C.	Woodruff	
Thorpe	Wheeler	Woods, Va.	

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
Mr. Mudd with Mr. Cullen.
Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Jones of Texas.
Mr. Brown of Wisconsin with Mr. Garner.
Mr. Frear with Mr. Williams of Texas.
Mr. Kahn with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Lanham.
Mr. Patterson of New Jersey with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Stoll.
Mr. Scott of Michigan with Mr. Overstreet.
Mr. Jones of Pennsylvania with Mr. Drane.
Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Hardy of Texas.
Mr. Connelly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Freeman with Mr. Johnson of Mississippi.
Mr. Denison with Mr. Linthicum.
Mr. Keller with Mr. McClintic.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Kitchin.
Mr. Paige with Mr. Sears.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.
Mr. Patterson of Missouri with Mr. Woods of Virginia.
Mr. Anthony with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
Mr. Crowther with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Fenn with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Clarke of New York with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Longworth with Mr. Briggs.
Mr. Smith of Michigan with Mr. Park of Georgia.
Mr. Fish with Mr. Garrett of Texas.
Mr. Wood of Indiana with Mr. Hawes.
Mr. Beedy with Mr. Connally of Texas.
Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Rogers with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Britten with Mr. Gallivan.
Mr. King with Mr. Larsen of Georgia.
Mr. Summers of Washington with Mr. Carew.
Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Green of Iowa with Mr. Favrot.
Mr. Free with Mr. McDuffie.
Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Montague.
Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Mott with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Almon.
Mr. MacLafferty with Mr. Wise.
Mr. Parker of New York with Mr. Tillman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RECESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House takes a recess to-night, it take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House takes a recess to-night it recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

Mr. IRELAND. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what will be in order to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. We hope to conclude our business to-night.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman how late he expects to run before the recess. Some of us may want to know about the plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There might be some difficulty in fixing the hour.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the statement be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

FARM CREDITS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I present the conference report and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 4280) to provide for the incorporation and supervision of corporations formed for the purpose of making agricultural and live-stock loans; to amend the Federal reserve act; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to extend and stabilize the market for United States bonds and other securities; to provide fiscal agents for the United States; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania presents a conference report on the bill S. 4280 and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. McFADDEN. I also ask, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. WINGO. But the report will be printed in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will. Is there objection to the immediate consideration? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Is there objection to the statement being read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The report and statement are as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 4280) to provide for the incorporation and supervision of corporations formed for the purpose of making agricultural and live-stock loans; to amend the Federal reserve act; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to extend and stabilize the market for United States bonds and other securities; to provide fiscal agents for the United States; 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment insert the following:

TITLE I.—FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS.

SECTION 1. That section 1 of the Federal farm loan act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I.—FEDERAL FARM LOANS.

"SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the 'Federal farm loan act.' Its administration shall be under the direction and control of the Federal Farm Loan Board hereinafter created."

SEC. 2. That the Federal farm loan act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title, to read as follows:

"TITLE II.—FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS.

"ORGANIZATION.

"SEC. 201. (a) That the Federal Farm Loan Board shall have power to grant charters for 12 institutions to be known and styled as 'Federal intermediate credit banks.'

"(b) Such institutions shall be established in the same cities as the 12 Federal land banks. The officers and directors of the several Federal land banks shall be ex officio officers and directors of the several Federal intermediate credit banks hereby provided for and shall have power to employ and pay all clerks, bookkeepers, accountants, and other help necessary to carry on the business authorized by this title.

"(c) Each Federal intermediate credit bank shall have all the usual powers of corporations, and shall have power to sue and be sued both in law and equity, and for purposes of jurisdiction shall be deemed a citizen of the State where it is located.

"(d) Federal intermediate credit banks, when designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as fiscal agents of the United States Government and perform such duties as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(e) Upon default of any obligation any Federal intermediate credit bank may be declared insolvent and placed in the hands of a receiver by the Federal Farm Loan Board, and proceedings shall thereupon be had in accordance with the provisions of section 29 of this act regarding national farm-loan associations.

"(f) The charters to such Federal intermediate credit banks shall be granted upon application of the directors of the Federal land banks, which application shall be in such form as the Federal Farm Loan Board shall prescribe.

"DISCOUNTS AND LOANS.

"SEC. 203. (a) That Federal intermediate credit banks, when chartered and established, shall have power, subject solely to such restrictions, limitations, and conditions as may be imposed by the Federal Farm Loan Board not inconsistent with the provisions of this act,—

"(1) To discount for, or purchase from, any national bank, and/or any State bank, trust company, agricultural credit corporation, incorporated live-stock loan company, savings institution, cooperative bank, cooperative credit or marketing association of agricultural producers, organized under the laws of any State, and/or any other Federal intermediate credit bank, with its indorsement, any note, draft, bill of exchange, debenture, or other such obligation the proceeds of which have been advanced or used in the first instance for any agricultural purpose or for the raising, breeding, fattening, or marketing of live stock;

"(2) To buy or sell, with or without recourse, debentures issued by any other Federal intermediate credit bank; and

"(3) To make loans or advances direct to any cooperative association organized under the laws of any State and composed of persons engaged in producing, or producing and marketing, staple agricultural products, or live stock, if the notes or other such obligations representing such loans are secured by warehouse receipts, and/or shipping documents covering such products, and/or mortgages on live stock: *Provided*, That no such loan or advance shall exceed 75 per centum of the market value of the products covered by said warehouse receipts and/or shipping documents, or of the live stock covered by said mortgages.

"(b) No paper shall be purchased from or discounted for any national bank, State bank, trust company, or savings institution under this section, if the amount of such paper added to the aggregate liabilities of such national bank, State bank, trust company, or savings institution, whether direct or contingent (other than bona fide deposit liabilities), exceeds the amount of such liability permitted under the laws of the jurisdiction creating the same; or exceeds twice the paid in and unimpaired capital and surplus of such national bank, State bank, trust company, or savings institution. No paper shall under this section be purchased from or discounted for any other corporation engaged in making loans for agricultural purposes or for the raising, breeding, fattening, or marketing of live stock, if the amount of such paper added to the aggregate liabilities of such corporation exceeds the amount of such liabilities permitted under the laws of the jurisdiction creating the same; or exceeds ten times the paid in and unimpaired capital and surplus of such corporation. It shall be unlawful for any national bank which is indebted to any Federal intermediate credit bank upon paper discounted or purchased under this section, to incur any additional indebtedness, if by virtue of such additional indebtedness its aggregate liabilities, direct or contingent, will exceed the limitations herein contained."

(c) Loans, advances, or discounts made under this section shall have a maturity at the time they are made or discounted by the Federal intermediate credit bank of not less than six months nor more than three years. Any Federal intermediate credit bank may in its discretion sell loans or discounts made under this section, with or without its indorsement.

(d) Rates of interest or discount charged by the Federal intermediate credit banks upon such loans and discounts shall be subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board. On the majority vote of the members of the Federal Farm Loan Board any Federal intermediate credit bank shall be required to rediscount the discounted paper of any other Federal intermediate credit bank at rates of interest to be fixed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

"ISSUANCE OF DEBENTURES.

"SEC. 203. (a) That Federal intermediate credit banks, when chartered and established, shall have power, subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to borrow money and to issue and to sell collateral trust debentures or other similar obligations with a maturity at the time of issue of not more than five years, which shall be secured by at least a like face amount of cash, or notes or other such obligations discounted or purchased or representing loans made under section 202: *Provided*, That no Federal intermediate credit bank shall have power to issue or obligate itself for debentures or other obligations under the provisions of this section in excess of ten times the amount of the paid-up capital and surplus of such bank.

"(b) The provisions of Title I relating to the preparation and issue of farm loan bonds shall, so far as applicable, govern the preparation and issue of debentures or other such obligations issued under this section; but the Federal Farm Loan Board shall prescribe rules and regulations governing the receipt, custody, substitution, and release of collateral instruments securing such debentures or other obligations, the right of substitution being hereby granted. Rates of interest upon debentures and other such obligations issued under this section shall, subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, be fixed by the Federal intermediate credit bank making the issue, not exceeding 6 per cent per annum.

"(c) The United States Government shall assume no liability, direct or indirect, for any debentures or other obligations issued under this section, and all such debentures and other obligations shall contain conspicuous and appropriate language, to be prescribed in form and substance by the Federal Farm Loan Board and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, clearly indicating that no such liability is assumed.

"DISCOUNT RATES.

"SEC. 204. (a) That before making any discounts under the provisions of this title each Federal intermediate credit bank shall establish and promulgate a rate of discount to be approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board. Any Federal intermediate credit bank which has made an issue of debentures under the provisions of this title may thereafter establish, with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, a rate of discount not exceeding by more than 1 per cent per annum the rate borne by its last preceding issue of debentures.

"(b) No organization entitled to the privileges of this title shall, without the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, be allowed to discount with any Federal intermediate credit bank any note or other obligation upon which the original borrower has been charged a rate of interest exceeding by more than 1½ per cent per annum the discount rate of the Federal intermediate credit bank at the time such loan was made.

"(c) A Federal intermediate credit bank may, subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, buy in the open market at or below par for its own account and retire at or before maturity any such debentures or obligations issued by it.

"CAPITAL STOCK.

"SEC. 205. That for the purpose of exercising the powers conferred by this title each Federal intermediate credit bank shall have a subscribed capital stock of $5,000,000. Capital stock of such amount shall be divided into shares of $5 each and shall be subscribed, held, and paid by the Government of the United States. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe to such capital stock on behalf of the United States, such subscription to be subject to call in whole or in part by directors of the said banks upon 30 days' notice to the Secretary of the Treasury and with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to take out shares as called and to pay for the same out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

"APPLICATION OF EARNINGS.

"SEC. 206. (a) That the Federal Farm Loan Board shall equitably apportion the joint expenses incurred in behalf of Federal land banks, joint-stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks, and shall assess against each Federal intermediate credit bank its proportionate share of the expenses of any additional personnel in the Federal Farm Loan Bureau made necessary in connection with the operation of this provision.

"(b) After all necessary expenses of a Federal intermediate credit bank have been paid or provided for, the net earnings shall be divided into equal parts and one-half thereof shall be paid to the United States, and the balance shall be paid into a surplus fund until it shall amount to 100 per cent of the subscribed capital stock of such bank, and that thereafter 10 per cent of such earnings shall be paid into the surplus. After the aforesaid requirements have been fully met the then net earnings shall be paid to the United States as a franchise tax. The net earnings derived by the United States from Federal intermediate credit banks shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be used to supplement the gold reserve held against outstanding United States notes, or shall be applied to the reduction of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Should a Federal intermediate credit bank be dissolved or go into liquidation, after the payment of all debts and other obligations as hereinbefore provided, any surplus remaining shall be paid to and become the property of the United States and shall be similarly applied.

"LIABILITY OF DEBENTURES.

"SEC. 207. That any Federal intermediate credit bank issuing debentures or other such obligations under this title shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall also be liable, upon presentation of the coupons for interest payments due upon any such debentures or obligations issued by any other Federal intermediate credit bank and remaining unpaid in consequence of the default of the other Federal intermediate credit bank. Any Federal intermediate credit bank shall likewise be liable for such portion of the principal of debentures or obligations so issued as are not paid after the assets of such other Federal intermediate credit bank have been liquidated and distributed. Such losses, if any, either of interest or of principal, shall be assessed by the Federal Farm Loan Board against solvent Federal intermediate credit banks liable therefor in proportion to the amount of capital stock, surplus, and debentures or other such obligations which each may have outstanding at the time of such assessment. Every Federal intermediate credit bank shall, by appropriate action of its board of directors duly recorded in its minutes, obligate itself to become liable on debentures and other such obligations as provided in this section.

"EXAMINATIONS AND REPORTS.

"SEC. 208. (a) That in order to enable each Federal intermediate credit bank to carry out the purpose of this title the Comptroller of the Currency is hereby authorized and directed, upon the request of any Federal intermediate credit bank, (1) to furnish for the confidential use of such bank such reports, records, and other information as he may have available relating to the financial condition of national banks through or for which the Federal intermediate credit bank has made or contemplates making discounts, and (2) to make through his examiners, for the confidential use of the Federal intermediate credit bank, examinations of organizations through or for which the Federal intermediate credit bank has made or contemplates making discounts or loans: *Provided*, That no such examination shall be made without the consent of such organization except where such examination is required by law: *Provided*, That any organization, except State banks, trust companies, and savings associations, shall, as a condition precedent to securing rediscount privileges with the Federal intermediate credit bank of its district, file with such bank its written consent to its examination as may be directed by the Federal Farm Loan Board by land bank examiners; and State banks, trust companies, and savings associations may be in like manner required to file their written consent that reports of their examination by constituted authorities may be furnished by such authorities upon request to the Federal intermediate credit bank of their district. Each Federal intermediate credit bank shall be examined and audited at least once each year by the Federal Farm Loan Board, and the results of such examination and audit shall be made public by the board.

"(b) Every Federal intermediate credit bank shall make to the Federal Farm Loan Board not less than three reports during each year as requested by the board and according to the form which may be prescribed by the board, verified by the oath or affirmation of the president, or secretary, or treasurer, of each Federal intermediate credit bank and attested by the signature of at least three of the directors. Each report shall exhibit, in detail and under appropriate heads, the resources and liabilities of the Federal intermediate credit bank at the close of business on any past day specified by the Federal Farm Loan Board within five days from the receipt of a request or requisition therefor from the board, and in the same form in which it is made to the Federal Farm Loan Board shall be published in a newspaper published in the place where such Federal intermediate credit bank is established, or if there is no newspaper in the place then in the one published nearest thereto in the same county, at the expense of the bank, and such proof of publication shall be furnished as may be required by the Federal Farm Loan Board. The Federal Farm Loan Board shall also have power to call for special reports from any particular Federal intermediate credit bank whenever in its judgment the same are necessary for a full and complete knowledge of its condition.

"(c) Land bank appraisers are authorized, upon the request of any Federal intermediate credit bank and with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to investigate and make a written report upon the products covered by warehouse receipts or shipping accounts and the live stock covered by mortgages which are security for notes or other such obligations representing any loan to any organization under this title. Land bank examiners are authorized, upon the request of any Federal intermediate credit bank and with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to examine and make a written report upon the condition of any organization, except national banks, to which the Federal intermediate credit bank contemplates making any such loan.

"(d) The Federal Farm Loan Board shall assess the cost of all examinations made by the examiners of the board under the provisions of this title upon the bank, trust company, savings institution, or organization investigated, in accordance with the regulations to be prescribed by the board.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS.

"SEC. 209. That the Federal Farm Loan Board is authorized to make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as it deems necessary for the efficient execution of the provisions of this title.

"TAX EXEMPTION.

"SEC. 210. That the privileges of tax exemption accorded under section 26 of this act shall apply also to each Federal intermediate credit bank, including its capital, reserve, or surplus, and the income derived therefrom and the debentures issued under this title shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government and shall enjoy the same tax exemptions as are accorded farm loan bonds in said section.

"PENALTY PROVISION.

"SEC. 211. (a) That any officer, director, agent, or employee of a Federal intermediate credit bank who embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds, or credits of such bank, or who, without authority from such bank, draws any order or bill of exchange, makes any acceptance, issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree, or who makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of such bank with intent in any case to injure or defraud such bank or any other company or person, or to deceive any officer of such bank or the Federal Farm Loan Board, or any agent or examiner appointed to examine the affairs of such bank; and every receiver of such bank who with like intent to defraud or injure embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds, or assets of such bank, and every person who with like intent aids or abets any officer, director, agent, employee, or receiver in any violation of this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof in any district court of the United States shall be fined not more than $5,000, or shall be imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, at the discretion of the court.

"(b) Whoever makes any statement, knowing it to be false, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any other person, firm, corporation, or association any advance, or extension or renewal of an advance, or any release or substitution of security from such bank, or for the purpose of influencing in any other way the action of such bank, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(c) Whoever willfully overvalues any property offered as security for any such advance shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

"(d) Any examiner appointed under this act who shall accept a loan or gratuity from any organization examined by him, or from any person connected with any such organization in any capacity, or who shall disclose the names of borrowers to other than the proper officers of such organization, without first having obtained express permission in writing from the farm loan commissioner or from the board of directors of such organization, except when ordered to do so by a court of competent jurisdiction or by direction of the Congress of the United States or of either House thereof, or any committee of Congress or of either House duly authorized, shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment of not exceeding one year, or both, and may be fined a further sum equal to the money so loaned or gratuity given, and shall forever thereafter be disqualified from holding office as an examiner under the provisions of this act. No examiner while holding such office shall perform any other service for compensation for any bank or banking or loan association or for any person connected therewith in any capacity.

"(e) Whoever, being an officer, director, employee, agent, or attorney of a Federal intermediate credit bank, stipulates for or receives or consents or agrees to receive any fee, commission, gift, or thing of value, from any person, firm, or corporation for procuring or endeavoring to procure for such person, firm, or corporation, or for any other person, firm, or corporation any loan from any such corporation or extension or renewal of loan or substitution of security, or the purchase or discount or acceptance of any paper, note, draft, check, or bill of exchange by any such corporation, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction thereof be imprisoned for not more than one year and fined not more than $5,000, or both.

"(f) Any person who shall falsely make, forge, or counterfeit or cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited or willingly aid or assist in falsely making, forging, or counterfeiting any debenture, coupon, or other obligation in imitation of or purporting to be in imitation of the debenture, coupon, or other obligation issued by any Federal intermediate credit bank, or any person who shall pass, utter, or publish or attempt to pass, utter, or publish any false, forged, or counterfeited debenture, coupon, or other obligation purporting to be issued by any such bank knowing the same to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited, or any person who shall falsely alter or cause or procure to be falsely altered or shall willingly aid or assist in falsely altering any such debenture, coupon, or other obligation or who shall pass, utter, or publish as true any falsely altered or spurious debenture, coupon, or other obligation issued or purporting to have been issued by any such bank knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not to exceed five years, or both.

"(g) Any person who shall deceive, defraud, or impose upon or who shall attempt to deceive, defraud, or impose upon any person, partnership, corporation, or association by making any false pretense or representation concerning the character, issue, security, contents, conditions, or terms of any debenture, coupon, or other obligation issued under the terms of this title, shall upon conviction be fined not exceeding $500, or imprisoned not to exceed one year, or both.

"(h) All corporations not organized under the provisions of this title are prohibited from using the words 'Federal intermediate credit bank' as part of their corporate name, and any violation of this prohibition shall subject the party charged therewith to a civil penalty of $50 for each day during which the violation continues.

"SEC. 212. That no Federal intermediate credit bank shall charge or receive any fee, commission, bonus, gift, or other consideration not herein specifically authorized."

TITLE II. NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATIONS.

FORMATION.

SEC. 201. That corporations for the purpose of providing credit facilities for the argicultural and live-stock industries of the United States, to be known as national agricultural credit corporations, may be formed by any number of natural persons not less in any case than five. Such persons shall enter into articles of association which shall specify the object for which the corporation is formed. Such articles of association shall be signed by the persons intending to participate in the organization of the corporation and be forwarded to the Comptroller of the Currency to be filed and preserved in his office.

REQUISITES OF ARTICLES AND CERTIFICATE.

SEC. 202. (a) That persons signing such articles of association shall make an organization certificate which shall specifically state the name of the corporation to be organized, the place where its office is to be located, the State or States in which its operations are to be carried on, the amount of its capital stock, and the number of shares into which the same shall be divided, and that the certificate is made to enable the subscribers to avail themselves of the advantages of this title.

(b) The name of each corporation organized under this title shall include the words "national agricultural credit corporation."

(c) The organization certificate and articles of association shall be acknowledged before some judge of a court of record or notary public, and shall, together with the acknowledgment thereof duly authenticated by the seal of such court or notary, be transmitted to the Comptroller of the Currency, who shall file, record, and carefully preserve the same in his office.

(d) Upon making and filing the articles of association and organization certificate with the Comptroller of the Currency, and when the Comptroller of the Currency has approved the same and issued a written permit to begin business, the corporation shall be and become a body corporate, and shall have power—

(1) To adopt and use a corporate seal.

(2) To have succession for a period of 50 years unless sooner dissolved by the act of shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock or by act of Congress or unless its charter shall be forfeited for violation of law.

(3) To make contracts.

(4) To sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of law or equity, and for purposes of jurisdiction shall be deemed a citizen of the State where it is located.

(5) To elect or appoint directors and by its board of directors to appoint such officers and employees as may be deemed proper; to define their authority and duties; to fix their salaries; in its discretion to require bonds of any of them and to fix the penalty thereof; and to dismiss at pleasure any of such officers or employees.

(6) To prescribe by its board of directors by-laws not inconsistent with law or the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency defining the manner in which its general business may be conducted, its shares of stock be transferred, its directors and officers be elected or appointed, its property transferred, and the privileges granted to it by law be exercised and enjoyed.

(7) To exercise by its board of directors or duly authorized officers or agents all powers specifically granted by the provisions of this title and such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry on the business for which it is incorporated, within the limitations prescribed by this title, but such corporation shall transact no business except such as is incidental and necessarily preliminary to its organization until authorized in writing by the Comptroller of the Currency to commence business under the provisions of this title.

(8) The affairs of each National Agricultural Credit Corporation shall be managed by not less than five directors, who shall be elected by the stockholders at a meeting to be held at any time before the corporation is authorized by the Comptroller of the Currency to commence business, and afterwards at meetings to be held on such day in January of each year as may be provided in the articles of association. The directors so elected shall hold office for one year, and until their successors are elected and have qualified. Every director and other officer of the corporation shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, take and subscribe an oath before a notary public or other official having a seal and authorized to administer oaths, conditioned for the faithful performance of the duties of his office. Such oath shall be in such form as may be prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency, and shall be filed in the office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Any vacancy in the board shall be filled by appointment by the remaining directors, and any director so appointed shall hold his place until the next election.

SEC. 203. (a) That each National Agricultural Credit Corporation shall have power, under such rules and regulations as the Comptroller of the Currency may prescribe—

(1) To make advances upon, to discount, rediscount, or purchase, and to sell or negotiate, with or without its indorsement or guaranty, notes, drafts, or bills of exchange, and to accept drafts or bills of exchange, which—

(A) Are issued or drawn for an agricultural purpose, or the proceeds of which have been or are to be used for an agricultural purpose;

(B) Have a maturity, at the time of discount, purchase, or acceptance, not exceeding nine months; and

(C) Are secured at the time of discount, purchase, or acceptance by warehouse receipts or other like documents conveying or securing title to nonperishable and readily marketable agricultural products, or by chattel mortgages or other like instruments conferring a first and paramount lien upon live stock which is being fattened for market.

(2) To make advances upon or to discount, rediscount, or purchase, and to sell or negotiate with or without its indorsement or guaranty, notes secured by chattel mortgages conferring a first and paramount lien upon maturing or breeding live stock or dairy herds, and having a maturity at the time of discount, rediscount, or purchase not exceeding three years.

(3) To subscribe for, acquire, own, buy, sell, and otherwise deal in Treasury certificates of indebtedness, bonds or other obligations of the United States to such extent as its board of directors may determine.

(4) To act, when requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, as fiscal agent of the United States, and to perform such services as the Secretary of the Treasury may require in connection with the issue, sale, redemption or repurchase of bonds, notes, Treasury certificates of indebtedness, or other obligations of the United States.

(5) To purchase, hold, acquire, and dispose of shares of the capital stock of any corporation organized under the provisions of section 207 of this title, in an amount not to exceed at any time 20 per centum of its paid in and unimpaired capital and surplus.

(6) To purchase, hold, and convey real estate for the following purposes, and for no others:

(A) Such as shall be necessary for its accommodation in the transaction of its business.

(B) Such as shall be mortgaged to it in good faith by way of security for debts previously contracted.

(C) Such as shall be conveyed to it in satisfaction of loans or advances made or debts previously contracted in the course of its dealings.

(D) Such as it shall purchase at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages held by the corporation or shall purchase to secure debts due to it.

(7) To act as custodian, trustee, or agent for holders of notes, drafts, or bills of exchange sold or negotiated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (a) of this section or under section 207.

(8) To issue, subject to such regulations as the Comptroller of the Currency may prescribe, collateral trust notes or debentures, with a maturity not exceeding three years, and to pledge as security for such notes or debentures any notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or other securities held by the corporation under the terms of this title. The regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency may prescribe the form of notes or debentures, and of notes, drafts, bills of exchange, warehouse receipts, chattel mortgages, or other instruments which may be pledged as security therefor, the provisions which may be made with regard to release, substitution, or exchange of such securities, and with regard to protection, supervision, inspection, and reinspection of the agricultural commodities or live stock pledged or mortgaged as security therefor.

(b) The United States Government shall assume no liability, direct or indirect, for any debentures or other obligations issued under this title, and all such debentures and other obligations shall contain conspicuous and appropriate language, to be prescribed in form and substance by the Comptroller of the Currency and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, clearly indicating that no such liability is assumed.

(c) Any obligation referred to in paragraphs (1) or (2) of subdivision (a) of this section, which is secured by chattel mortgage upon live stock of an estimated market value at least equal to the face amount of such obligation, may be additionally secured by mortgage or deed of trust upon real estate or by other securities, under such regulations as may be made by the Comptroller of the Currency.

LIMITATIONS.

SEC. 204. Except as hereinafter provided in section 207 of this title, no national agricultural credit corporation shall incur liabilities, whether direct or contingent, in excess of ten times its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus; nor shall any such corporation make advances to or hold notes or other direct obligations of any person or corporation, or have outstanding acceptances for any person or corporation, in an amount exceeding 20 per centum of the paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus of such corporation, unless such advances, notes, acceptances, or other obligations are adequately secured by warehouse receipts representing readily marketable and nonperishable agricultural commodities, in which event the amount of such advances to, or notes or other direct obligations of, or acceptances for, such one person, association, or corporation shall not exceed 50 per centum of such paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus. No such corporation shall purchase, own, or deal in any live stock except live stock taken in the course of liquidation of obligations held by it.

INTEREST RATES.

SEC. 205. (a) Any national agricultural credit corporation may charge on any loan or discount made, or upon any note, bill of exchange, or other evidence of debt, interest at the rate allowed by the laws of the State in which such corporation is located.

(b) The taking, receiving, reserving, or charging a rate of interest greater than is allowed by subdivision (a), when knowingly done, shall be deemed a forfeiture of the entire interest which the note, bill, or other evidence of debt carries with it or which has been agreed to be paid thereon. In case the greater rate of interest has been paid, the person by whom it has been paid, or his legal representative, may recover back in an action in the nature of an action for debt twice the amount of the interest thus paid from the corporation taking or receiving the same, provided such action is commenced within two years from the time the usurious interest was collected.

CAPITAL STOCK.

SEC. 206. (a) That no national agricultural credit corporation shall be permitted to commence business with a paid-in capital of less than $250,000; and no permit to begin business shall be issued to any such corporation by the Comptroller of the Currency until there shall have been filed with him a certificate signed by the president or treasurer and by individuals comprising a majority of the board of directors of such corporation showing that at least 50 per cent of the authorized capital stock of such corporation has been paid in in cash; and the remainder of the capital stock of such corporation shall be paid in installments of at least 10 per cent each on the whole amount of the capital, and the entire authorized capital stock shall be paid in within six months from the date upon which such corporation shall be authorized by the Comptroller of the Currency to commence business. The payment of each installment shall be certified to the Comptroller of the Currency under oath by the president or cashier of such corporation.

(b) The capital stock of any such corporation may be increased at any time with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency by a vote of two-thirds of the holders of its issued and outstanding capital stock, or by written consent of all of

its shareholders without a meeting and without a formal vote; and may be reduced in like manner: *Provided*, That in no event shall such capital stock be reduced to an amount less than one-tenth of its then outstanding indebtedness, direct or contingent, or to an amount less than $250,000, nor without at the same time reducing proportionately outstanding liabilities. No national agricultural credit corporation, except as herein provided, shall withdraw or permit to be withdrawn, either in the form of dividends or otherwise, any portion of its paid-in capital; and section 5204 of the Revised Statutes, prohibiting the payment of unearned dividends or the withdrawal of capital of national banks, shall be held to apply to national agricultural credit corporations.

(c) The provisions and limitations contained in section 5139 of the Revised Statutes, relative to transfer of the shares of the capital stock of national banks, shall apply to national agricultural credit corporations.

(d) Whenever any shareholder or his assign fails, upon demand of the Comptroller of the Currency, to pay his subscription or any part thereof on stock of any national agricultural credit corporation subscribed to by him, the directors of the corporation, after 15 days' notice, shall proceed in the manner prescribed by section 5141 of the Revised Statutes for the collection of unpaid subscriptions to stock of national banks.

(e) Section 5144 of the Revised Statutes, which relates to the right of shareholders of national banks to vote by proxy, shall be held to apply to shareholders of national agricultural credit corporations.

REDISCOUNT CORPORATIONS.

SEC. 207. (a) That national agricultural credit corporations having an authorized capital stock of $1,000,000 or over may be organized under the provisions of this title, to exercise all the powers enumerated in section 203, except that in lieu of the powers conferred in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (a) of such section, such corporations shall have power—

(1) Upon the indorsement of any national agricultural credit corporation, or of any bank or trust company which is a member of the Federal reserve system, to rediscount for such corporation, bank, or trust company, notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and acceptances, which conform to the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (a) of section 203. Such indorsement shall be deemed to be a waiver of demand notice and protest by such corporation as to its own indorsement exclusively.

(2) To discount or purchase notes, drafts, or bills of exchange issued or drawn by cooperative associations of producers of agricultural products, provided such notes, drafts, or bills of exchange are secured at the time of discount or purchase by warehouse receipts or other like documents conveying or securing title to nonperishable and readily marketable agricultural products and have a maturity at the time of discount or purchase not exceeding nine months.

(3) To sell or negotiate with or without recourse any note, draft, or bill of exchange discounted or purchased hereunder.

(b) National agricultural credit corporations organized under the provisions of this section shall not be subject to the limitations contained in section 204, but the Comptroller of the Currency may, by general regulations, from time to time prescribe the amount of indebtedness, direct or contingent, which such corporations may incur, and the aggregate amount of paper of different types which such corporations may rediscount for any one corporation.

(c) Corporations with powers limited, as provided in this section, shall not be subject to the requirements as to deposit of bonds or other obligations of the United States, as provided in section 208 of this title.

PERMIT TO BEGIN BUSINESS.

SEC. 208. (a) That no national agricultural credit corporation, except corporations with powers limited as provided in section 207, shall commence business until it has deposited with the Federal reserve bank of the district wherein it has its place of business, bonds or other obligations of the United States in an aggregate face amount of at least 25 per cent of its paid-in capital stock. Each such corporation shall at all times keep on deposit with such Federal reserve bank an amount of such bonds or other obligations of the United States at least equal in face value to 7½ per cent of the aggregate indebtedness of such corporation, direct or contingent, said amount to include the 25 per cent deposited as hereinbefore by this section provided. Except as hereinafter provided, such bonds or other obligations shall be held by such Federal reserve bank, subject to the direction and control of the Comptroller of the Currency, in trust for the equal and pro rata protection and benefit of all holders of notes, debentures, drafts, bills of exchange, or acceptances upon which such corporation may be directly or contingently liable. Upon receipt of proper evidence that the amount of such bonds or other obligations of the United States so deposited exceeds 7½ per cent of such aggregate indebtedness, the Comptroller of the Currency may release such excess, provided that the amount remaining on deposit shall in no event be reduced below 25 per cent of the paid-in capital stock of such corporation. Under such regulations as the Comptroller of the Currency may prescribe, a Federal reserve bank may, upon request of the corporation which deposited the same, sell any such bonds or obligations for account of such corporation and permit such corporation to use the proceeds thereof for the protection or preservation of any property pledged or mortgaged as security for obligations owned or indorsed by the corporation. If by reason of such sale the face amount of such bonds or other obligations of the United States remaining on deposit with such Federal reserve bank shall be less than 7½ per cent of such aggregate indebtedness of the corporation, no further advances shall be made, or notes, drafts, or bills of exchange discounted, rediscounted, accepted, or purchased, by such corporation until sufficient additional bonds or other obligations of the United States have been deposited to make good the deficiency.

(b) In determining whether to grant permission to do business to any National Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency shall take into account the extent to which the laws of the State or States in which the corporation will do business afford adequate protection to advances made upon the security of warehouse receipts covering agricultural commodities or chattel mortgages upon live stock with respect to (1) bonding, licensing, and inspection of warehouses; (2) recordation of chattel mortgages or deeds of trust on live stock; (3) recordation of brands or other identifying marks on live stock; (4) reporting and recording of interstate shipments and slaughter of live stock; and (5) right of mortgagee to release a portion of the mortgaged property without prejudice to the priority of lien as against junior lienors or other creditors of the mortgagor.

MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

SEC. 209. (a) That all National Agricultural Credit Corporations shall be under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency, who shall be charged with the execution of all laws of the United States relating to the organization, regulation, and control of such corporations. The Comptroller of the Currency shall exercise the same general power of supervision over such corporations as he now exercises over national banks organized under the laws of the United States.

(b) In addition to the two Deputy Comptrollers of the Currency now provided for by law, there shall be in the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency a third Deputy Comptroller of the Currency who shall be appointed in the same manner and shall take a like oath of office and give a like bond as the deputy comptrollers now provided for by law. Under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency, such additional deputy comptroller shall have charge of the administration of the provisions of this title relating to the organization and operation of national agricultural credit corporations and shall perform such other duties as shall be assigned to him by the Comptroller of the Currency. The Comptroller of the Currency is hereby authorized to employ such additional examiners, clerks, and other employees as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and to assign to duty in the office of his bureau in Washington such examiners and assistant examiners as he shall deem necessary to assist in the performance of the work of that bureau. The salaries of the Deputy Comptrollers of the Currency and of such additional examiners, assistant examiners, clerks, and other employees shall be fixed in advance by the Comptroller of the Currency. The salaries of the two deputy comptrollers now provided for by law and of all national-bank examiners and assistant examiners assigned to duty in the office of the bureau in Washington in connection with the supervision of national banks shall be considered part of the expenses of the examinations provided for by section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and the salaries of such additional deputy comptroller and of all examiners, assistant examiners, clerks, and other employees appointed under the terms of this title and assigned to duty in connection with the administration of this title shall be considered part of the expenses of the administration of this title: *Provided, however*, That the salary of the additional deputy comptroller provided for by this subdivision shall be considered partly an expense of the administration of this title in proportions to be determined from time to time by the Comptroller of the Currency with a view to a fair apportionment of such expense, until such time as it shall be necessary for such additional deputy comp-

troller to give his full time to the administration of this title. The Comptroller of the Currency shall have power to levy semiannually upon the national agricultural credit corporations operating under the provisions of this title, in proportion to their total assets, an assessment sufficient to pay the expenses of the administration of this title for the ensuing half year, together with any deficit carried forward from the preceding half year. Each such corporation shall pay the amount so assessed against it to the Treasurer of the United States subject to the order of the Comptroller of the Currency to be disbursed by the comptroller in payment of expenses incurred in the administration of this title.

(c) The Comptroller of the Currency shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of examiners to examine National Agricultural Credit Corporations or to use national bank examiners for this purpose. All examiners appointed by him shall be subject to existing provisions of law relating to national bank examiners and to the provisions of the Federal reserve act which prohibit national bank examiners from performing any service for compensation for any bank or officer and from disclosing the names of borrowers or the collateral for loans without obtaining the written consent of the Comptroller of the Currency, and such provisions shall be held to apply to examiners appointed to examine corporations organized under the provisions of this title.

(d) The expense of all of the examinations of National Agricultural Credit Corporations shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency upon the corporations examined in proportion to assets or resources held by the corporations upon the dates of examination of the various corporations: *Provided*, That a minimum charge of $50 shall be made for each such examination.

(e) The provisions of the Federal reserve act which prohibit any member bank from making loans or granting a gratuity to any national bank examiner shall be applicable to National Agricultural Credit Corporations.

(f) National Agricultural Credit Corporations shall be required to make reports to the Comptroller of the Currency at the time and in the manner required by sections 5211 and 5212 of the Revised Statutes, and shall be subject to the provisions, so far as the same may be held by said comptroller to be applicable of section 5213 of the Revised Statutes.

(g) The Secretary of Agriculture may issue a license to any person, upon presentation to him of satisfactory evidence that such person is competent to inspect live stock as a basis for loans. The Secretary of Agriculture may suspend or revoke any license issued by him under this subdivision whenever, after opportunity for hearing has been given to the licensee, the Secretary shall determine that such licensee is incompetent, or has knowingly or carelessly made false or erroneous inspection reports with respect to any live stock, or has accepted any money or other consideration, directly or indirectly, for any neglect or improper performance of duty, or has in any other manner shown himself to be unfit to act as a live-stock inspector. Pending investigation, the Secretary of Agriculture, whenever he deems it necessary, may suspend a license temporarily without a hearing. It shall be unlawful for any person other than a holder of a license duly issued under this subdivision, or any person whose license has been suspended or revoked under the terms of this subdivision, to represent that he is a Federally licensed live-stock inspector, and any violation of this provision shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

(h) Any inspector licensed under the provisions of subdivision (g) who makes any statement in any inspection report or to any person for the purpose of obtaining for himself, or any other person, any advance on the security of the live stock inspected, knowing the same to be false, or who willfully overvalues any security by which an advance is secured, shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(i) The Comptroller of the Currency shall allot to the Department of Agriculture from time to time such sums as may be estimated to be necessary for the administration of the functions vested in that department by this title, and may ratably assess the same from time to time against national agricultural credit corporations.

BANKS MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM MAY BECOME STOCKHOLDERS.

SEC. 210. That any member bank of the Federal reserve system may file application with the Comptroller of the Currency for permission to invest an amount not exceeding in the aggregate 10 per cent of its paid-in capital stock and surplus in the stock of one or more of the national agricultural credit corporations, and upon approval of such application may purchase said stock. The Comptroller of the Currency shall have discretion to approve or reject such application in whole or in part.

TAXATION.

SEC. 211. That taxation by a State of the shares in national agricultural credit corporations, or of dividends derived therefrom, or of the income of said corporations, or real estate owned by them, shall be such only as is or may be authorized by law in the case of national banking associations; and taxation by a State of the debentures or other obligations of such corporations shall not be at a higher rate than the rate applicable to other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens thereof.

DEPOSITS.

SEC. 212. That the moneys of national agricultural credit corporations may be kept on deposit subject to check in any member bank of the Federal reserve system.

CONVERSION OF CORPORATIONS.

SEC. 213. (a) That any agricultural or live-stock financing corporation incorporated by special law of any State or organized under the general laws of any State and having an unimpaired capital sufficient to entitle it to become a national agricultural credit corporation may, by the vote of the shareholders owning not less than 51 per centum of the capital stock of such corporation, with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, be converted into a national agricultural credit corporation under this title, with any name approved by the Comptroller of the Currency: *Provided*, That the said conversion shall not be in contravention of the State law.

(b) In such case the articles of association and organization certificate may be executed by a majority of the directors of the corporation, and the certificate shall declare that the owners of 51 per centum of the capital stock have authorized the directors to make such certificate and to change or convert the corporation into a national agricultural credit corporation. A majority of the directors, after executing the articles of association and the organization certificate, shall have power to execute all other papers and to do whatever may be required to make its organization perfect and complete as a national agricultural credit corporation. The shares of any such corporation may continue to be for the same amount each as they were before the conversion, and the directors may continue to be directors of the corporation until others are elected or appointed.

(c) When the Comptroller of the Currency has given to such corporation a certificate that the provisions of this title have been complied with, such corporation, and all its stockholders, owners, and employees, shall have the same powers and privileges and shall be subject to the same duties, liabilities, and regulations, in all respects, as shall have been prescribed by this title for corporations originally organized as national agricultural credit corporations.

CONSOLIDATION OF CORPORATIONS.

SEC. 214. (a) That any two or more national agricultural credit corporations, with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, may consolidate into one corporation under the charter of either or any of the existing corporations on such terms and conditions as may be lawfully agreed upon by a majority of the board of directors of each corporation proposing to consolidate, such agreement to be ratified and confirmed by the affirmative vote of the shareholders of each of such corporations owning at least two-thirds of its capital stock outstanding, at a meeting to be held on the call of the directors after publishing notice of the time, place, and object of the meeting for four consecutive weeks in some newspaper published in the place where the said corporation is located, and if no newspaper is published in the place, then in a paper published nearest thereto, and after sending such notice to each shareholder of record by registered mail at least 10 days prior to said meeting: *Provided*, That the capital stock of such consolidated corporation shall not be less than $250,000 paid in if the corporations consolidated are organized to exercise the powers covered by section 203, or less than $1,000,000 paid in if the corporations consolidated are those organized under section 207.

(b) When such consolidation shall have been effected and approved by the Comptroller of the Currency any shareholder of either of the corporations so consolidated who has not voted for such consolidation may give notice to the board of directors of the corporation in which he is interested, within 20 days from the date of the certificate of approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, that he dissents from the plan of consolidation as adopted and approved, whereupon he shall be entitled to receive the value of the shares so held by him, to be ascer-

tained by an appraisal made by a committee of three persons, one to be selected by the shareholder, one by the directors, and the third by the two so chosen; and in case the value so affixed shall not be satisfactory to the shareholder, he may within five days after being notified of the appraisal appeal to the Comptroller of the Currency, who shall cause a reappraisal to be made, which shall be final and binding; and if said reappraisal shall exceed the value affixed by said committee, the corporation shall pay the expense of the reappraisal, otherwise the appellant shall pay said expense; and the value so ascertained and determined shall be deemed to be a debt due and be forthwith paid to said shareholder by said corporation, and the shares so paid shall be surrendered and after due notice sold at public auction within 30 days after the final appraisement provided for by this title.

(c) Where corporations consolidate under the provisions of this title, all of the rights, franchises, and interest of said corporations shall be consolidated in and to every species of property, personal and mixed, and choses in action thereto belonging, and shall be deemed to be transferred to and vested in the corporation into which it is consolidated without any deed or other transfer, and the said consolidated corporation shall hold and enjoy the same and all rights of property, franchises, and interest, in the same manner and to the same extent as they were held and enjoyed by the corporations so consolidated therewith.

INSOLVENCY, RECEIVERSHIP, AND LIQUIDATION.

SEC. 215. (a) That whenever any national agricultural credit corporation shall be dissolved and its rights, privileges, and franchises declared forfeited as prescribed in the preceding section, or whenever any creditor of any such corporation shall have obtained a judgment against it in any court of record and made application accompanied by a certificate from the clerk of the court, stating that such judgment has been rendered and has remained unpaid for the space of 30 days or whenever the Comptroller of the Currency shall become satisfied of the insolvency of such corporation, he may, after due examination of its affairs in either case, appoint a receiver who shall proceed to wind up the affairs of such corporation. The receiver so appointed shall exercise the powers and be subject to the restrictions of receivers of national banks; and the Comptroller of the Currency shall have the same powers and duties in connection with the administration of such receivership as he has in reference to the receivership of national banks.

(b) Shareholders' agents for shareholders of national agricultural credit corporations may be appointed in the manner prescribed by section 3 of the act of June 30, 1876, as amended, and shall have the same general powers and duties and be subject to the same restrictions as shareholders' agents of a national bank.

(c) Any national agricultural credit corporation may go into liquidation and be closed by the vote of its shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock. Whenever a vote is taken to go into liquidation it shall be the duty of the board of directors to cause notice of this fact to be certified under the seal of the corporation by its president or cashier to the Comptroller of the Currency and publication thereof to be made for a period of two months in a newspaper published in the city or town in which the corporation is located, or if no newspaper is there published, in the newspaper published nearest thereto, that the corporation is closing up its affairs and notifying the creditors to present their claims against the corporation for payment. All such claims shall be presented to and approved by a liquidating agent to be appointed by the board of directors of such corporation, with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the affairs of such corporation shall be liquidated by such agent and under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency.

PENALTY PROVISIONS.

SEC. 216. (a) That any officer, director, agent, or employee of a national agricultural credit corporation who embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds, or credits of such corporation, or who without authority from the directors draws any order or bill of exchange, makes any acceptance, issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree, or who makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of such corporation with intent in any case to injure or defraud such corporation or any other company or person or to deceive any officer of such corporation or the Comptroller of the Currency or any agent or examiner appointed to examine the affairs of such corporation; and every receiver of such corporation who with like intent to defraud or injure embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds, or assets of the corporation, and every person who with like intent aids or abets any officer, director, agent, employee, or receiver in any violation of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction in any district court of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or shall be imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, at the discretion of the court.

(b) Whoever makes any statement, knowing it to be false, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any other person, firm, corporation, or association any advance, or extension or renewal of an advance, or any release or substitution of security, from a national agricultural credit corporation, or for the purpose of influencing in any other way the action of such corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(c) Whoever willfully overvalues any property offered as security for any such advance shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

(d) Any examiner appointed under this title who shall accept a loan or gratuity from any organization examined by him, or from any person connected with any such organization in any capacity, or who shall disclose the names of borrowers to other than the proper officers of such organization, without first having obtained express permission in writing from the Comptroller of the Currency or from the board of directors of such organization, except when ordered to do so by a court of competent jurisdiction or by direction of the Congress of the United States or of either House thereof, or any committee of Congress or of either House duly authorized, shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment of not exceeding one year, or both, and may be fined a further sum equal to the money so loaned or gratuity given, and shall forever thereafter be disqualified from holding office as an examiner under the provisions of this title. No examiner while holding such office shall perform any other service for compensation for any bank or banking or loan association or for any person connected therewith in any capacity.

(e) Whoever, being an officer, director, employee, agent, or attorney of a national agricultural credit corporation stipulates for or receives or consents or agrees to receive any fee, commmission, gift, or thing of value from any person, firm, or corporation for procuring or endeavoring to procure for such person, firm, or corporation, or for any other person, firm, or corporation any loan from any such corporation or extension or renewal of loan or substitution of security, or the purchase or discount or acceptance of any paper, note, draft, check, or bill of exchange by any such corporation, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be imprisoned for not more than one year or fined not more than $5,000, or both.

(f) Any person who shall falsely make, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited, or willingly aid or assist in falsely making, forging, or counterfeiting any debentures, coupons, or other obligations in imitation of or purporting to be in imitation of the debentures, coupons, or other obligations issued by any national agricultural credit corporation, and any person who shall pass, utter, or publish or attempt to pass, utter, or publish any false, forged, or counterfeited debenture, coupon, and other obligation purporting to be issued by any such corporation knowing the same to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited, and any person who shall falsely alter or cause or procure to be falsely altered, or shall willingly aid or assist in falsely altering any such debenture, coupon, or other obligation, or who shall pass, utter, or publish as true any falsely altered or spurious debenture, coupon, or other obligation issued or purporting to have been issued by any such corporation knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not to exceed five years, or both.

(g) Any person who shall deceive, defraud, or impose upon or who shall attempt to deceive, defraud, or impose upon any person, partnership, corporation, or association by making any false pretense or representation concerning the character, issue, security, contents, conditions, or terms of any debenture, coupon, or other obligation issued under the terms of this title, shall be fined not exceeding $500 or imprisoned not to exceed one year, or both.

(h) All corporations not organized under the provisions of this title are prohibited from using the words "national agricultural credit corporation" as part of their corporate name, and any violation of this prohibition shall subject the party charged therewith to a civil penalty of $50 for each day during which the violation continues.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND.

SEC. 217. That the right to amend, alter, or repeal the provisions of this title is hereby expressly reserved.

TITLE III.—AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT.

SEC. 301. That the second paragraph of section 3 of the Federal farm loan act is amended to read as follows:

"Said Federal Farm Loan Board shall consist of seven members, including the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be a member and chairman ex officio, and six members to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the six members to be appointed by the President, not more than three shall be appointed from one political party, and all six of said members shall be citizens of the United States and shall devote their entire time to the business of the Federal Farm Loan Board; they shall receive an annual salary of $10,000 payable monthly, together with actual necessary traveling expenses. One of the additional members of the Federal Farm Loan Board, hereby provided for, shall be appointed for a term expiring August 6, 1929, and one for a term expiring August 6, 1931, and thereafter the terms of all members of the Federal Farm Loan Board shall be as in this section otherwise provided for."

SEC. 302. That the eighth paragraph of section 3 of the Federal farm loan act is amended and divided into three paragraphs to read as follows:

"The salaries and expenses of the Federal Farm Loan Board and farm loan registrars and examiners authorized under this section shall, after June 30, 1923, be paid by the Federal and joint-stock land banks in proportion to their gross assets, as follows:

"The Federal Farm Loan Board shall, prior to June 30, 1923, and each six months thereafter, estimate the expenses and salaries of the Federal Farm Loan Board, its officers and employees, farm-loan registrars, deputy registrars, the examiners and reviewing appraisers, and apportion the same among the Federal and joint-stock land banks in proportion to their gross assets at the time of such apportionment and make an assessment upon each of such banks pursuant to such apportionment, payable on the 1st of July or January next ensuing. The funds collected pursuant to such assessments shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to be disbursed in payment of such salaries and expenses on appropriations duly made by Congress for such purpose.

"If any deficiency shall occur in such fund during the half-year period for which it was estimated, the Federal Farm Loan Board shall have authority to make immediate assessment covering such deficiency against the Federal and joint-stock land banks upon the same basis as the original assessment. If at the end of the six months' period there shall remain a surplus in such fund, it shall be deducted from the estimated expenses of the next ensuing six months' period when assessment is made for such period. Land-bank appraisers shall receive such compensation as the Federal Farm Loan Board shall fix and shall be paid by the Federal land banks and the joint-stock land banks which they serve in such proportion and in such manner as the Federal Farm Loan Board shall order."

SEC. 303. That the second paragraph of section 4 of the Federal farm loan act is amended to read as follows:

"The Federal Farm Loan Board shall establish in each Federal land-bank district a Federal land bank, with its principal office located in such city within the district as said board shall designate. Each Federal land bank shall include in its title the name of the city in which it is located. Subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, any Federal land bank may establish branches within the land-bank district. Subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board and under such conditions as it may prescribe, the provisions of this act are extended to the island of Porto Rico and the Territory of Alaska; and the Federal Farm Loan Board shall designate a Federal land bank which is hereby authorized to establish a branch bank in Porto Rico, and a Federal land bank which is hereby authorized to establish a branch bank in the Territory of Alaska. Loans made by each such branch bank shall not exceed the sum of $10,000 to any one borrower and shall be subject to the restrictions and provisions of this act, except that each such branch bank may loan direct to borrowers, and, subject to such regulations as the Federal Farm Loan Board may prescribe, the rate charged borrowers may be 1½ per cent in excess of the rate borne by the last preceding issue of farm-loan bonds of the Federal land bank with which such branch bank is connected: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made in Porto Rico or Alaska by such branch bank for a longer term than 20 years."

SEC. 304. That the twentieth to twenty-fifth paragraphs, inclusive, of section 4 of the Federal farm loan act are amended to read as follows:

"The board of directors of every Federal land bank shall be selected as hereinafter specified and shall consist of seven members. Three of said directors shall be known as local directors and shall be chosen by and be representative of national farm-loan associations and borrowers through agencies; three shall be known as district directors and shall be appointed by the Federal Farm Loan Board and represent the public interest. The term of office of local and district directors shall be three years.

"Within 30 days from the date of passage of the agricultural credits act of 1923, and thereafter at least two months before each election, the Federal Farm Loan Board shall divide each land-bank district into three divisions, as nearly equal as possible, according to the number of borrowers and the voting strength of national farm-loan associations and borrowers through agencies, and the farm loan commissioner shall thereupon notify each association and agency in writing that an election is to be held for one local director from each of said divisions and requesting each association and agency to nominate one candidate for each division. Within 10 days of receipt of such notice each national farm-loan association and borrower through agencies shall forward nominations of residents of their respective divisions for one director for such division to said farm loan commissioner. The farm loan commissioner shall then prepare a list of candidates for local directors, consisting of the 10 persons receiving the highest number of votes from national farm-loan associations and borrowers through agencies for each division.

"At least one month before said election the farm loan commissioner shall mail to each national farm-loan association and to each borrower through agencies the list of candidates for their respective divisions. The directors of each national farm-loan association shall cast the vote of said association for one of the candidates on said list and shall forward said vote to the said farm loan commissioner within 10 days after said list of candidates is received. In voting under this section each association shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to the total voting strength of the stockholders in association meetings, and each borrower through agencies shall be entitled to cast one vote for each share of stock held by him in the Federal land bank not exceeding 20 shares, and shall forward said vote to the said farm loan commissioner within 10 days after said list of candidates is received. The candidate receiving the highest number of votes in his division shall be declared elected as local director of the Federal land-bank district from his division. In case of a tie, the farm loan commissioner shall determine the choice. The nominations from which the list of candidates is prepared, and the votes of the respective associations and borrowers through agencies for such candidates, as counted, shall be tabulated and preserved, subject to examination by any candidate, for at least one year after the result of the election is announced.

"The Federal Farm Loan Board shall designate one of the district directors to serve until December 31, 1924, one to serve till December 31, 1925, and one to serve till December 31, 1926. After their first appointment each district director shall be appointed for a term of three years. At the first regular meeting of the board of directors of each Federal land bank the local directors shall designate one of their members to serve till December 31, 1924, one to serve till December 31, 1925, and one to serve till December 31, 1926. Thereafter each local director shall be chosen as hereinbefore provided and shall hold office for a term of three years. Any vacancies that may occur in the board of directors shall be filled for the unexpired term in the manner provided herein for the original selection of such directors. At the same time that the associations and borrowers through agencies nominate the candidates for the local directors, each association and each borrower through agencies shall also nominate one candidate for director at large for the entire district, and from the three persons having the greatest number of votes for nominee for director at large the Federal Farm Loan Board shall select a director at large, whose term of office shall terminate on the 31st day of December, 1925, and every three years thereafter. Such seventh director may be removed by the Federal Farm Loan Board for neglect of duty, incapacity for the work, or malfeasance in office after charges duly preferred and a hearing had thereon, and in such cases the associations of the district shall in like manner nominate candidates for another director at large to fill the vacancy, for whom the Federal Farm Loan Board shall in same manner select a successor, but any person who is removed can not be nominated to succeed himself. The board of directors thus selected shall, upon qualification, immediately take over the management of each bank.

"Directors of Federal land banks shall have been, for at least two years, residents of the district for which they are ap-

pointed or elected, and a local director shall be a resident of his division when elected. No district director of a Federal land bank shall, during his continuance in office, act as an officer, director, or employee of any other institution, association, or partnership engaged in banking or in the business of making or selling land-mortgage loans.

"Directors of the Federal land bank shall receive, in addition to any compensation otherwise provided, a reasonable allowance for necessary expenses in attending meetings of their boards, to be paid by the respective Federal land banks. Any compensation that may be provided by boards of directors of the Federal land banks for directors, officers, or employees shall be subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board."

SEC. 305. That the fourth paragraph of section 7 of the Federal farm loan act is amended by adding thereto the following: "No such secretary-treasurer shall engage in the making of land-mortgage loans eligible at a Federal land bank through or for any other land-mortgage company or agency, and the making of any such loan by any secretary-treasurer shall forthwith work a forfeiture of his office."

SEC. 306. That subdivision (d) of paragraph "Fourth" of section 12 of the Federal farm loan act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) To liquidate indebtedness of the owner of the land mortgaged, incurred for agricultural purposes, or incurred prior to January 1, 1922."

SEC. 307. That paragraph "Seventh" of section 12 of the Federal farm loan act is amended to read as follows:

"Seventh. The amount of loans to any one borrower shall in no case exceed a maximum of $25,000, nor shall any one loan be for a less sum than $100, but preference shall be given to applications for loans of $10,000 and under."

SEC. 308. That section 21 of the Federal farm loan act is amended by adding at the end thereof 12 new paragraphs to read as follows:

"Whenever it shall appear desirable to issue consolidated bonds of the 12 Federal land banks and to sell them through a common selling agency, and the Federal land banks shall, by resolution, consent to the same, the banks may issue and sell said bonds as hereinafter provided.

"Every bond so issued shall be signed by the Farm Loan Commissioner and attested by the secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board, and their signatures may be either written or engraved thereon and shall recite in the face of the bond the fact that it is the joint and several obligation of the 12 Federal land banks, and shall in all respects be governed by the provisions of the Federal farm loan act not inconsistent herewith.

"The consolidated bonds issued under this provision shall be made payable at any Federal land bank, and may be made payable at any Federal reserve bank or banks designated in the face of the bond.

"Each Federal land bank on whose behalf consolidated bonds shall be issued under this provision shall in all respects be bound by the act of the Farm Loan Commissioner and the secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board in executing such bonds.

"Every Federal land bank, before participation in a consolidated issue, as herein provided, shall by appropriate action of its board of directors, duly recorded in its minutes, obligate itself to become liable on Federal farm loan bonds as provided in this section and be bound by the action of the Farm Loan Commissioner and the secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board in executing the same.

"Every farm loan bond issued hereunder shall contain on the face thereof a certificate signed by the Farm Loan Commissioner to the effect that it is issued under the authority of Title I of the Federal farm loan act, has the approval in form and issue of the Federal Farm Loan Board, and is legal and regular in all respects; that it is not taxable by national, State, municipal, or local authority; that it is issued against collateral security consisting of obligations of the United States Government, or indorsed first mortgages on farm lands, at least equal in amount to the bonds issued; and that all Federal land banks are liable for the payment of each bond.

"When any Federal land bank shall desire to participate in a consolidated issue of farm loan bonds it shall make application to the Federal Farm Loan Board for the approval on its behalf of such issue and tender to the registrar approved farm mortgages, or obligations of the United States Government, as security therefor, and no banks shall participate in such consolidated issue until such application has been approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board. Each bank shall pay when due, without notice, all bonds and coupons issued on its behalf hereunder.

"If any Federal land bank shall fail to pay its proportion of interest or principal as herein prescribed, the Federal Farm Loan Board shall immediately call upon the other Federal land banks for the amount necessary to make said payment, the assessments to be made in proportion to the capital stock of each, which assessments shall be forthwith paid by said banks.

"The presidents of the 12 Federal land banks shall constitute the bond committee of the Federal land banks and shall select a chairman from among their number. The vice president may act in place of the president on the president's request or in case he fails to act.

"When an issue of consolidated bonds is contemplated, the bond committee shall determine the amount of such issue, the rate of interest which it is to bear, and the participation of the several banks therein, and submit their recommendations to the Federal Farm Loan Board for approval. When approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board the bonds shall be executed by the Farm Loan Commissioner and the secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board, as herein provided.

"The expenses of the bond committee and of the sale of bonds shall be charged against the several land banks in proportion to their participation in the proceeds.

"The presidents of the Federal land banks shall receive no additional compensation for their services as members of the bond committee, but shall be paid necessary traveling expenses."

SEC. 309. That subdivisions (a) and (b) of the eighth paragraph of section 22 of the Federal farm loan act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) To pay off farm loan bonds issued by or in behalf of said bank as they mature.

"(b) To purchase at or below par Federal farm loan bonds."

SEC. 310. That section 25 of the Federal farm loan act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 25. That if there shall be default under the terms of any indorsed first mortgage held by a Federal land bank under the provisions of this title, the National Farm Loan Association through which said mortgage was received by said Federal land bank shall be notified of said default. Said association may thereupon be required, within 30 days after such notice, to make good such default, either by payment of the amount unpaid thereon in cash or by the substitution of an equal amount of Federal farm loan bonds, with all unmatured coupons attached."

SEC. 311. That section 29 of the Federal farm loan act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"Upon liquidation of any national farm-loan association, the stock in the Federal land bank held by such association shall be canceled and the Federal land bank shall thereupon issue to the borrowers through such association an amount of stock in the Federal land bank equal to the amount of stock held by such borrowers in the liquidated association, such stock to be held by the bank as collateral to the loans of such borrowers and to be paid off and retired at par in the same manner as stock held by borrowers in farm-loan associations, and the Federal land bank shall pay to the borrowers holding such stock the same dividends as are paid to national farm-loan associations by such bank. The personal liability of the stockholders in such liquidated association to the association shall survive such liquidation and shall be vested in the bank in that district, which may enforce the same as fully as the association could if in existence."

TITLE IV.—AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

SEC. 401. That the ninth paragraph of section 9 of the Federal reserve act is amended to read as follows:

"No applying bank shall be admitted to membership in a Federal reserve bank unless (a) it possesses a paid-up, unimpaired capital sufficient to entitle it to become a national banking association in the place where it is situated under the provision of the national bank act, or (b) it possesses a paid-up, unimpaired capital of at least 60 per cent of the amount sufficient to entitle it to become a national banking association in the place where it is situated under the provisions of the national bank act and, under penalty of loss of membership complies with rules and regulations which the Federal Reserve Board shall prescribe fixing the time within which and the method by which the unimpaired capital of such bank shall be increased out of the net income to equal the capital which would have been required if such bank had been admitted to membership under the provisions of clause (a) of this paragraph: *Provided*, That every such rule or regulation shall require the applying bank to set aside annually not less than 20 per cent of its net income of the preceding year as a fund exclusively applicable to such capital increase."

SEC. 402. That the second paragraph of section 13 of the Federal reserve act is amended and divided into two paragraphs to read as follows:

"Upon the indorsement of any of its member banks, which shall be deemed a waiver of demand, notice and protest by such bank as to its own indorsement exclusively, any Federal reserve bank may discount notes, drafts, and bills of exchange arising out of actual commercial transactions; that is, notes, drafts, and bills of exchange issued or drawn for agricultural, industrial, or commercial purposes, or the proceeds of which have been used, or are to be used, for such purposes, the Federal Reserve Board to have the right to determine or define the character of the paper thus eligible for discount, within the meaning of this act. Nothing in this act contained shall be construed to prohibit such notes, drafts, and bills of exchange, secured by staple agricultural products, or other goods, wares, or merchandise from being eligible for such discount, and the notes, drafts, and bills of exchange of factors issued as such making advances exclusively to producers of staple agricultural products in their raw state shall be eligible for such discount; but such definition shall not include notes, drafts, or bills covering merely investments or issued or drawn for the purpose of carrying or trading in stocks, bonds, or other investment securities, except bonds and notes of the Government of the United States. Notes, drafts, and bills admitted to discount under the terms of this paragraph must have a maturity at the time of discount of not more than 90 days, exclusive of days of grace.

"Upon the indorsement of any of its member banks, which shall be deemed a waiver of demand, notice, and protest by such bank as to its own indorsement exclusively, and subject to regulations and limitations to be prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board, any Federal reserve bank may discount or purchase bills of exchange payable at sight or on demand which are drawn to finance the domestic shipment of nonperishable, readily marketable staple agricultural products and are secured by bills of lading or other shipping documents, conveying or securing title to such staples: *Provided*, That all such bills of exchange shall be forwarded promptly for collection, and demand for payment shall be made with reasonable promptness after the arrival of such staples at their destination: *Provided further*, That no such bill shall in any event be held by or for the account of a Federal reserve bank for a period in excess of 90 days. In discounting such bills Federal reserve banks may compute the interest to be deducted on the basis of the estimated life of each bill and adjust the discount after payment of such bills to conform to the actual life thereof."

SEC. 403. That the fourth paragraph of section 13 of the Federal reserve act is amended to read as follows:

"Any Federal reserve bank may discount acceptances of the kinds hereinafter described, which have a maturity at the time of discount of not more than 90 days' sight, exclusive of days of grace, and which are indorsed by at least one member bank: *Provided*, That such acceptances if drawn for an agricultural purpose and secured at the time of acceptance by warehouse receipts or other such documents conveying or securing title covering readily marketable staples, may be discounted with a maturity at the time of discount of not more than six months' sight, exclusive of days of grace."

SEC. 404. That the Federal reserve act is amended by adding at the end of section 13 a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 13a. Upon the indorsement of any of its member banks, which shall be deemed a waiver of demand, notice, and protest by such bank as to its own indorsement exclusively, any Federal reserve bank may, subject to regulations and limitations to be prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board, discount notes, drafts, and bills of exchange issued or drawn for an agricultural purpose, or based upon live stock, and having a maturity, at the time of discount, exclusive of days of grace, not exceeding nine months, and such notes, drafts, and bills of exchange may be offered as collateral security for the issuance of Federal reserve notes under the provisions of section 16 of this act: *Provided*, That notes, drafts, and bills of exchange with maturities in excess of six months shall not be eligible as a basis for the issuance of Federal reserve notes unless secured by warehouse receipts or other such negotiable documents conveying or securing title to readily marketable staple agricultural products or by chattel mortgage upon live stock which is being fattened for market.

"That any Federal reserve bank may, subject to regulations and limitations to be prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board, rediscount such notes, drafts, and bills for any Federal intermediate credit bank, except that no Federal reserve bank shall rediscount for a Federal intermediate credit bank any such note or obligation which bears the indorsement of a nonmember State bank or trust company which is eligible for membership in the Federal reserve system, in accordance with section 9 of this act.

"Any Federal reserve bank may also buy and sell debentures and other such obligations issued by a Federal intermediate credit bank or by a national agricultural credit corporation, but only to the same extent as and subject to the same limitations as those upon which it may buy and sell bonds issued under Title I of the Federal farm loan act.

"Notes, drafts, bills of exchange or acceptances issued or drawn by cooperative marketing associations composed of producers of agricultural products shall be deemed to have been issued or drawn for an agricultural purpose, within the meaning of this section, if the proceeds thereof have been or are to be advanced by such association to any members thereof for an agricultural purpose, or have been or are to be used by such association in making payments to any members thereof on account of agricultural products delivered by such members to the association, or if such proceeds have been or are to be used by such association to meet expenditures incurred or to be incurred by the association in connection with the grading, processing, packing, preparation for market, or marketing of any agricultural product handled by such association for any of its members: *Provided*, That the express enumeration in this paragraph of certain classes of paper of cooperative marketing associations as eligible for rediscount shall not be construed as rendering ineligible any other class of paper of such associations which is now eligible for rediscount.

"The Federal Reserve Board may, by regulation, limit to a percentage of the assets of a Federal reserve bank the amount of notes, drafts, acceptances, or bills having a maturity in excess of three months, but not exceeding six months, exclusive of days of grace, which may be discounted by such bank, and the amount of notes, drafts, bills, or acceptances having a maturity in excess of six months, but not exceeding nine months, which may be discounted by such bank."

SEC. 405. That section 14 of the Federal reserve act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(f) To purchase and sell in the open market, either from or to domestic banks, firms, corporations, or individuals, acceptances of Federal intermediate credit banks and of national agricultural credit corporations, whenever the Federal Reserve Board shall declare that the public interest so requires."

SEC. 406. That section 15 of the Federal reserve act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"The Federal reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositories for and fiscal agents of any national agricultural credit corporation or Federal intermediate credit bank."

SEC. 407. That the act entitled "An act to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act," approved April 13, 1920, is repealed.

TITLE V.—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

AMENDMENTS TO WAR FINANCE CORPORATION ACT.

SEC. 501. That the time during which the War Finance Corporation may make advances and purchase notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or other securities under the terms of sections 21, 22, 23, and 24 of the War Finance Corporation act, as amended, is further extended up to and including February 29, 1924: *Provided*, That if any application for an advance or for the purchase by the War Finance Corporation of notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or other securities is received at the office of the corporation in the District of Columbia on or before February 29, 1924, such application may be acted upon and approved, and the advance may be made or the notes, drafts, or other securities purchased, at any time prior to March 31, 1924.

SEC. 502. That the second paragraph of section 12 of Title I of the War Finance Corporation act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"The power of the corporation to issue notes or bonds may be exercised at any time prior to January 31, 1927, but no such bonds or notes shall mature later than June 30, 1927."

SEC. 503. (a) That the third paragraph of section 15 of Title I of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out at the beginning of such paragraph the words "beginning July 1, 1923," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "beginning April 1, 1924."

(b) The fourth paragraph of such section, as amended, is amended by striking out at the beginning of such paragraph the words "After July 1, 1923," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "After April 1, 1924."

INDEBTEDNESS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

SEC. 504. That section 5202 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"Eighth. Liabilities incurred under the provisions of section 202 of the Federal farm loan act, approved July 17, 1916, as amended."

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.

SEC. 506. (a) That a joint committee be appointed, to consist of three members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, to be appointed by the President thereof, and five members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker thereof. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

(b) The joint committee is authorized to inquire into the effect of the present limited membership of State banks and trust companies in the Federal reserve system upon financial conditions in the agricultural sections of the United States; the reasons which actuate eligible State banks and trust companies in failing to become members of the Federal reserve system; what administrative measures have been taken and are being taken to increase such membership; and whether or not any change should be made in existing law, or in rules and regulations of the Federal Reserve Board, or in methods of administration, to bring about in the agricultural districts a larger membership of such banks or trust companies in the Federal reserve system.

(c) The committee is authorized to sit at any time during the sessions or recesses of the Congress, to conduct its hearings at Washington or at any other place in the United States, to send for persons, books, and papers, to take testimony, to administer oaths, and to employ experts deemed necessary by such committee, a clerk, and a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, such stenographer's services to be rendered at a cost not exceeding $1.25 per printed page. The expenses of such committee shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives in proportion to the membership of such committee from each House.

(d) The committee shall from time to time report to both the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its inquiries, together with its recommendations, and may prepare and submit bills or resolutions embodying such recommendations, and the final report of said committee shall be submitted not later than January 31, 1924.

SEPARABILITY PROVISION.

SEC. 507. That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment is rendered.

DEFINITIONS.

SEC. 508. That when used in this act the term "Federal farm loan act" means the Federal farm loan act approved July 17, 1916, as amended, and the term "Federal reserve act" means the Federal reserve act approved December 23, 1913, as amended.

SHORT TITLE.

SEC. 509. That this act may be cited as the "Agricultural credits act of 1923."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

LOUIS T. MCFADDEN,
PORTER H. DALE,
A. P. NELSON,
OTIS WINGO,
HENRY B. STEAGALL,
Managers on the part of the House.

GEORGE P. MCLEAN,
WILLIAM M. CALDER,
GEORGE W. PEPPER,
GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK,
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 House to the bill (S. 4280) to provide for the incorporation and supervision of corporations formed for the purpose of making agricultural and live-stock loans; to amend the Federal reserve act; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to extend and stabilize the market for United States bonds and other securities; to provide fiscal agents for the United States; and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The amendment of the House strikes out all after the enacting clause in the Senate bill. The Senate recedes from its disagreement with the House amendment with an amendment which is a substitute for the House amendment. The effect of the substitute amendment is explained in the following paragraphs:

The House bill so restricted the scope of the operations of the national agricultural credit corporations that they would not be able to function. The managers on the part of the House have taken for granted, in the consideration in conference, the fact that it was the intention of the House to make this dual rural credit bill function to the full extent of its ability. Therefore, the conferees have agreed in substance to the provisions in the Senate bill which reinstate in this bill certain features which were eliminated previously by the Committee on Banking and Currency in their desire to harmonize the so-called Capper-McFadden, Lenroot-Anderson, Strong bills into a single composite measure. In doing this there is being created in this bill two distinct and separate rural-credit organizations, namely, the Federal intermediate credit banks and the national agricultural credit corporations. The former is placed under the control and management of the Federal Farm Loan Board and the latter under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency.

While the two systems will furnish relief to the agricultural interests of the country, the Federal intermediate credit banks will more particularly take care of the needs of a certain class and might come nearer than do the national agricultural credit corporations in taking care of the entire needs of the general agricultural public; the national agricultural credit corporations will make certain the caring for, in a national way, of the live-stock and cooperative marketing requirements.

Your managers took into consideration also the fact that the national agricultural credit corporations will be organized along the same lines that national banks are organized, namely, by private subscription to capital, and, secondly, that the acceptances, collateral trust notes, or debentures issued by them under the provisions of the act carry no tax-exemption privileges, whereas Federal intermediate credit banks are capitalized by the United States Government and are permitted to issue tax-free debentures.

The managers on the part of the House, in agreeing to the Senate provision in regard to the increase from $10,000 to $25,000, as the maximum amount of loans which can be made to an individual by the Federal farm loan system, in lieu of the provision in the House bill which provided the maximum loan limit of $16,000, which, with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, might in special cases be raised to $25,000, insisted upon the proviso in the House bill that preference shall be given to applications for loans of $10,000 and under, upon the theory that it was better to fix definitely the loan limit than to leave it to the discretion of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the inclusion under the operations of the Federal farm loan system of a provision which will bring the Territory of Alaska under the operations of the Federal farm loan system under rules and regulations to be approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

The managers on the part of the House yielded to the pressure for the extension of the legal life of the War Finance Corporation for a period of nine months instead of for the period of six months as provided in the House bill. Under the provisions agreed upon the active operations of the War Finance Corporation can continue until April 1, 1924. Your managers were governed by the fact that the organization of these credit banks under this bill will take some period of time, and inasmuch as the War Finance Corporation is at present financing the rural credit needs to an extent of nearly $150,000,000, it was thought best to safeguard the possible requirements of the rural credit interests of the country during the interval, it being agreed as a natural sequence of the coming into full operation of these two new credit agencies, supplemented by the increased operations of the Federal land banks and the broadening of the operations of the Federal reserve system to meet the needs of the agricultural interests, that the operation of the War Finance Corporation would gradually be reduced, so that the complete

liquidation of this corporation might be had without an additional extension beyond that already provided for in this bill.

The House bill provided for the fixing of the rate of interest to be paid by the borrowers from the national agricultural credit corporations. Your managers gave very careful consideration to this provision and after full conference were compelled to recede to the Senate provision upon the theory that we should not attempt to fix the rate of interest paid by borrowers, as that was a question entirely in the hands of the States, and any attempt on the part of Congress to fix the rate of interest that should be charged borrowers in the several States would be usurping a right which belongs entirely to the States, and if the precedent were established in this instance it might mean the limiting of rates of interest charged by national banks as well, and the further reason that it might deprive the national agricultural credit corporations of the right to fully serve the needs of their agricultural borrowers at a critical time when the rates for money might be high and in the competitive market the collateral trust certificates or debentures issued by these institutions would not be in as favored a position as other obligations issued bearing tax-exemption privileges.

LOUIS T. MCFADDEN,
PORTER H. DALE,
A. P. NELSON,
OTIS WINGO,
HENRY B. STEAGALL,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield 30 minutes of my hour to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] to use or parcel out as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the managers in connection with the conference report on this bill have had a pretty troublesome job on their hands. At the outset and at this moment I want to extend my appreciation to my colleagues, the conferees, both Republicans and Democrats. I also want, as chairman of the committee, to voice my sincere appreciation of the cooperation of those who were opposed to and in favor of this bill in the House Committee on Banking and Currency. They have cooperated faithfully in the development of this bill from time to time, and it has made possible the consummation of this important piece of legislation.

The Senate sent to us two very important measures, the Lenroot-Anderson and Capper-McFadden bills. The House had passed the so-called Strong bill, making certain important amendments to the Federal farm-loan system. The committee consolidated the bill into one composite measure, and the conferees have perfected the bill into what I believe is a workable, dual system of short-time rural credits.

Now, in the few minutes that I have, I want, if possible, to explain to the House the purposes and operation of these two institutions that are provided for in this bill. The first portion of the bill provides for the establishment of the Federal intermediate credit banks, a system which is an adjunct to the Federal farm-loan system; it creates 12 separate individual reservoirs of intermediate credits which are under the management and control of the Federal Farm Loan Board in the 12 Federal land-bank districts.

The management of each institution will be under a board of directors which will be chosen by and under the supervision of the Federal Farm Loan Board. These institutions are capitalized by Government money at $60,000,000. You will recall that there was a provision in the bill which provided under certain circumstances—I am speaking of the Senate bill—that the capital could be raised another $60,000,000, making a total capital of $120,000,000. The intended purpose of this was to provide working capital for these institutions to meet the immediate demands of the borrowers. The conferees took into consideration the fact that these institutions are permitted to issue debentures and other obligations which will be sold to the investing public, and the only purpose for which the capital stock was authorized in the first instance was to provide money in sufficient amounts to permit the banks to function in an orderly manner. The conferees took into consideration the fact that a $60,000,000 capital would permit the accumulation of enough credit instruments so that debentures might be issued from time to time and be available for sale to the public to replenish their treasury until the operation could again be repeated. Therefore it was not necessary to increase the capital beyond that provided in the House bill, namely, $60,000,000. In all probability these intermediate credit banks will provide for the issuance and sale of these debentures in lots of $50,000,000 or more, much in the same manner that the Farm Loan Board now issues and sells through banking syndicates the several issues of farm-loan bonds to the investing public.

There is a provision in this bill which makes it possible for the farmers to organize to borrow either through their own banks or through cooperative associations and otherwise. This system was designed more particularly to take care of the Northwest, the Middle West, and the South, but at the same time it would, under certain circumstances, take care of the financing of the remaining sections of the country where present rural banking facilities are not adequate, and is so constituted to also give relief to cooperative marketing associations and to live-stock cattle organizations.

Just a moment to the other kind of banks which we have been pleased to call "national agriculture credit associations" in this measure. The theory of this system has been based largely upon the experience of the operations of the War Finance Corporation during the past few years and is patterned very much after the national bank act. Therefore, the conferees thought best to provide for the management of these institutions in the office of the Comptroller of the Currency, because of the fact that the supervision provided in that office at this time is perhaps better fitted and more capable of handling that class of business than other offices. These institutions are to be organized and operated with private capital. The bill provides for the organization of these corporations with $250,000 capital or more. It also provides that these institutions may subscribe up to 20 per cent of their stock in the stock of the rediscount corporation, for which the bill also provides an organization plan, which can give relief and provide additional credits when needed for the farmers of the country by providing these additional discount facilities. These rediscount corporations, whose capital shall be not less than $1,000,000, and the $250,000 corporations have the right to issue debentures and other obligations. These obligations issued by these national agricultural associations do not have the tax exemption privilege, and they do not use nor ask for Government capital. They are private institutions similar to national banks but are not permitted to take deposits and get their money from the sale of acceptances or debentures, under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The other institutions are provided with Government capital and have the right to issue tax-exempt securities.

We have tried to create institutions which would function independently of each other and meet fully the requirements of the agricultural interests of the country, and at the same time provide sufficient safeguards in the way of supervision and security to keep them in the investment channels when their securities were long-time securities rather than to get these new securities into the liquid channels of the Federal reserve system.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. What was the idea, when organizing two kinds of credit institutions, one public and the other private, to grant one the right of tax-exempt securities, or the issue of debentures, and so forth, and deprive the other of that privilege? That ought to be sufficient to show that there will not be any private institutions and that it was intended that there should be none.

Mr. McFADDEN. Oh, the gentleman is entirely wrong, because the gentlemen who appeared before the committee and asked for this legislation did not ask for Government assistance; they said they did not want it. All they wanted was the right to organize and have the right to have these institutions supervised in the same manner as national banks. One thing in particular these people wanted—and I am speaking now of the cattle loan people—was that there should be embodied in this bill a provision which would provide for the licensing of appraisers, men who would go out and investigate the security back of the cattle loans, men whose names meant something. Therefore we have provided that the Secretary of Agriculture shall grant licenses to competent men, when they have passed certain requirements, so that they will be known as national appraisers.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the gentleman if those who desired the commercial banks knew at the time they said that they would not want tax-free debentures that the Government was going to have tax-free debentures under the farm-loan bank proposition?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; they knew that. They had full knowledge of that fact, because legislation was pending.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman says that they understood that. Is there anything in the record to show anywhere that there was such a statement made?

Mr. McFADDEN. There is; the statement of Mr. Bixby, president of the National Live Stock Association.

Mr. SNYDER. I understand that there has been inserted into the bill now what was practically section 5 of the Strong bill, creating agencies that were frowned upon by the House and voted out of the bill.

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman is mistaken. That has not been done. The items from the Strong bill that have been put in are, first, the assumption by the farm loan banks of the operating expenses which are now being paid out of the Treasury. The Federal land banks are fully capable of meeting those expenses. The next item is the permanent organization of the Federal farm loan system, which provides for the election of directors. The other provision is for the consolidated bond issue, and the other proposition provides for fixing the loan limit maximum at $25,000. With the limitation that preference shall be given to applications for loans of $10,000 or under so the poor farmer will always have the preference.

Mr. SNYDER. Then there is nothing in the bill now that compensates for section 5 of the Strong bill, so far as the individual agencies are concerned?

Mr. McFADDEN. No; that was taken out of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman explain what security is behind the debentures issued by the privately owned banks, and what supervision there is over those securities to see that they are ample?

Mr. McFADDEN. I shall be very glad to. These concerns have the right to make loans and advances to borrowers up to 75 per cent of the value of the property pledged, secured by warehouse receipts, chattel mortgages on cattle and other readily marketable products such as eggs, butter, cheese, wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and so forth.

This will mean that no loan can be made in a greater amount than that per cent of margin which at all times must be kept good. One of the provisions in regard to the cattle loans is for the appraisers to make investigations and appraisals of live stock under license from the Secretary of Agriculture. As I understand the cattle-loaning business, it is necessary that these appraisers and these institutions which make loans must have accurate knowledge of the condition of the herds which are used as security for the loans. These herds are generally out over the ranges, and it is my understanding that we have provided in this bill for most expert examinations so that the banks that make the loans will know that the security is ample and is being properly protected. Now, the bill has a provision for securing——

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman has not answered the question.

Mr. McFADDEN. I will answer if the gentleman will give me time. There is an additional provision that the loans can be made and secured by marketable commodities or warehouse receipts or any evidence showing goods in transit, and they are permitted to loan up to 75 per cent of the value. There are other safeguards, such as supervision by the Comptroller of the Currency and the same protection in the way of management that any other bank has.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. May I ask if all these provisions, except perhaps that of the appraisers, were in the House bill?

Mr. McFADDEN. Many were.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I desire information as to what changes the conferees have made in the bill.

Mr. McFADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that owing to the short time in conference it has been impossible for us to get the report printed and back from the printing office. There are many changes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. What I desire to know is, What fundamental changes are made?

Mr. McFADDEN. They are these: We have transferred the management of these privately owned credit banks, which are known as agricultural credits banks, from the Federal farm-loan system to the management of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and we have provided, also, for appraisers and examiners to be licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture. We have made some changes in regard to the issuance of debentures—giving to these institutions the right of issue, and, also, to issue acceptances.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. There are no fundamental changes?

Mr. McFADDEN. Those are some of the changes.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish the gentleman would answer the question which I have asked. I do not think he has answered it. My question was this: What is the security behind the debentures which these privately owned institutions issue, and what supervision is given anywhere over the amount of security and its character upon which the debentures are issued?

Mr. McFADDEN. In the first place the farmer goes to one of the $250,000 banks—or it may have a larger capital. He gives his note secured by warehouse certificates or other evidence that a certain amount of goods are held. You have the borrower's note secured by goods with more than 25 per cent of the face value of the loan and these loans can not be made at a greater rate than 75 cents on the dollar; or it may be that the borrower is a live-stock man who puts up a chattel mortgage at 75 cents on the dollar; or if he be a cotton planter he puts up cotton to secure his note in the same manner. Now, if the bank which makes these loans, later on needs more money to take care of its demands, it can take these secured notes, indorse them and take them to the rediscount bank and guarantee them. When debentures are issued all of these securities are placed in trust to secure same, and the debentures are placed in the hands of the investing public by sale in the same manner as any other bond or security is sold. They are amply secured first by the maker; then by the goods, at 75 per cent of their value; and then the bank and then the rediscount bank. It will be readily seen therefore that the loan is well secured and the provision about which the gentleman has asked amply protects the maker of the loan, first, through the scrutiny of the bank making the initial loan; second, through the scrutiny of the rediscount corporation; and third, through the supervision by the live-stock appraisers appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the bank examiners appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will first yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague.

Mr. LUCE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the directors of the farm-loan banks operating as intermediate credit banks are named by the Government?

Mr. McFADDEN. I said they could act as directors. I may have misspoke myself in that respect, but I think not. In the Strong bill provision is made for the election of directors of the Federal land banks where the Farm Loan Board elects three directors, the association or agency elects three, and the gentleman is familiar with the process by which they choose the seventh man——

Mr. LUCE. I am.

Mr. McFADDEN. These directors may act in the management——

Mr. STEVENSON. If the gentleman will permit, is it not absolutely prescribed in the bill that the directors of the Federal farm-loan banks shall be directors of the intermediate credit banks? I understood the gentleman to say something indicating a change in the conference.

Mr. McFADDEN. No; I was explaining more particularly the operation of these banks under the terms of the bill.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman will remember that the Strong bill, while we contemplated only a farm-mortgage system, provided for the election of four out of seven directors by the borrowers on real-estate mortgages. Does the bill in its present shape still provide that the loaning of money on personal chattel security to the extent of $600,000,000 shall be in the hands of directors, the majority of whom have been chosen by the sufferance of borrowers on real security?

Mr. McFADDEN. Well, the provision in the bill is very clear that these directors may be the same directors. The gentleman has virtually answered his own question.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will.

Mr. LUCE. In the confusion I could not hear distinctly the reading of the title of the bill, but I understood the reading clerk to say that it included a phrase "to extend and stabilize the market for United States bonds." Did I hear correctly?

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LUCE. I do not recall, in any of the three bills which the committee had under consideration, any provision relating to the extending and stabilizing of the market for United States bonds. Has any such provision been inserted?

Mr. McFADDEN. I do not think it has. That is the usual language followed in the amendment of these different acts. I imagine the same course is pursued here. There is, however, I will say to the gentleman, a provision with which he is perfectly

familiar: That these institutions are designated as fiscal agents of the Government and can buy and sell Government bonds. It may be that in this respect that construction can be given, that this power to act as fiscal agents would have a stabilizing effect on Government bonds. There is no other provision in the bill that tends to stabilize the market for Government bonds that I know of.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I now used?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used 22 minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will.

Mr. BEGG. The thing that I am most interested in is the security. If I should buy in the warehouse $100,000 worth of cotton at 40 cents a pound, could I borrow from this bank and mortgage that cotton for $75,000?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; but you would have to look the banker in the eye, just as you do now. He would take into consideration the same elements of risk that he takes when you go to the banker now. This proposition does not mean easy money for the borrower any more than the operation of any other institution means that. The banker who loans money will always see to it that the margin of collateral is always maintained. But a man must not expect to get money for nothing under this bill, and he must at all times be willing, and compelled, to put up ample security.

Mr. BEGG. Let us carry that on one step farther. Suppose I get the $75,000 and cotton then breaks in price while it is in the warehouse. What is the security that the man in New York has behind the debentures?

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman is playing on his imagination a little bit. That is an ordinary banking transaction, and those transactions are protected by all bankers. I can not imagine any banker permitting a loan to be made on that kind of a basis and permitting his security to depreciate. If he does, he will suffer a considerable loss. My experience with banks is that they are watching those things, and watching the collateral at all times.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. He will call for a margin?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; he will call for a margin or dispose of the goods which are held as security before the price drops below the face of his loan.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HUSTED. Have the conferees made any change at all in the plan of organization and control of the 12 intermediate credit banks? And is the money still exclusively to be supplied by the Government, and is all of the stock to be held by the Government?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; so far as capital is concerned; and the particular additional capital which these banks will require will be obtained from the sale of the obligations and debentures.

Mr. HUSTED. Then, so far as the 12 intermediate banks are concerned, the conferees have made no change?

Mr. McFADDEN. Not of any moment.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Under one of the provisions of the bill the advance of 75 per cent can only be obtained in cases where the product is practically to be immediately marketed?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the conference report extend the life of the War Finance Corporation up to March 1, 1924?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; it does. The House bill provided for an extension up to January 1, and the Senate provision provided the nine months' extension, and the House conferees, under the circumstances, yielded to the Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under that provision the War Finance Corporation, after March 1, 1924, can not advance money to the farm-credit associations to market their products after that date. What is the maximum amount that can be borrowed by any farm cooperative association through the banks set up by this bill?

Mr. McFADDEN. It has been estimated at somewhere from $600,000,000 to $1,200,000,000. Under the rediscount provision some of these institutions could rediscount with the Federal reserve system.

It also provides for the sale of acceptances to banks and to the Federal reserve system through open-market transactions. So it will be difficult to answer what amount of credit might be available.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee's idea is that any such association will be able to borrow all the money that it needs.

Mr. McFADDEN. That is the idea, and I think they will soon organize, so there will be no need to continue the War Finance Corporation beyond this date. I think these institutions will care for the needs of the farmer, so that the corporation will go out of business March 1 next.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Do the 12 Government land banks have the power to issue $60,000,000 of exempt securities?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; and many times that amount. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. McFADDEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I will try to make a brief and concise statement of the purposes of this bill as well as I can in the short time allotted to me. I ask not to be interrupted until I finish my statement. In passing, before I forget it, I want to state that I do not agree with all that is in the statement that has been made by the managers on the part of the House. The principal changes that have been made in conference is what you are interested in. This bill as now reported combines into one bill the three bills known as the Strong bill, the Capper-McFadden bill, and the Lenroot-Anderson bill. So far as the Strong bill is concerned, the bill is the same as it passed the House, with two exceptions—that is, as the Strong bill passed the House the other day. Section 5, which caused so much controversy in the House, and which provided for the direct loan, is not in the bill, was not in this bill as it passed the House, and it is not included in the conference report.

There are only two changes that are in the Strong bill that were not in the Strong bill when it passed the House. They are the ones with reference to the secretary-treasurers and the other with reference to Alaska.

Section 305 in the conference report has the provision that no such secretary-treasurer—that is, of the local farm-loan association—shall engage in making loans eligible at the Federal land bank through any other mortgage company or agency and the making of any such loan by a secretary-treasurer shall forthwith work a forfeiture of his office.

That was in the triplet bill that passed the other day, but it was not in the Strong bill as it passed separately. In conference we have agreed to a proposition proposed by the Senate that would authorize the Farm Loan Board to permit, and is intended to permit if they see fit, one Pacific coast Federal land bank to set up a branch bank in Alaska available under the same permit that the House authorized in Porto Rico. Those are the only two possible changes in the Strong bill as it originally passed the House.

That leaves the Capper bill and the Lenroot-Anderson bill and what changes have the conferees made? That is what you are entitled to know. There are several minor changes, but the major change which would perhaps cause a man to doubt and come to a different conclusion than he had when the bill passed the House is this: As the bill passed the House, it was urged by the Senators that we had absolutely destroyed the Capper corporations—that is, the system that provided for independent private capital with no Government aid. They said, and truly, that we had taken away from both the $250,000 corporations authorized by the Capper bill and the $1,000,000 rediscount corporations the right to issue debentures and left them so that they were compelled to go for funds to the intermediate credit banks created under the Lenroot-Anderson proposition, being in the Federal land banks, the officers and directors of which are the officers and directors of the Federal land banks and the capital stock of which is contributed and subscribed by the United States Government to the extent of $5,000,000 for each of the 12 banks.

They contended that the House bill left the Capper corporations, the Capper banks, the private banks, with the only recourse for a workable capital other than their capital stock, to go to these intermediate credit banks. This is the position of the Senate. They said that they should have had the right to have a separate and independent control, just like national banks had, to be under the same control as national banks—that is, the Comptroller of the Currency; that they should be permitted to issue debentures as originally provided by the Capper bill when it passed the Senate. On these two propositions a majority of the House conferees yielded to the Senate, so the bill as we bring it back to you to-night restores the independ-

ence of the Capper corporations. They will have absolutely no connection, legally or otherwise, through rediscounts, or anything else, with the intermediate credit banks created under the Lenroot-Anderson Government-aided corporations, but they will be under the control of the Comptroller of the Currency. They furnish their own capital stock by private subscription. They may issue debentures to the extent of ten times their capital stock. They are identical with the original national banks with two exceptions, or almost identical. The skeleton outline of the formation of the smaller corporations, the $250,000 corporations, are identical with the original plan of the national banks with two exceptions. One is they do not have the right of note issue, and the other is that they do not have the right to receive demand deposits. They get their funds only in two ways, either by borrowing on bills payable or issuing debentures. That is the change that was made in conference with respect to the Capper corporations.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I would rather wait until I have finished the complete statement. What other changes have we made? First, there was another change in the Capper corporations. As the bill passed the House we had provided that the interest to be charged to the customers, to use a common expression, on rediscount, trust companies, or cooperative associations that might bring paper to them, should not exceed the rediscount rate at the intermediate credit banks by more than 1½ per cent. That was in lieu of the Senate provision which, upon the question of interest charges, provided that the law of the State in which the Capper bank is located should control upon that point. The Senate conferees insisted strenuously that that restriction should not be placed upon these private corporations. They said, first of all, that the House provision was objectionable because it made the basic rate the same as the basic rate of a Government-controlled institution, a Government-subsidized institution, an institution that had the benefit of exemption from taxation, and that those benefits in all probability would so reduce its rediscount rate as to absorb completely the 1½ per cent spread and would leave the Capper corporations practically helpless, so that they could not operate. The Senate conferees further insisted to the House that as these were private corporations, formed for the purpose of making money, competitive banks, they could be depended upon within the limits of the usury laws of the States to protect those who dealt with them. Finally a majority of the House conferees yielded on that proposition. Those are the major changes that were made in the Capper bill.

I did forget one change that was made in the Strong bill, and I will return to it for a moment. As the conferees bring you the Strong bill to-night the maximum loan to any one person, land loan, under the Federal farm loan act is increased to $25,000, the Senate provision, with one of the House provisions, giving preference to loans of $10,000 or less.

Now, let us take up the Lenroot-Anderson proposition. As a matter of fact, there are no changes in the Lenroot-Anderson bill made in the conference to which any friend of that bill would object, but those who are against it will ask whether there are any changes to which those who oppose the Lenroot-Anderson bill would object. I think not. I can understand the basic objection that some gentlemen have, and for their objection I have great respect, and that one basic objection is that the Government furnishes the capital for these Lenroot-Anderson institutions. The bill as we bring it to you to-night is unchanged in that respect. We did cut out one provision, and that is technical, which was really put in there through a mistaken idea on the part of the House, that would do the opposite of what the House intended to do and which was a restriction that was tighter than any commercial bank now has, either under section 5200 of the Federal statutes or any State bank in Ohio or elsewhere.

Let me say this to you conservative men who have been afraid of these institutions: I have studied this question and I want to say to you in my judgment there is not one single thing that you can object to in either one of these bills on the question of soundness, except your basic objection to the Government furnishing the capital of these Lenroot-Anderson banks. Why do I say that? What about the paper, what about the security, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and others ask? Why, under the Federal law at this hour, under the national bank law at this hour, national banks can loan on notes secured by warehouse receipts 87½ per cent on the value of cotton and other basic commodities in the process of marketing. Have you heard of any protests to that? You hear protests on the part of honest, cautious bankers that that is too close a restriction. The loans under both sections of this bill are as safe, are as sound, as any loans that any national bank is authorized to make under your national banking law, and in some respects they are more closely restricted. I challenge any man to point to the contrary. I grant you that as the Capper bill and the Lenroot-Anderson bill came from the Senate I would not have signed my name to any report that approved them. They were wide open at both ends and loose in the middle.

But your committee has amended them as best they could in the limited time we had. They put in the customary limitation clause, and they put in the customary penalty clauses that are now in the national bank law, and it is my judgment, gentlemen, while the bill is not going to do what the farmer has been led by some to believe it will do, yet in my candid judgment the good in it outweighs the bad, and any man this night can vote for this bill feeling sure that if disappointment comes it is going to be upon the part of the farmer and not upon the part of some conservative legislator fearful that he is voting for something unsound.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. I understood from the colloquy which the gentleman from Arkansas has had that these loans could only be made on products readily marketable?

Mr. WINGO. The loans to which I referred are those secured by warehouse receipts on readily marketable staple agricultural products. You will find in section 5200 of the national bank law to-day almost the identical language that authorizes the national banks to loan on paper thus secured by 115 per cent of value, which means a loan to about 87 per cent of value of the commodity. In other words, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that I am insisting and I made a fight before the conferees to get section 5200 liberalized. Why did we do it? Because I know that all over this land national banks are absolutely losing safe, sound loans of this character, because the State banks doing business across the street from them are not subject to the restrictions of section 5200 while the national banks are. There is no question about it.

Mr. BURTON. But will the gentleman please explain how, if these products are to be readily marketable, the time is fixed on them from six months to three years? Do national banks make loans on three years' time or even one year's time?

Mr. WINGO. Oh, the gentleman knows that national banks, banks of demand deposits, that must at all times keep their assets liquid in order to meet the deposit demand, do not make these long loans. If they did, under the law, if the maturity is over six months, the paper is not eligible for rediscount at the Federal reserve bank. Such paper is not barred because unsound or unsafe, but solely because of long maturity it is not eligible for note issue. That is the reason why this new system is proposed, free from the demand of demand deposits. Instead of issuing demand currency on rediscount it is proposed to issue long-time debentures.

Mr. BURTON. I still do not understand why the period of three years should have been inserted here.

Mr. WINGO. Well, the gentleman is certainly very badly mistaken if he does not make a clear distinction between the particular classes of loans to which his colleague referred on the third proposition. The gentleman read the bill as it passed the House on that proposition, did he not?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. It is more conservative in the conference report, if anything, than as the bill passed the House.

Mr. BURTON. One other thing. The gentleman from Arkansas says the private banks are subject to a secondary liability. Is the secondary liability attached to that equally with the other class of banks? That is a very material difference, is it not?

Mr. WINGO. There is not any provision covering that that I recall at the moment.

Mr. BURTON. That is a very material difference. Is there any provision in this bill which exempts the Government in specific language from any liability?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman read that?

Mr. WINGO. We have inserted in conference at the insistence of the House conferees this provision on that question:

> The United States Government shall assume no liability, direct or indirect, for any debentures or other obligations issued under this section, and all such debentures and other obligations shall contain conspicuous and appropriate language, to be prescribed in form and substance by the Federal Farm Loan Board and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, clearly indicating that no such liability is assumed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I repeat that the bill reported by the conference and which is offered for your adoption is a composite bill embodying the three different bills known as the Strong bill, the McFadden-Capper bill, and the Lenroot-

Anderson bill. The Strong bill embodies certain amendments to the Federal farm loan act to which the House agreed the other day when it passed that bill as a separate measure. The so-called Capper-McFadden bill provides for the creation of two separate kinds of corporations. Both of these corporations are to have their capital stock subscribed entirely through private capital. One class of corporations is to have a capital stock of not less than $250,000 and the other class, known as the rediscounting corporation, must have a capital stock of at least $1,000,000. These corporations are banks in effect, but are not permitted to receive demand deposits. The smaller corporation procures its working capital, other than its capital stock, through either an issue of debentures, the sale of its paper, or the rediscounting of its paper at the rediscount corporation. The rediscount corporation procures its additional working capital through either bills payable, the sale of its paper, or the issuance of debentures, or by all three methods. It is contended that these corporations will be used primarily to finance the live-stock industry, though they are authorized to handle agricultural paper of a general character having maturity of not exceeding nine months, while the live-stock paper may have a maturity of not exceeding three years.

The Lenroot-Anderson system provides for 12 intermediate credit banks, each having a capital stock of five million contributed by the Government, which banks are set up in connection with the 12 Federal land banks. The directors of the Federal land banks are made ex officio directors of the intermediate credit banks, and the Federal Farm Loan Board will have the same control over these banks that it has over the Federal land banks. The function and chief business of these intermediate credit banks will be to discount or purchase from banks, agricultural credit corporations, incorporated live-stock loan companies, cooperative banks, and incorporated cooperative credit or marketing associations paper representing loans which have been made in the first instance for an agricultural purpose or for the raising, breeding, fattening, or marketing of live stock. It is intended that these banks will thus rediscount that class of paper having a maturity that is longer than the maturity now permitted to be rediscounted at the Federal reserve banks. The express provision on that point limits them to paper having a maturity of not less than six months or more than three years, while under the Federal reserve act such paper can not be rediscounted at the Federal reserve bank having a maturity of more than six months, although this very bill carries an amendment to the Federal reserve act which will permit the rediscount at the Federal reserve banks of some paper issued for agricultural purposes or based upon live stock having a maturity of not exceeding nine months.

These intermediate credit banks will procure their additional funds other than their capital stock by issuing bills payable or long-time debentures with a maturity not exceeding five years and limited in an amount not in excess of ten times the paid-up capital stock and surplus. Nowhere in the act are these intermediate credit banks authorized to make loans direct to the farmers, but the farmer to get the benefits of it must come through some bank or incorporated organization of the character which I have named.

In addition to setting up the two new systems which I have described, this act makes certain amendments to the Federal reserve act which are very necessary, among them being a specific provision repealing the so-called progressive rediscount rate law. The bill also provides for an extension of the War Finance Corporation to February 29, 1924.

I wish to reiterate what I have said before, that this bill does not contain all the evil that has been charged to it, nor does it contain all the virtues that have been ascribed to it. The farmers, who have been led to believe that this bill will bring about a credit millennium, are doomed to disappointment. I also wish to direct attention to the fact that there is nothing in the bill that requires a bank to loan money to a farmer without security or for any length of time that the farmer wishes, as some enthusiastic friends of the measure seem to think. The old, old problem of credits, especially rural credits, is not entirely solved by this measure. The best that can be said is that it makes a start in taking care of the so-called intermediate credits. Let me say to my Democratic friends that the Democratic members of the committee have taken this bill as the best thing that the administration would permit us to have for the farmer. As a matter of fact, the Capper bill and the Lenroot-Anderson bill were held up in the Senate until just a few days ago, and were rushed through the Senate finally when the Republicans found that it was necessary to get them out of the way of the ship subsidy bill. Many Senators have frankly admitted that they did not know what the bills really contained, and many of them voted for the bills not because they favored this class of legislation, but solely to get them out of the way of the ship subsidy bill. They unloaded these bills upon the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, with the private assurance that whatever evils they contained would be eliminated by the House committee, and that that committee could be depended upon to cure their defects. Unfortunately the time has been so short and the pressure so great on our committee that we have not had the opportunity to give these bills the consideration and the attention which their magnitude required. I doubt not that in our haste we have overlooked some things and have left some things in that may rise up and plague us, but we have done the best we could.

The Democratic members of the committee have felt that it was the intention of the Republican leaders of both Houses to get this measure in a jam so that it could not be brought out in time to be enacted into law and that a situation could be created by which the Democrats could be blamed for the failure to act. But the Democratic members of the committee have at all times stood ready and willing to cooperate and have put forth every effort to prevent a failure, and as a matter of fact when a majority of the Republicans following the sincere judgment of a majority of the Republican House leaders failed to report the bill out of the committee we Democrats went to the rescue. On Saturday night the Republicans outvoted us so that my motion to report the bill failed on a tie vote, but Sunday afternoon I got more of the Democratic members present and finally our motion to report the bill out was adopted.

I regret that for two years this administration has drifted along without doing anything to solve that other great problem which must be solved before agriculture can prosper, and that is the question of transportation and marketing. Freight rates are still so high and so discriminatory that in many sections of the country farm products rot in the fields while the ultimate consumer is either compelled to do without them or must pay an exorbitant price. At one end stands the farmer who in many instances gets less than the cost of production, while at the other end stands the consuming public paying an ever constantly rising exorbitant price for the same products. This Republican Congress either lacks the capacity to deal with this problem or else it is indifferent to the distress which such a situation has produced. [Applause.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I submit the following letters from Mr. Roy B. Epps, of Athens, Ga., my home city, an ex-service man who is now a patient in United States Veterans' Hospital No. 63, Lake City, Fla. I do not know anything about the situation at this hospital or the treatment the inmates generally are receiving. I do know, however, that Mr. Epps is an honorable and truthful man and enjoys the respect and esteem of all who know him. I am printing these letters by his permission. I consented to do so in the interest of the service generally, and particularly in the interest of Mr. Epps and other inmates in this hospital. I think the conduct referred to by Mr. Epps as set forth in these communications is an outrage, and every physician and officer who is a party to it should be called to account therefor. I particularly call the attention of the Senate investigating committee, of which Mr. REED of Missouri is chairman, to these letters and the charges set forth therein:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' HOSPITAL NO. 63,
Lake City, Fla., January 23, 1923.

Hon. C. H. BRAND,
Athens, Ga.

DEAR SIR:

* * * * * * * *

Millions of the people's money is being spent for the treatment of disabled veterans, and I know that these people expect the very best treatment that money can provide. The general public does not know the inefficiency, the incompetency, and neglect with which some of these hospitals are handled. Lake City is certainly a case in point.

As you know, I was sent to Lake City hospital in November for treatment for asthma. After being examined by the ward surgeon, he informed me that nothing could be done for my disability. I then requested to be sent back home, since nothing could be done here; asked him verbally more than once and then by letter, and was told that I could not be discharged under three months except against medical advice. But I needed treatment, and I knew that treatment could be had at home; so I wrote the Atlanta office asking that authority be given for my immediate discharge. The reply, dated December 4, is

inclosed, reference to which will be made in a later paragraph of this letter. My writing Atlanta seems to have incensed the medical officer in charge and the ward surgeon, and they have seemingly done everything possible since to make life disagreeable for me.

The ward surgeon practically ignored my case, even while I was quite sick with dengue fever. All the medicine ordered while under his care was aspirin on two different occasions. I persisted in asking that something be done, to have him walk off generally leaving me talking to myself. Then one day he said there were symptoms of tuberculosis, but that I could not be transferred to a tuberculosis ward at that time, as no beds were available in those wards. The fact is that there were available beds, and I was so informed by the surgeon of those wards and by certain patients there I knew. I therefore took the matter up with the medical officer in charge in an endeavor to get the transfer, stating that if I did have symptoms of tuberculosis I should be in charge of a tuberculosis specialist for observation and treatment. He promised to handle my case at once, to make the transfer, and also to talk to the new surgeon about my asthma. Nothing whatever was done. Several days later, while sick and disgusted, I told the ward surgeon frankly what I thought of such treatment and that something had to be done. That day, after giving me a general upbraiding for finding fault with a "doctor," he did complete the transfer.

The new surgeon made an examination, listened to my history, and ordered a dose of calomel. I had taken calomel on the day preceding, so this made me very sick. After a couple of days I felt better, and then was told by the nurse that other medicine had been prescribed for me. Thinking that I had a right to know the nature of the medicine, I asked and was told that a patient was not supposed to know anything about the medicine he took, and she grew very angry. Well, it seemed that I would be compelled to leave the hospital and go somewhere for ordinarily humane treatment. Decided, however, that I ought to tell the medical officer in charge about it once more, and if he wouldn't make any effort in my behalf I would leave. This officer promised that things would be righted at once, that he would talk to the surgeon and see that I got adequate attention. This he either did not do or the ward surgeon has failed to comply with his instructions. I have repeatedly asked him for treatment and tried to tell him of the case, only to get the reply, "Oh, forget it." The only special medicine that I have gotten has been a home doctor's prescription, copy of which I asked the assistant surgeon to have filled for me, and it took a "near fight" to get that.

Some time ago I went to the dentist for necessary dental work. Teeth were in bad condition and work was actually needed. The dentist absolutely refused to do a thing without definite authority from the district office. It became necessary for me to wire Mr. Bryson to get the attention, a thing that other patients get on request from the dentist. Only this morning the dentist called me over for an appointment.

Eyes gave me trouble. After examination by the eye doctor, was told that I needed new glasses badly, but that same could not be furnished at Government expense. He said that lenses would cost me $12 and the frames $5. I asked him to order them and I would try to get reimbursed later. Seeing him again after a few days, he informed me that he would be able to furnish the glasses complete for $12. Other men are furnished glasses free of charge as necessary medical treatment.

In the ward no sick calls are made, as is the daily custom in other hospitals. Never have I seen the ward surgeon go to the patients and listen to complaints on service, etc. The medical officer in charge of the hospial has never been known to do such a thing.

A workingman's diet is served to all patients. Ambulatory patients, infirmary patients, and all get the same food, prepared in the same way. Complaints galore as to half-cooked meats, dirty dishes, etc., are made to nurses and doctors without avail. I wish you could see for yourself from the standpoint of the sick man. A syphilitic negro cook was employed in the general kitchen until the commanding officer discharged him, only when forced to do so by pressure of the patients. I understand that this same negro is back on duty in the hospital bakery, even though the hospital bacteriologist made a written statement that a blood test of this man showed that he was suffering from syphilis.

Referring to the letter addressed to me from Mr. Bryson, district manager in re matter of discharge, inclosed, the ward surgeon one day told me that he had a letter from Atlanta on my case in the office and that I might come down and read it. There it was on his desk—an open letter, the envelope gone, and addressed to me personally. I demanded to know who had opened it and where he had found it, and was referred to the commanding officer. The commanding officer finally said that the letter had come through the office—and I could get no other information on it. All patients' mail is handled through the personnel office, there being no post office on the reservation. Then, it seems that he had intercepted my letter. I am especially anxious that you start an investigation of this matter as a protection to patients and public in general in the future. The commander of the local D. A. V. post will make affidavit to the fact that the commanding officer requested him to have all D. A. V. mail come through the hospital. The inference is clear.

You can understand, Judge, from the foregoing that I have personally been under a terrible mental strain since being in this place, and that I am very desirous of getting away. I want you to use your influence in getting me home treatment, or else compensation sufficient to allow me to go home and secure the proper medical treatment. In conclusion, I want to thank you for the interest you have taken in me in the past and assure you that I will appreciate anything that you can do for me in this instance.

Any investigation as to conditions in this hospital will have to be made through the patients, instead of through the medical officers, if these things are uncovered.

Very respectfully,

ROY B. EPPS.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU, HOSPITAL NO. 63,
Lake City, Fla., February 14, 1923.

Hon. C. H. BRAND,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Supplementing the facts given in my previous letter to you regarding conditions in this hospital, I wish to add the following:

When I first came here I was placed in a room with a patient who was taking treatment for syphilis. Later on still another man suffering with the same disease and with a running sore was placed in the bed next to mine. Due to the fact that but one wash bowl and one stool was available, it was necessary for me and 17 other men to have to use the same equipment. These men were not removed until a vigorous protest was made.

When I was transferred from this ward to another, supposedly for observation for tuberculosis, I was placed in a bed next to a man who was almost dead with the disease. Patients are not segregated in any way, but placed together, whether under observation or far advanced, and you can readily see that a man without the disease is placed in great danger, especially in my case.

In my case no treatment was begun whatever except as mentioned in previous letter until about the 27th of January, when my three months' period was about up. Now they are trying to do something for me in order to keep me here longer.

I mention these facts to show the utter indifference and carelessness with which men are handled in this hospital. If I do not already have tuberculosis I have certainly had the very best opportunity for contracting it that a man ever had. All statements that I have made to you in regard to these conditions can be fully substantiated.

Hoping that you will be able to do something and advise me of same, I am

Very respectfully yours,

ROY B. EPPS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] very properly pointed out the main cases for legitimate criticism of this bill. I can understand the viewpoint of gentlemen who oppose the bill for what they regard as fundamental defects. I have no quarrel with any gentleman who objects to either of the fundamental principles of this measure against which objection has been lodged. Such views are natural for those of more conservative ideas. I refer to the provision by which the Government becomes a stockholder and the owner of the capital stock of the Federal intermediate credit banks established under the Lenroot-Anderson plan, and I refer also to the provision which gives the Federal intermediate credit banks the privilege of tax-free securities. I can understand the viewpoint of objection to that provision. But I have discovered that not many gentlemen in this House who are so earnestly opposed to the issuance of tax-free securities have found any trouble in supporting this bill, which in effect looks toward the issuance of some $600,000,000 of additional securities of that kind by the Federal intermediate credit banks.

Those objections, on the part of any gentleman who holds these views, may properly be lodged against this bill. The only other objection that can be substantiated and sustained is that the measure, to some extent at least, is not scientifically drawn, is not drawn in an orderly manner, and sets up two systems—one in competition with the other. But you all know the circumstances under which this legislation has been prepared, and I may say to you that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, after having reported the Strong bill and its passage through this body, took up the Capper bill and had that ready to submit to the House. Just as we had finished that work the suggestion was submitted to us that we must have the Lenroot-Anderson bill and put them both in one measure and the Strong bill was to be included—making three bills in one. So when we took up that task we were forced to go about it without sufficient time, and I am frank to confess that there is something of inconsistency in attempting to set up in the same measure the two systems under the bill passed by the House.

The Capper banks, as originally contemplated, were bound by the limitations as to interest rates and the control that the Government institutions were bound by, and yet without the advantages which the Government institution have. The Federal intermediate credit banks were to be owned by the Government and given the right to issue tax-free securities. And so, when we got into conference on these measures the conference committee was in the same attitude that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House found itself in at the outset. We were, in the first place, ordered to take these two measures and put them into one, and make them workable, each side demanding that its scheme be preserved in all its purity, and that some things in the other be eliminated.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Not now; my time is limited. And when the House passed the two measures it struck out of the Capper bill, as to both of the banks provided for in the Capper bill, the right to issue debentures under the same terms and threw the same interest-rate restrictions around them that were carried in the other measure—the Federal intermediate credit banks.

It is easy to see that the Capper banks could not function if bound by the same restrictions in interest to be charged as applied to the Federal intermediate credit banks, which have the right to issue tax-exempt debentures and enjoy Government subsidies not extended the other institutions. The conference committee desired to do all considered possible to make the plan work. We labored hard night and day at our task in utmost endeavor to carry out the mandate imposed upon us by the House.

When we began our report the conference committee had the job of taking the two measures, putting them into one bill, and making it workable. The House had so amended the Capper bill that in my judgment we might as well not have attempted to provide for the organization of any of these institutions. No institutions would have been organized other than these intermediate credit banks provided for in the measure that passed the House.

When we got into conference we soon found the Capper bill had some friends, and they insisted on the right to issue debentures being restored to the $250,000 corporation, and also the rediscount corporations provided for in the Capper bill. They further insisted that the restrictions as to interest rates, which would have made it impossible for these institutions to do business, should be stricken from the bill.

The conference committee took it for granted that the House meant what it said when they attempted to pass the two measures embodied in one, and so to meet the necessities of the situation and to carry out the manifest purpose of the House, we tried to reach such agreement as will enable these institutions provided in the Capper bill to do business as well as the intermediate credit banks. Without some of these changes, I do not hesitate to say that the rediscount banks provided in the Capper bill would never have been organized, because there would have been no reason for anybody to invest money in such institutions.

The fact is that we were confronted with a situation which required that we either strike the rediscount banks from the bill or find a way to make them workable. This was the contention that confronted the conference committee. We did the best we could. The result is before you.

Now, I want to call attention to another thing. The House yielded on one proposition in the Strong bill. You remember when the matter was up the other day—I refer to the maximum limit of loans to be authorized by the Federal land banks. When that measure was before the House I opposed the plan embodied in the Strong bill as against all other members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, with two or three exceptions. But we submitted that question to a vote and the House adopted the plan fixing the limit at $16,000 and providing $25,000 might be loaned in special cases when approved by the Farm Loan Board.

It was insisted that would lead to confusion and we struck it out. The argument was made that it would be unwise to have the Farm Loan Board passing on individual cases, that the result would be that the Farm Loan Board would simply issue regulations to the various land banks authorizing loans to the amount of $25,000, so it was decided to set that amount as the limit, with provision that preference be given loans not exceeding $10,000. In my judgment this change in the farm loan act is a mistake. I fought it, but the House was against me in one instance and the conference committee in the other. We had to do the best we could in this as in other instances as to the control of the farm loan banks; we worked out a plan that divides the power between the associations, borrowers, and the Farm Loan Board. The associations select the seventh member, naming three, one of whom shall be designated by the board, with the right of removal for cause. I believe the plan will work well and should satisfy all concerned. I hope the House will approve the report. The bill will help the farmers of the country to some extent at least. But I wish to say in this connection that in my judgment it will fall far short of curing all his ills. The farmer of the country must be relieved of some of his burdens in taxes—direct and indirect—and transportation charges, before he can prosper as he should, and something must be done to cut down the spread between what he gets for his products and the price paid by the consumer. Nothing short of this will bring real relief to agriculture.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ].

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, for some time past I have taken an interest in the national cemeteries in Europe, of which there are eight—six being in France, one in Belgium, and one in England, and in which cemeteries there are now 30,587 bodies. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a communication signed by Thomas V. Fields, State commander of the National Disabled Soldiers' League, who has visited each of these cemeteries and who has made a detailed report. I ask that that be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated in 8-point type. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL DISABLED SOLDIERS' LEAGUE,
NEW JERSEY STATE HEADQUARTERS,
Journal Square, Jersey City, February 8, 1923.

Congressman WELLS GOODYKOONTZ,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOODYKOONTZ: I am very glad to acknowledge your letter of January 29. I deeply regret that I was unable to answer prior to now, but I have been away resting from the effects of a very severe ocean voyage.

As you request, I am very glad to herewith furnish you a detailed account of my observation in the American cemeteries in France, Belgium, and England. I am going to relate to you in a plain, ordinary way, without camouflage or exaggerating, just what I saw and learned while on this trip.

There are eight national cemeteries in Europe, six of which are in France, one in Belgium, and one in England. There are 30,587 bodies at present in Europe, distributed as follows:

Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, No. 1232:	
Romagne-sous-Montfaucon (Meuse), France	13,938
Unknown	483
St. Mihiel American Cemetery, No. 1233:	
Thiaucourt, Meurthe et Moselle, France	4,231
Unknown	157
Somme American Cemetery, No. 636:	
Bony, Aisne, France	1,830
Unknown	154
Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, No. 608:	
Seringes-et-Nesles, Aisne, France	6,071
Unknown	698
Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, No. 1764:	
Belleau, Aisne, France	2,220
Unknown	224
Suresnes American Cemetery, No. 34:	
Suresnes, Paris, Seine, France	1,497
Unknown	2
Flanders Field American Cemetery, No. 1252:	
Waereghem, Belgium	365
Unknown	29
Brookwood American Cemetery, No. 107-E:	
Brookwood, Surrey, England	435
Unknown	66

I first visited Suresnes Cemetery, just outside of Paris, and I found this to be the nicest and best kept of all the American cemeteries, which can probably be accounted for because of its close proximity to Paris. However, this cemetery has no chapel or other place where one may offer service or seek shelter. While I was at this cemetery a light rain came up, and I was drenched before I finally reached an old, dilapidated dugout. While in this dugout a mother of one of the boys who rested in this cemetery came in, and she too had to rest in this old dugout until the rain had ceased. I realized then how neglectful we were in not providing a proper place where these mothers and other relatives who visited these cemeteries could retire to offer some prayer for their loved ones resting in this cemetery.

I next visited Aisne-Marne Cemetery, and I found this cemetery in just a fair condition. As in Suresnes, there was no chapel or other place where one could suitably find shelter or rest, and I found the employees or caretakers at this cemetery very unsympathetic. The cemetery itself could be greatly improved in condition, such as roads, sodding the graves, painting the crosses, and a little cooperation from those who are employed there, such as making an honest effort to furnish transportation to visitors and also make efforts to make them feel as though the United States Government really wanted to welcome them in trying to make them feel at home and welcome in their visit to their loved ones' graves who had died for their flag. I say furnish transportation, because there is a car there idle and the cemetery is several miles from the railroad station, and the car is idle, I was informed, most of the time, and the taxi fare from Belleau to the cemetery is outrageous.

I next visited Meuse-Argonne Cemetery, and I found this to be the largest of our cemeteries overseas. The cemetery itself is 6 miles from the nearest railroad station, and this station is upon one of the most poorly conducted branches of the French railroads, and few, if any, go that route. Most people motor from Verdun to the cemetery and return, paying something like $40 for the trip. However, those in poor circumstances have to use the shorter route on this terrible branch railroad, and on reaching there they are then required to pay taxi fare amounting to, as they return the same day, which is in most cases probable, $10. The cemetery itself is laid out upon a

slight rise, forming what one would call a slope, and the first appearance is rather nice; but, however, as I entered the cemetery I sank knee-deep in mud. I found the cemetery torn up for the laying of drainage pipes. I found the crosses in a poor condition. Directly facing the cemetery is a large hill, upon which has been built many barracks used for the housing of the men who were employed in the cemetery; also numerous houses used for the officers. I also found a long barracks building, about 75 feet in length, and used as a hostess house. The hostess house itself is a dilapidated affair and impossible to keep warm due to its poor construction. It is maintained by the Young Women's Christian Association, and they have two American ladies who have charge and who do their utmost to make one at home. There are accommodations with 25 beds for those who wish to make a stay not exceeding three days. While in the cemetery I met Mrs. L. J. Hill, of 1441 E Street SE., Washington, D. C., and also of 3228 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, who was visiting the grave of her brother, First Sergt. Hiram J. Johnson. Mrs. Hill felt terribly sad over the condition of the cemetery and complained to me about misrepresentation in letters she received from the War Department at Washington, D. C., informing her how well the graves are being cared for. Mrs. Hill advised me that she had requested the body of her brother to be brought back to the United States, so that she could personally do what the Government was neglecting. I also met a Mr. James T. Richards while at the cemetery, whose address is the Hotel des Allies, Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, who is formally an investigator for the American Graves Registration Service in France and who acted as an investigator and a locater of missing bodies.

Mr. Richards told me—and some 20 other men who were also present at the time, and engaged in the same work, also agreed to the statement—that there are still several hundred bodies in the Argonne Forest that could be located and brought in, but that this work was never vigorously pushed, and that there is absolutely no work of that kind going on now. The inhabitants of the village, which has suffered severely from shell fire, are of a very nice type, but they are loud in their denunciation of the Americans, and especially of the officers who are in command, for the unsympathetic way they handled the American bodies. I found no chapel at this cemetery, and no place where any service could be held, and if it were not for the hostess house it would be a very sad condition indeed. In my wanderings over the reservation I came to the warehouse—at least that was what it resembled to me, though I was later informed that it was a morgue—and resting in this morgue I counted 16 caskets, and upon questioning I was informed that these were to be buried at a later date. The caskets were of the same type as those which our boys were sent home in, and each casket was covered with a flag. There could be no complaint along these lines, except that there was no honor guard, and there seemed to be no good reason for the bodies resting in the morgue.

I next visited Somme American Cemetery, in Bony, Aisne, France. I found this cemetery in a deplorable condition—in fact, most of the bodies are still lying as buried during hostilities—and those in charge informed me that none of these bodies had caskets, but were just buried in blankets and such as could be done under the circumstances existing at that time. There is a lot of room for improvement here. I have been led to believe that there has been some influences brought to bear in Washington, D. C., to prevent the disinterment of these bodies; or, in other words, some influences have been working to prevent these boys receiving the same honors as those in the other cemeteries. And I might add that there are 698 unknown soldiers in this cemetery, and if they were disinterred the presumption is that a large number of these unknowns would be identified. The same could be said regarding Fere en Tordenois, Chateau Thierry, Belleau Woods, for in these cemeteries there are also many who have not been disinterred and been given the proper military burial.

Flanders Field Cemetery was next visited and found to be in a splendid condition; and then Brookwood, in England, was visited and also found in a splendid condition.

There are a great many nasty rumors current in the American quarters that there has been a lot of extravagance and also insufficient handling of funds. One rumor, I might add, and which seems to have a lot of truth in it was to the effect that several thousand embalmers were sent to France to embalm bodies that had been in earth for over a year; and, of course, everyone knows that bodies that have been in the earth for upward of a year can not be embalmed.

When the big lay-off came over there the first work that was stopped was the locating of missing bodies, and yet it was known that as the days go on it becomes more difficult to locate those who are missing; and yet there is still held on the pay roll at several thousand dollars per year salary a labor foreman to keep 17 laborers and also an engineer and an assistant engineer at some thousand dollars salary to keep these same 17 men employed; and it seems, my dear Congressman, that this money could be used to better advantage in locating the missing bodies.

One of the things that hurt me most in our national cemeteries was the utter lack of respect for our fallen heroes. As I was guided to the different graves I was amazed at the number of graves that we trod upon; in fact, we made the shortest cuts possible and dodged around crosses. I realized then how sad it must be if some mother was taken over the same route that I traveled; and, my dear Congressman, it was known in France that I was there as the representative of the National Disabled Soldiers' League, and that I was securing data for that organization. This incident brought out to me very strongly that those who are to remain permanently in our American cemeteries should be trained personnel, and I believe, my dear Congressman, that the finest persons that the Government select will be disabled soldiers especially trained by the United States Veterans' Bureau for this work.

We will then have some assurance that those who visit our national cemeteries in France will be made to feel that the United States Government really welcomes them, and that an honest effort is being made to show that the Government appreciates the sacrifices made, and if this plan were accepted, you will appreciate, I am sure, that these men would be trained in the various problems that would arise in a cemetery, and therefore would be equipped to represent the Government in a very greater extent than is now the case with the present incumbents, and also it would furnish a means of rehabilitating 150 disabled men.

The Young Women's Christian Association, which maintains the hostess house at Romagne, should be commended and encouraged to carry on the splendid work that they are now doing; but I assure you that they will not be able to go on much longer in the tumble-down shack that the Government provided for them, and which they are now holding forth in. In my humble opinion, the Government should provide a splendid hostess house at Romagne, and allow this organization, the Young Women's Christian Association, to continue on, because they are furnishing to-day the only real sympathetic comfort in this the largest of our cemeteries in Europe.

After your appropriation is made to continue this graves-registration work in France, the work will be immediately resumed, I believe, and it would be a godsend, my dear Congressman, if some provision were made whereby the Americans who are now in France would be employed, because, I believe, you will agree that in this work the majority of the employees should be Americans and this provision would help a great many of our Americans who are overseas, 90 per cent of whom are ex-service men, and who have married French or Belgian wives and have made their homes overseas.

The selection of the national cemeteries in France I sometimes think has not been the wisest, because of the great distances from railroads and other transportation means, but then there may be some good reason for the selection of these sites, but surely, my dear Congressman, there should be some obligation to furnish transportation from the nearest railroad station to these cemeteries, because the majority of these people, relatives of those who have been left overseas, are not wealthy people, and in many cases feel keenly this added expense.

The day that I was in Fere en Tardenois a Frenchman was walking around the cemetery, and he was addressed by one of the employees of the cemetery, and asked what his business was, and his reply was this: "This is my ground; you have not paid me for it, and until such time as you do I intend to walk around. It is about time that your rich Government paid a poor man like me." I have no reason to doubt this Frenchman, and I believe if you will inquire at the American Graves Registration Service in Washington, D. C., that this could be sustained, and if it is, well, it is a sad condition of affairs. I was confidently informed in the Paris office of the American Graves Registration Service that we have other cemeteries which have not been paid for.

MARCH 1, 1923.

I had originally intended, my dear Congressman, to make this letter some 15 pages in length, so that you could get a good, clear idea of my observations during my recent trip to France, but due to a return of my disability contracted in service, I have been confined to bed until to-day, and realized that Congress will very shortly adjourn. I send this letter, such as it is, trusting that you will overlook the various mistakes and corrections, be-

cause this work has been performed by a disabled soldier whom we are trying to rehabilitate, so that he can once more enter a gainful occupation, and as he is not very proficient upon the machine, hence these many errors do not give you all the details that I intended; but if you are still interested, and if it would do any good, I shall be very glad to immediately forward the rest to you.

I do, in the name of the National Disabled Soldiers' League, extend our appreciation for your interest.

Yours very respectfully,

THOMAS V. FIELDS,
State Commander, Chairman Overseas Committee.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I do not have the honor of a personal acquaintance with Commander Thomas V. Fields, of Jersey City, the author of the communication, but the fact that he is the commander for the State of New Jersey and the chairman of the overseas committee of the National Disabled Soldiers' League ought to be a sufficient evidence of his character and responsibility, and, therefore, of the accuracy of the statements contained in the document I have placed in the RECORD.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WINGO. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 276, nays 34, answering "present" 2, not voting 114, as follows:

YEAS—276.

Abernethy	Dyer	Lankford	Roach
Anderson	Elliott	Larsen, Ga.	Robertson
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans	Lawrence	Robsion
Ansorge	Fairchild	Lazaro	Rodenberg
Anthony	Fairfield	Lea, Calif.	Rossdale
Appleby	Faust	Leatherwood	Rouse
Aswell	Favrot	Lee, Ga.	Rucker
Atkeson	Fess	Lee, N. Y.	Sabath
Bacharach	Fields	Lehlbach	Sanders, Ind.
Bankhead	Fish	Lineberger	Sanders, Tex.
Barbour	Fisher	Little	Sandlin
Barkley	Fitzgerald	Logan	Schall
Beck	Focht	London	Scott, Tenn.
Beedy	Fordney	Lowrey	Shaw
Begg	Foster	Luhring	Shreve
Bell	Free	Lyon	Siegel
Benham	French	McArthur	Sinclair
Bixler	Fuller	McDuffie	Sinnott
Black	Fulmer	McFadden	Sisson
Bland, Ind.	Funk	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Bland, Va.	Gahn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smithwick
Blanton	Garrett, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snell
Boies	Garrett, Tex.	McPherson	Snyder
Bond	Gensman	McSwain	Speaks
Bowers	Gernerd	Madden	Sproul
Bowling	Gifford	Magee	Steagall
Box	Gilbert	Mansfield	Stedman
Brand	Goldsborough	Mapes	Stevenson
Briggs	Goodykoontz	Martin	Strong, Kans.
Brooks, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Mead	Strong, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Green, Iowa	Michener	Sumners, Tex.
Burtness	Greene, Mass.	Miller	Swank
Butler	Griest	Moore, Ohio	Sweet
Byrnes, S. C.	Hadley	Moore, Va.	Swing
Byrns, Tenn.	Hammer	Morgan	Taylor, Colo.
Campbell, Kans.	Haugen	Morin	Ten Eyck
Campbell, Pa.	Hawley	Mott	Thompson
Cantrill	Hayden	Murphy	Timberlake
Carter	Herrick	Nelson, Me.	Tincher
Chalmers	Hersey	Nelson, A. P.	Towner
Chandler, Okla.	Hickey	Nelson, J. M.	Turner
Chindblom	Himes	Newton, Minn.	Tyson
Clague	Hoch	Newton, Mo.	Upshaw
Clarke, N. Y.	Hooker	Nolan	Vaile
Cole, Iowa	Huddleston	Norton	Vestal
Cole, Ohio	Hudspeth	O'Brien	Vinson
Collier	Hull	O'Connor	Voigt
Collins	Humphrey, Nebr.	Ogden	Volk
Colton	Humphreys, Miss.	Oldfield	Volstead
Connally, Tex.	Hutchinson	Oliver	Walters
Cooper, Ohio.	Ireland	Parker, N. Y.	Ward, N. C.
Cooper, Wis.	James	Parks, Ark.	Wason
Coughlin	Jefferis, Nebr.	Patterson, N. J.	Watson
Crago	Jeffers, Ala.	Paul	Weaver
Cramton	Johnson, Ky.	Perlman	Webster
Crisp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Petersen	White, Kans.
Crowther	Kearns	Pringey	Williams, Ill.
Curry	Kelly, Pa.	Purnell	Williamson
Dale	Kendall	Quin	Wilson
Dallinger	Ketcham	Rainey, Ill.	Wingo
Darrow	Kincheloe	Raker	Woods, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Kissel	Ramseyer	Wright
Dempsey	Kleczka	Rankin	Wurzbach
Dickinson	Kline, Pa.	Ransley	Wyant
Dominick	Knutson	Rayburn	Yates
Doughton	Kopp	Reece	Young
Dowell	Kraus	Reed, N. Y.	Zihlman
Driver	Kunz	Reed, W. Va.	
Dunbar	Lampert	Rhodes	
Dupré	Langley	Ricketts	

NAYS—34.

Ackerman	Frothingham	Moores, Ind.	Taylor, N. J.
Andrew, Mass.	Gallivan	Parker, N. J.	Temple
Burdick	Glynn	Perkins	Tilson
Burton	Greene, Vt.	Radcliffe	Tinkham
Cannon	Hill	Reber	Tucker
Deal	Husted	Riordan	Underhill
Dunn	Kreider	Stafford	Winslow
Edmonds	Luce	Stephens	
Fenn	MacGregor	Tague	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Johnson, Wash. Ward, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—114.

Almon	Freeman	Knight	Rosenbloom
Arentz	Garner	Lanham	Ryan
Bird	Gorman	Larson, Minn.	Sanders, N. Y.
Blakeney	Gould	Layton	Scott, Mich.
Brennan	Graham, Pa.	Linthicum	Sears
Britten	Griffin	Longworth	Shelton
Brooks, Ill.	Hardy, Colo.	McClintic	Slemp
Brown, Tenn.	Hardy, Tex.	McCormick	Smith, Mich.
Browne, Wis.	Hawes	McLaughlin, Pa.	Steenerson
Buchanan	Hays	MacLafferty	Stiness
Burke	Henry	Maloney	Stoll
Cable	Hicks	Merritt	Sullivan
Carew	Hogan	Michaelson	Summers, Wash.
Chandler, N. Y.	Huck	Mills	Taylor, Ark.
Christopherson	Hukriede	Mondell	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, Fla.	Jacoway	Montague	Thomas
Classon	Johnson, Miss.	Moore, Ill.	Thorpe
Clouse	Jones, Pa.	Mudd	Tillman
Codd	Jones, Tex.	Olpp	Treadway
Connolly, Pa.	Kahn	Overstreet	Wheeler
Copley	Keller	Paige	White, Me.
Cullen	Kelley, Mich.	Park, Ga.	Williams, Tex.
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Patterson, Mo.	Wise
Denison	Kiess	Porter	Wood, Ind.
Drane	Kindred	Pou	Woodruff
Drewry	King	Rainey, Ala.	Woodyard
Echols	Kirkpatrick	Riddick	
Ellis	Kitchin	Rogers	
Frear	Kline, N. Y.	Rose	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Mondell with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Rogers with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Almon.

Mr. Cable with Mr. Jacoway.

Mr. Hardy of Colorado with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. Longworth with Mr. Pou.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. King with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

Mr. Porter with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.

Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Jones of Texas.

Mr. Patterson of Missouri with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. WARD of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening, when his name was called?

Mr. WARD of New York. I was not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rules. He may be recorded present.

Mr. WARD of New York. I desire to be recorded present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, during the Sixty-seventh Congress the assertion has been frequently made upon the floor of the House that Massachusetts was in the saddle and that she would probably receive more than her fair share of favorable consideration. This was partially due to the fact that the Vice President of the Nation and presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the Senate, the Secretary of War, and several House chairmanships were held by men who hailed from Massachusetts. In spite of this wealth of material and position, I call your attention to the fact that Massachusetts and New England have suffered from certain legislation but more because of lack of legislation. The new tariff was not particularly favorable to New England; in fact, against our interests as a whole. Legislation which has been passed by the organization known as the farm bloc will prove anything but beneficial to New England. We have been grievously disappointed in the defeat of the Cape Cod Canal waterway project, which was in the interest of national defense and which the Government in the past has favorably considered in other similar projects located elsewhere. The merchant marine bill, of great importance to the country as a whole and of

especial importance to every State on the Atlantic seaboard and of particular importance to Massachusetts, was also defeated. Both of these measures failed of passage not by the votes of Congress but by the indirect method of filibuster by Members located to a large extent in the South and Middle West.

Experiencing the most severe climate in the country, we have been denied priorities in the movement of coal, and our people have suffered most grievously.

We have tried to secure favorable consideration for the Boston Navy Yard, one of the most thoroughly equipped plants belonging to the Government, with an overhead of less than any other navy yard, and the reputation for good work second to none. The *Leviathan*, which could have been reconditioned at this yard at a saving of several hundred thousand dollars, was sent elsewhere. More civilian employees have been discharged from this yard than any other of the Government naval stations. The steamship *Mount Vernon*, now lying in East Boston, adjacent to the Boston Navy Yard, is to be reconditioned at a considerable expense. This vessel should be repaired at the Boston yard and advantage taken of the plant and personnel, which are now almost out of commission.

I trust that when this Congress adjourns that the apparent prejudice against Massachusetts and New England will disappear and that this section of the country may receive equal consideration with other sections by the heads of the various departments. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing any individual. We have probably been the victims of circumstances.

The New England Representatives have been generous in recognizing claims of other sections of the country. Some of us may have disagreed on questions of economics, but none of us have refused to come to the assistance of any other part of the country on questions where there has been need of national aid.

I trust that the Sixty-eighth Congress may have a more kindly feeling toward New England, in spite of the fact that we have furnished some conspicuous leaders. Heaven only knows what would have become of us if we had not had them to assist in our defense.

I take this opportunity to urge every Member of Congress to visit Massachusetts. Come up from the South or West via the Cape Cod Canal, make a tour of quaint, delightful Cape Cod, visit Plymouth and the rock of your liberties, see Boston Harbor and the Commonwealth piers, upon which the State has spent over $10,000,000. Look over the wonderful plant at the Boston Navy Yard and put your feet on the deck of the *Constitution*—"Old Ironsides." Get the thrill of Concord, Lexington, Bunker Hill, Faneuil Hall—the "Cradle of Liberty"—the Old North and Old South Churches. Visit the beautiful and historic Deerfield Valley and the Berkshires. Look over quaint old Provincetown, Marblehead, and Gloucester. There is no end to the pleasure and sight-seeing awaiting you in Massachusetts and New England. It is the Nation's playgroud in the summer time. Every part of the State is accessible by excellent State roads or highways, smooth as the floor, and an automobile trip anywhere within its confines is a delight to the tourist. The people are not of the cold, austere type, but truly hospitable. Come up and get acquainted with your neighbors.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD in 8-point type an address delivered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] at the Washington Day exercises at the University of Pennsylvania. I might add, in that connection, a statement which will be of interest to his colleagues, that on that occasion the distinguished gentleman from Virginia was made a doctor of laws by that historic institution. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The address referred to is as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. A. J. MONTAGUE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA ON FEBRUARY 22, 1923, ON GEORGE WASHINGTON.

"Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Provost, Ladies, and Gentlemen, nearly a century of observance of the 22d day of February by the University of Pennsylvania deserves and commands the reverent approval of many thousands of your alumni and of your fellow citizens throughout America. Naturally have you fallen upon this patriotic custom, for Washington performed the major portion of his public services in Pennsylvania, especially in Philadelphia. In taking the note to the French commandant in 1753, protesting against further aggression upon the Ohio country, he found his most perilous journey within the confines of Pennsylvania. He presented en route a letter from the Governor of Virginia to the Governor of Pennsylvania, containing the interesting expression that young Washington was 'a person of distinction.'

"It was in Pennsylvania, at Fort Necessity in 1754, that his reckless courage bore him to a temporary victory which almost encompassed the destruction of his troops.

"It was in Pennsylvania in 1755 that he saved the remnant of the ill-fated Braddock expedition, and it was in Pennsylvania three years thereafter that he again traversed the Great Meadows to accomplish the conquest of Fort Duquesne, renaming it Fort Pitt, and unfurling the British colors from its rude ramparts.

"He revisited Pittsburgh in 1774, and thence down the Ohio by canoe to the Great Kanawha, studying all the while the possibilities of water transportation between the West and the East and the association of the contiguous colonies for the maintenance of the great enterprise.

"He became a landowner in Pennsylvania, and 1784 he sets forth to the county of Washington, wherein these lands were situated, to make an examination of them and to secure the protection of his rights therein.

"In Philadelphia he takes his seat in the first and second Continental Congresses, and from the latter he received his commission as Commander in Chief of the Continental forces, shortly thereafter returning with his army through your streets and leaving to attack with ferocious energy and great skill the enemy at Germantown, despite the tremendous odds he had to encounter. Then the heroic agony of Valley Forge, followed by his brilliant assault at Monmouth upon the enemy, who would have been captured or destroyed but for the treachery of Charles Lee (who was no kin to the Virginia Lees), which was a depressing prelude to the defeat of the incompetent Gates at Camden and the treason of Arnold at West Point. But cabal and defeat and treason could not daunt the lion-hearted commander, and he seized the opportunity, long cherished and planned, to strike southward, and Yorktown soon made one of the immortal chapters of history, for without the decisive victory at Yorktown the great Franklin said that American independence would have been set back a thousand years.

"An incomparable convention assembles in your city in 1787, and Washington presides over its momentous deliberations, from which issued the organic charter of a new republic.

"We next find him the first President of the Republic, and not long after his inauguration in New York he takes up his official residence in this city, where for some seven anxious years he administers the untried powers of a new government, with a tact and patience so extraordinary, with an energy and courage so prodigious, and with a sagacity and patriotism so consummate that his success revealed him as a magistrate and a statesman of the highest order.

"Before the days of battle, before the days of the Congress, he knew Philadelphia. Here he had been a welcome guest on more than one occasion. Here he purchased his brave clothes to appear in Boston and demand of Shirley his military rank and status. Here in his hours of recreation he attended, in 1770 and 1773, the races of the Philadelphia Jockey Club. But amidst his comings and goings, amidst his exacting labors and formidable vicissitudes, he was proudly pleased to receive the hospitality of this historic university. He attended its commencements in 1775 and 1782, and in 1787 he accompanied his hostess, Mrs. Robert Morris, to a 'charity reading' in your college hall. He sought these academic associations, not so much by reason of the delights of scholarship as by reason of the power and range of a great mind that instantly and accurately appraised the influence of collegiate training upon a young and growing people.

"He was present in 1790 to hear James Wilson deliver his introductory lecture in your law school, and he made a felicitous and appreciative recognition of your diploma, conferring upon him in 1783 the degree of doctor of laws.

"It was in Philadelphia, at the close of his term of office as President, that he delivered his immortal "Farewell Address" on the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution, which in force and prestige ranks along with George Mason's Bill of Rights and Jefferson's Declaration of Independence.

"It was his friend, Benjamin Franklin, the greatest Pennsylvanian, who selected the famous artist, Houdon, to chisel in marble the 'counterfeit presentment' of Washington that has so long adorned the rotunda of the capitol of Virginia, and which is perhaps the most priceless piece of statuary on this hemisphere.

"And when his great life closed, it was in Philadelphia that John Marshall, then a Member of Congress from the district now represented by your speaker, announced to the House of Representatives his untimely death, and within a few weeks thereafter in a 'meeting house' near this spot, in the presence

of the assembled Congress and a host of distinguished citizens and patriots, his long-time friend and neighbor, Henry Lee (the father of Robert Edward Lee), delivered a funeral oration declaring, in a memorable climax, that Washington was 'First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.'

"So when a Virginian comes to Philadelphia he comes to learn of Washington, to touch the visible associations of his activities, and to absorb the nourishing traditions and to appropriate the ideals that here took form and vigor, rather than to bring any new interpretation of his marvelous life.

"I might bring you from Virginia some faint picture of him as a youth; of the boy eager to enroll as a midshipman in His Majesty's navy; of the young surveyor doing his work with fidelity and efficiency under the authority and seal of the old and historic College of William and Mary; of his associations with the Fairfaxes and others of equal culture and refinement; of his romances and his marriage and of a love which he in his old age confessed under his own hand he had not outlived and from which he had received his first and noblest inspirations; of his happy days at Mount Vernon, with his horse and horn and hounds; of him as a planter and manager of estates; of him as a miller, a justice of the peace, a vestryman, a Mason, a neighbor, and friend; of the young burgess, maturely and decisively casting aside all social and friendly besetments to pursue with relentless conviction the recovery and establishment of what he believed to be the inalienable rights and liberties of the people of the Colonies; and of the young officer so grave and commanding and recognized by all as made of a finer metal and cast in a loftier mold than all others in the service of his Virginian colony.

"But I must desist save to suggest a bare outline of the environment within which he grew and developed. Let the sons of Massachusetts speak. In writing of the soldiers, statesmen, and jurists who were Washington's neighbors, friends, associates, and compatriots in Virginia, HENRY CABOT LODGE declares that—

"We must go back to Athens to find another instance of a society so small in numbers and yet capable of such an outburst of ability and force.

"And in more glowing words the late Senator Hoar said, in referring to this period and environment:

"What a constellation then arose upon the sky. The list of her great names in that wonderful period is like a catalogue of fixed stars. For all time the American youth who would learn the principles of liberty protected by law; who would learn to frame constitutions and statutes; who would seek models of the character of the patriot, of the statesman, of the soldier, may find instruction from her—may study her history as in a great university.

"This society was a simple but powerful environment, and in it he was bred and schooled to move upon the world's portentous stage.

"Was Washington a great military captain? The answer is found in the comparison of the resources of the two nations at war; of the number and training of the two armies; in the cabals and treachery, poverty, and suffering of the one and the unity, comfort, and appalling odds of the other; in the substantial unanimity of the British and in the ominous disloyalty in the Colonies; and in the results of the long struggle.

"In commenting upon the skill with which Washington employed his Army of 6,000 between New York and Yorktown, Cornwallis stated:

"But, after all, your excellency's achievements in New Jersey were such that nothing could surpass them.

"Frederick the Great declared this same campaign to have been the most brilliant of the century.

"When General Wilson, of the American Army, saw a portrait of Washington, by Stuart, in Wellington's home, the eldest son, the second duke, responding to an inquiry, said:

"It was placed there by my father, who esteemed Washington as perhaps the purest and the noblest character of modern times—possibly of all time—and, considering the material of the armies with which he successfully met the trained and veteran soldiers of the Old World, fairly entitles him to a place among the great captains of the eighteenth century.

"As a statesman, perhaps Washington looms larger than as a soldier. He possessed two qualities which rarely, if ever, are found in statesmen. He never desired or sought public place. A striking instance of this trait of character appears in his letter to his wife upon his appointment as commander in chief of the Continental Armies:

"I assure you, in the most solemn manner," he said, "that, so far from seeking this appointment, I have used every endeavor in my power to avoid it. * * * It was utterly out of my power to refuse this appointment without exposing my character to such censure as would have reflected dishonor upon myself and given pain to my friends."

"When, however, he accepted a public trust he was embarrassed by no diffidence or lack of confidence. He was as sure of himself in war as he was confident of himself in peace; and this self-confidence, together with his ability, his valor, and devotion, inevitably brought to him the unbounded respect and confidence of all who came in contact with him.

"We thus understand his other great quality, namely, his incomparable influence among his fellow citizens. No man in human history ever wielded so potent an influence. It was the result of his strength of mind, his vigorous sense of justice, his courage, and his unwavering devotion to the public welfare. It was this influence that held in line of service an army suffering in rags and tatters through the neglect of their States. It was this influence that secured reenlistments of soldiers whose terms of service were too short to effect their training. It was this influence that held together the dissolving bonds of the Colonies at the close of the Revolution. And it was this influence that engendered and solidified public sentiment for the establishment of a more perfect union of the States under a new Constitution.

"It is this influence which has for over a century and a quarter persuaded the American people to support a policy of opposition to foreign alliances as outlined in his farewell address. Whether Washington, if living to-day, would approve in its entirety the opinion expressed on this subject is questioned by many, in view of the changed economic, mechanical, and political conditions of the world. He approved of an alliance with France to establish the Republic. Would he approve of an alliance to save the Republic? Would he, if living, approve a league or an association of nations to preserve the peace and perhaps the civilization of the world? Would he support the establishment of a permanent international court of justice for the purpose of accomplishing a like end? To attempt an answer might violate the proprieties of this occasion, but the interest of the American people in so stupendous a subject at least justifies the inquiry.

"And it is the influence of his example that has almost read into the Constitution the salutary ineligibility of the President to hold office for a third consecutive term.

"Washington was no moralist or metaphysician. He indulged in no speculations in political philosophy. He saw troubles and he undertook to cure them. He met obstacles to the progress and freedom of the people and he at once set about to remove them.

"Earlier than any statesman of his day, unless it be Patrick Henry, he foresaw the Revolution was more than a protest against British oppression. He sought no precedents or academic reasoning to validate this conclusion. He would not debate; he would equip an army of 1,000 at his own expense and march to the assistance of Boston. He saw the necessity of separation, and he hurriedly left New York to urge upon Congress at Philadelphia the immediate adoption of a Declaration of Independence. Well does Mr. Thayer characterize him as the greatest 'actual statesman' of all time.

"Washington had the biggest mind for public business of any man that ever sat in the President's chair. He suffered no illusions. He knew man and his needs. He believed in liberty, but he also believed in order and law. He vividly saw that the Government under the Articles of Confederation was a failure. Therefore he undertook to coordinate the forces of commerce and liberty and law in order to establish a Federal union.

"In the Constitutional Convention he offered no reflections upon the growth and evolution of representative government as did Madison. The analogies of the Amphictyonic or Achaian leagues were negligible; the necessity and the practicability of the Union were obvious to him. He might not draw the details of the structure of the ship of state, but he knew that such a ship was needed, and he knew better than anybody else the dimensions and the strength of the craft, and the course and distance and object of the voyage.

"He spoke most infrequently in the convention, although he was considered as possessing the most solid information and the soundest judgment of any Member of the Continental Congress. One memorable speech he made according to the record in the convention. Leaving the chair of the presiding officer, and standing in dignity and majesty upon the floor, with emotion suppressed, and in tones of ominous solemnity, he addressed the timid and the doubting, by saying:

"It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God.

"And from this convention came the instrument declared by Gladstone to be the—

"Greatest work ever struck off at one time by the brain and purpose of man.

"Whether it was done at one time is debatable, but that it was done is largely attributable to Washington.

"He realized the significance of the achievement, and he at once exerted his great influence with pen and speech, with energy and tact, to secure its adoption by the States. This accomplished, all eyes were again turned to him as the one person to establish the government of the new constitution. He was most reluctant to accept the trust; but he responded as he did when chosen to command the armies.

He must have subscribed heartily to William Penn's practical governmental philosophy, which contains these remarkable words:

"Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined, too.

"Therefore, Washington selected great statesmen and advisers to set the clock in motion. Jefferson and Randolph, of Virginia, Hamilton, of New York, and General Knox, of Massachusetts, formed his first Cabinet. Would his example in this respect had always been followed by his successors! Washington believed as President what he believed as a member of the convention, that government was not "influence" or "advice"; that it was an institution for the maintenance and promotion of law and order and freedom under organic sanctions and limitations whereby civilization might be steadily advanced.

"He did not at first believe in parties; he thought public opinion at that time was too embryonic to be disturbed by conflicting counsels and ambitions. He would consolidate and direct public opinion solely to the establishment of the Government. So he endeavored to select a nonpartisan or coalition Cabinet. But his Cabinets were composed of such vigorous and diverse types and tempers that sooner or later conflicting views and policies inevitably arose. With extraordinary energy and sagacity he pursued his fixed purpose of first placing the Government securely upon its feet, and before he died he not only saw it surmount almost insuperable obstacles but progress in well-defined paths to a place of commanding dignity and power in the family of nations. This was the test of his statesmanship.

"The several powers of the new Government had to be tried and developed. Those relating to internal affairs—such as commerce, which was the germ of the Union—must first be dealt with. So very soon taxation and the banking powers of the Federal Government became acute controversies.

"The relations of the Executive to the legislative department involved delicate and difficult treatment. His own relations with the Senate give an interesting chapter in the political history of our country.

"Taking advantage of the so-called 'whisky insurrection' in Pennsylvania, he procured the act of February 28, 1795, 'to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions,' which was, rightfully or wrongfully, as viewed by the Southern and Northern States, invoked by Abraham Lincoln, regarded the most illustrious of Washington's successors, in calling out troops in the late war between the States.

"The Genet episode well illustrates his Americanism and his application of the usages of foreign intercourse. The gratitude of America to France and the reaction of the French Revolution upon American democracy lent to Genet's meddlesome conduct a dangerous popularity. Washington struck at the appropriate hour, Genet was recalled, and henceforth America was master in its own house.

"Yet withal, and in spite of his inexperience in foreign affairs, he dealt with France, our great ally in the Revolution, a nation so conventional and sensitively proud, in a manner so tactful, wise, and firm as to preserve peace throughout his entire administration and at the same time to retain the affections of this high-strung and generous people.

"Time and occasion forbid any further mention of his varying activities, many of which only need to be recalled to experience an exaltation of our patriotism. He has passed into the ages, and his immortal fame is beyond the detraction of men.

"For many years," says Mr. LODGE, "I have studied minutely the career of Washington, and with every step the greatness of the man has grown upon me; every analysis has failed to discover the act of his life which, under the conditions of the time, I could unhesitatingly pronounce to have been an error."

"Thomas Jefferson said of him that he was—

"The only man in the United States who possessed the confidence of all. There was no other one who was considered as anything more than a party leader.

"The whole of his character was in its mass perfect, in nothing bad, in a few points indifferent. And it may be truly said that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies have merited from man an everlasting remembrance."

"Upon his death Napoleon issued a decree from which I beg to quote the following:

"The name of Washington is inseparably linked with a memorable epoch. He adorned this epoch by his talents and the nobility of his character, and with virtues that even envy dared not assail. History offers few examples of such renown. Great from the outset of his career, patriotic before his country had become a Nation, brilliant and universal despite the passions and political resentments that would gladly have checked his career, his fame is to-day imperishable, fortune having consecrated his claim to greatness, while the prosperity of a people destined for grand achievements is the best evidence of a fame ever to increase.

"Lord Brougham, with entrancing language, declared:

"It will be the duty of the historian and the sage, in all ages, to let no occasion pass of commemorating this illustrious man; and until time shall be no more will a test of the progress which our race has made in wisdom and in virtue be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington.

"If I can not add to these veracious tributes no word of mine shall detract from them. I beg, nevertheless, in this presence to voice my opinion that Washington was easily the most transcendent figure in the world of his day, and that in the immeasurable epoch through which he moved he was at once the Army, the Revolution, the Constitution, and the Government of these United States."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill which has just been passed. I have not had time to say what I do not know about this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING AGENTS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4637, for the relief of certain disbursing agents under the Department of Commerce, and asks unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts calls up a Senate bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the respective accounts of disbursing agents under the Department of Commerce for payments of loss by exchange on salary and per diem checks issued under appropriations respectively for the fiscal years 1917 to 1922, inclusive, containing a provision for "exchange on official checks," the accounts of which payments may have been heretofore settled or may hereafter become the matter of settlement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us how much this will involve?

Mr. WINSLOW. It will involve about $20,000, and it does not take any money out of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, the proposition in respect of this measure is this: It does not take any money out of the Treasury. Under the practice of the disbursing agents of the Department of Commerce in various parts of the world, outside of the United States, they were allowed to make up to those on the pay rolls whatever may have been lost to them by virtue of variation in rates of exchange. They had reimbursed employees of the Government who had so suffered. The department here in Washington suddenly determined that they would not recognize that allowance and that determination was made without advice of the fact being sent early enough to the disbursing agents abroad. These disbursing agents kept on making good to those whom they had to pay, and one day they were refused reimbursement from the Washington office.

That meant that various disbursing agents lost sums ranging from $1,000 up and down, to the total amount of about $20,000, which they have had to pay out of their own pockets. The money has already been appropriated, but through one of those funny quirks and twists which we hear about in the departments these disbursing agents can not be reimbursed. The query is, Shall we let a lot of good fellows, who have been doing their duty along the lines of a previous custom, with the approval of the department, suffer for the want of this reimbursement?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the situation, this money has already been appropriated.

Mr. WINSLOW. Quite so.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the only reason this is necessary is in order to correct a situation brought about by a decision of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WINSLOW. Quite so; after the previous method had been followed for a number of years.

Mr. BARKLEY. It resolves itself into a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE RIVER.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 3874) granting the consent of Congress for a bridge across the Rio Grande River was passed by the House this afternoon, and I shall ask that a resolution be sent to the Senate requesting the return of the bill to the House. The situation is this: This afternoon, in the effort of the leader of the majority to help along the cause of passing bills, by accident this particular bill got into his grist and went through the House. It was not intended that it should go through. All of the people interested in the bill were equally asleep or otherwise missed the cue and failed to follow the gentle and soothing mumbling of the reading clerk. An injustice has been done by passing the bill to the people in interest. The purpose is to send the bill back to the Senate and in the interest of everyone have it returned to the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not very probable that by this time the Senate has passed the bill? It takes very quick action sometimes.

Mr. WINSLOW. It was a Senate bill that we passed, and it was the wrong one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution.

Resolved, That the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to return to the House the bill (S. 3874) granting the consent of Congress for a bridge across the Rio Grande River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

JOINT COMMISSION OF GOLD AND SILVER INQUIRY.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 287, creating the joint commission of gold and silver inquiry, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri moves to suspend the rules and pass the Senate Joint Resolution 287 as amended, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 287.

Resolved, etc., That a joint commission is hereby created, to be known as the joint commission of gold and silver inquiry, which shall consist of five Senators, three of whom shall be members of the majority party and two of whom shall be members of the minority party, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Representatives, three of whom shall be members of the majority party and two of whom shall be members of the minority party, to be appointed by the Speaker.

Said commission shall investigate and report to the Congress on January 1, 1924, upon the following subjects:

1. The causes of the continuing decrease in the production of gold and silver.

2. The causes of the depressed condition of the gold and silver industry in the United States.

3. The production, reduction, refining, transportation, marketing, sale, and uses of gold and silver in the United States and elsewhere.

4. The effect of the decreased production of gold and silver upon commerce, industry, exchange, and prices.

The said commission is further authorized:

1. To confer with citizens, associations, or corporations of foreign countries with a view to the stabilization and wider use of silver in exchange.

2. To propose, either formally or informally, to the President of the United States, or the heads of the proper departments, plans for negotiations with foreign governments to the same end.

The commission shall include in its report recommendations for legislation which in its opinion will tend to remedy existing conditions and shall specifically report upon the limitations of the powers of Congress in enacting relief legislation.

The commission shall elect its chairman, and vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

The commission or any subcommittee of its members is authorized to sit during the sessions, recesses, or adjournments of the Sixty-seventh and Sixty-eighth Congresses in the District of Columbia or elsewhere in continental United States, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such personal services and incur such expenses as may be necessary, not to exceed the sum of $15,000, to carry out the purposes of this resolution; such expenditure shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate and the House of Representatives in equal proportions, upon vouchers authorized by the committee and signed by the chairman thereof, and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, miscellaneous items, and expenses of special select committees, the sum of $7,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution, for the payment of one-half of the expense herein authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Texas to 20 minutes.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is the resolution that came up two or three days ago on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] saw fit to object. The first thing to which I wish to call the attention of the House is that this resolution has been amended in such a way as to meet certain suggestions by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr GRAHAM] and the objections of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate has already passed this resolution. The House Committee on Mines and Mining has reported the resolution. It is on both the Unanimous Consent and Union Calendars. The House Committee on Mines and Mining, while it did not hold extensive hearings on this resolution, had before it some of the witnesses who appeared before the Senate Committee on Mines and Mining, and we examined very carefully the hearings which were held by that committee.

We found that a large number of men, eminent economists and authorities on the question of mining and metallurgy, appeared before the committee and gave testimony. It was the consensus of opinion among those who testified that a most unusual condition exists in the United States with regard to the gold and silver industry. In fact, gentlemen, we have never seen a time in our day and generation when such unusual conditions confront the gold and silver mining industry of the United States. In the first place, during the war period a great many gold and silver mines in the United States were compelled to close down because of the high cost of operation. The price of silver to-day, I believe, is about 67 cents per ounce; and if it were not for the fact that under existing law the price of silver is fixed, to-day it would probably be 56 or 57 cents an ounce.

In other words, on the expiration of the Pittman Act, which will expire by virtue of its own terms within the next seven months, or, I should say, when 270,000,000 ounces of silver shall have been purchased, the opinion of the people best informed on the subject is that the price of silver will fall below 60 cents per ounce. It is apparent unless something is done to secure a better market for silver the price of silver must fall. Another thing, gentlemen, because of the consequences of the great World War every country in continental Europe has already begun to debase its silver currency. England is doing it, and a great many subject countries of the British Empire are doing it. It is also true in the oriental countries. The greatest market for American silver is found in China and in India, and the testimony of Professor Jenks on this point, who appeared before the Senate Committee on Mines and Mining, was corroborated by the testimony of other eminent men.

They believe that steps ought to be taken at once on the part of the United States to prevent, if possible, the disaster that is sure to follow. Professor Jenks is the man President Roosevelt sent in 1901 to the Far East to study monetary conditions in that country. He is the man who went to Mexico in 1904 for the purpose of making a study of the mining and monetary questions of that country, and this House will do well to give heed to the evidence that is set forth in this wonderful report of the Senate Mining Committee. I want to submit, gentlemen of the House, this fact, that the world's annual production of gold has been rapidly declining the last few years. Do you know, my friends, in 1919 more gold went into jewelry and in the fine arts in the United States than was produced that year. The judgment of your committee is that the commission should be created for the purpose of making an inquiry into this subject and submitting to Congress the result of such inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. How much time have I used?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed nine minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RHODES. If the gentleman will make it brief, I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The Congress closes to-morrow at noon. Does not the gentleman think it a wise provision to limit the members of this committee to the Members of the Sixty-eighth Congress?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, if it had not been for the persistent inconsistency of the gentleman from Texas, which marks his usual course, this bill would have passed this House two days ago.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Texas——

Mr. RHODES. I decline to yield further, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserves the remainder of his time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five minutes.

Mr. Speaker, whenever you put a coal of fire on a terrapin's back the terrapin is going to move. I asked the gentleman from Missouri a courteous question and a pertinent question, and a question that deserved a courteous answer.

Mr. RHODES. Which the gentleman from Texas refused to give this gentleman day before yesterday.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, the gentleman from Missouri is not going to interfere with my speech, not at all, so he may just as well sit down. He was discourteous to me when I asked him a courteous question. This Congress closes to-morrow at noon. Oh, yes it does, regardless of your head shaking, unless the gentleman has lost his bearings.

The Sixty-seventh Congress closes at noon to-morrow, and yet the resolution that the gentleman has brought in here for passage at this late hour does not limit the appointment of these five Congressmen from the House of Representatives to the Sixty-eighth Congress. If this resolution passes and becomes a law, the Speaker could appoint five "lame ducks" from the present Congress on this committee.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not now. Let me illustrate, for instance: He could appoint a "lame duck" from Missouri on this commission. [Laughter.] He could appoint a "lame duck" from out in Nevada. He could appoint a "lame duck" from any other part of the West; and they would serve. [Laughter.]

It is true that this resolution does not provide any salary, but I have seen resolutions like this pass before. There was one passed in the Sixty-fifth Congress in its dying days, and it did not provide for any salary for men who were retiring from Congress. But after the Congress closed up and the retiring "lame-duck" Members were put on that board, the Congress came along later on and allowed them $7,500 a year salary.

I know something about these resolutions, although I have been here only a comparatively short time. I have been watchful in the closing hours of Congress. I sat up here all night long when the Sixty-fifth Congress closed, when we had just such resolutions, and we are still having them.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. You let a fellow want to get on a junket, and he is afraid his junket is going to fail, and he realizes that the hours are fleeting, and he gets in a bad humor; and when you ask him a courteous question he gets mad and answers you discourteously. That is not right.

Now let me tell you something about this resolution. These five Congressmen and these five Senators who would be appointed under this resolution could meet together to-morrow evening and plan their first meeting in San Francisco a week from to-morrow. They could employ their stenographers and take them with them, and their clerical help, and they could go out there on the Pacific coast and spend three months summering on the coast.

Let me tell you about the stenographers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield myself five minutes more. [Laughter.]

Did you know that over in the House Office Building right now—or we did have them to-day—we have four reporters who usually serve committees, stenographic reporters, who draw $6,000 a year of the people's money? And, beginning to-morrow, if the rumors are correct, and no special session is called, they will not have one single thing to do from to-morrow until the 1st of December next. But they will draw this $6,000 a year of the people's money and do nothing for nine months.

Mr. TILSON. How about the gentleman from Texas? Is he not going to take a little rest from now until then? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Connecticut could see my desk now, piled up with papers a foot or two high, he would understand that there is probably two or three months' hard work there right now. I want to tell you something: When the distinguished parliamentarian of this House who hails from Connecticut goes home next week he will have to begin to answer questions that the people will ask him, and he will think he has done more to earn his money by answering those questions than he ever did to earn it before, because it is going to be the hardest task he ever performed to answer those questions satisfactorily to the people. [Laughter.]

You are going to have a job in front of you, Brother TILSON, and that is one reason why at least five other Congressmen do not want to go home. [Laughter.] They want to go on a nine months' junket so that they can visit Seattle and San Francisco and Miami, Fla., and Boston, and elsewhere here and there, until January 1, 1924, and spend $15,000 and more of the people's money.

I want to tell you something about what these special committees have cost lately. I will not mention this $600,000 coal committee—$600,000 that you are giving that coal committee when the winter is now over. But let me call your attention to what a few select committees of this kind have cost. I will not talk about the special committee that you provided for last night, chosen from the membership of the Committee on Agriculture—another junketing committee. That has just $5,000 to expend. But you had another so-called agricultural one not long ago that traveled over a large part of the United States. Here is what it cost the people of this country: It cost $10,913.21. Those figures are correct, because I got them from the office of my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and his figures are always correct when you go to his expert bookkeeper in there and get them. [Laughter.]

Now, let me tell you what the distinguished Joe Walsh committee cost, the committee that went out to the Pacific coast in a special train of Pullman cars and lived in them for months out there, from California to Seattle. Do you know how much that Joe Walsh junketing trip cost? It cost $43,969.04. Tell me one single benefit that the people have ever gotten out of it. Then let me come down to the special junketing committee of the new floor leader of the House, my dear friend from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

How much did his special committee cost? Let me tell you. He never has told you. I have been waiting for him to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has occupied 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I am constrained to yield myself two minutes more. Let me show you what this special Graham committee cost. It cost $157,109.91. Ah, my colleagues, you ought to stop it. It is not right. It is not just to the people. Let me tell you what the Bergdoll committee cost—$6,441.85. That report, filed by that distinguished committee, has been pigeonholed for over a year. That report recommended to Congress that it take action against the Army officers of our Government who let that infamous draft dodger escape. You have let that resolution sleep in the pigeonhole for months. You have not called it up. Why do you not call that up and take proper action on it before you call up another?

I do not blame the gentleman from Missouri for getting angry at me, because he knew what I was going to tell him. I plead guilty; I have kept you for two days from passing this resolution. I am not ashamed of it; I am going to the American people with my record on it. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, if there was any need for this commission I, for one, would not object to what it cost to carry it out. But I can not understand why we should have a joint commission, to be known as the joint commission on gold and silver inquiry. As I understand it now, we have the Interior Department, and in that department we have a bureau of experts under the Bureau of Mines. That is all that that department is for, is to investigate just such matters as the commission appointed under this resolution would investigate, and the Government of the United States is paying for that service now. I can not understand, gentlemen of the House, why, in this late hour of the session, when the majority have declined to allow the cotton-producing States of this Union to bring in a resolution that has been unanimously indorsed from the Senate on down through the Rules Committee, and by agreement we were to vote on it to combat the boll weevil, why

this resolution, which will cost we know not how much to investigate, something about gold and silver? Why take up the time of the House with this?

If you are not going to pass any more major legislation, why not adjourn, observe the Lord's day, go to church to-morrow morning instead of sitting here passing a junketing trip? That is what you are doing. The majority leader—and I like him; I think he is a nice man—allows this matter to be considered, but when it comes to the question of doing anything for the cotton farmer of the South, he can not see what in the world nitrate of soda and calcium arsenate has to do with the boll weevil. [Laughter.] He is willing that we should come here at this late hour to-night to pass this resolution. Listen to it. It says "to employ such personal services and incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this article."

Now, that is an open proposition—it allows them to spend any amount of money they want to. I think we had better go to church in the morning, read the prayer book, get down on our knees, and pray to God to forgive us for some of the things we have voted for here and are passing at this late hour in the session. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the practical situation which confronts us about this matter is somewhat peculiar, and I think for the purposes of the RECORD it should be stated. I sympathize with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and by my friend from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS], but here is the practical condition: The Senate passed this resolution some days ago. To-day the Senate passed another simple Senate resolution, providing to go it alone in the event that the joint resolution does not pass. The Senate resolution providing for the committee to go it alone is absolutely unlimited as to expenditure. This resolution limits the expenses to $15,000. If this shall pass, therefore, it will take the place of an independent Senate committee and will be a joint committee. That is the peculiar situation with which we are confronted, and I think it is in the interest of economy to agree to it.

Mr. OLIVER. Was there a proviso in the Senate resolution that this should supersede that in the event that this would pass?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I can not say about that, but I understand that it will do so.

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Do I understand that the gentleman is for this resolution because he thinks it is less harmful than the Senate resolution, or because he thinks this resolution is right?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So far as my investigation of the resolution has gone, I think it has merit justifying its support, standing alone; but certainly under the conditions that confront us I think we should pass the resolution.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I can answer the last question that was asked of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] by saying that if this resolution does pass, it does supersede the Senate resolution. The Senate passed that resolution this afternoon, fearing that we were not going to pass this, and owing to the very great interest which this resolution has to the western mining States, they wanted to be sure and have this investigation.

The trouble with most of the speeches made against the resolution is that the gentlemen who have made them apparently have not listened to the reading of the resolution. It limits the cost to $15,000. There can not be any junket to Europe or even to San Francisco or scarcely any other place on the $15,000, one half of it limited to the House and the other half to the Senate.

The United States produces 80 per cent of all of the silver of the world. Canada produces some and Mexico produces some. This continent produces 90 per cent of all of the silver in the world, and yet the price of silver is fixed every morning by four gentlemen in London in the employ of the Bank of England, where they produce no silver. To-day they are paying 67 cents an ounce, and they are selling it to China and India for $1.20 and $1.30 an ounce.

Gentlemen will remember that some time ago Will Rogers, the comedian, said that the American people never lost a war and never won a conference. That is absolutely true, and as a matter of fact when it comes to international conferences we get the worst of it. If there ever was a time in the history of this country when we ought to have a high-class commission to determine the monetary condition in respect to the production of gold and silver and the price we shall get for it, it is at the present time. We want to investigate these smelting charges; we want to investigate the freight charges; we want to investigate international speculation in silver; and we want to stabilize the production of silver and gold in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON].

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 287. This provides for a fact-finding commission who will be authorized to go carefully into the entire situation as it affects the mining industry in America. No investigation has ever been conducted in this country by Congress of the mining industry. It is one of the basic industries of the country. More and more the business of mining is being conducted on a scientific basis. Formerly the element of chance entered largely into the business. It has always been a hazardous business, but the element of chance is now largely removed. Many of the best citizens of this country are engaged in mining and have invested large sums of money. They are entitled to every effort on the part of this Government to protect them in their rights and to give them the benefit of the best information obtainable in carrying on their business. There is no source to which the mining industry may go now for accurate and definite information as to the cause of the widespread depression in the mining industry.

In 1915 the world's production of silver was between 180,000,000 and 200,000,000 ounces. Of that amount we produced in this country about 101,000,000 ounces. That production has decreased until our production this year will probably not reach 50,000,000 ounces. Just now the industry is stimulated by reason of the Pittman Act, but that act will expire in October or November of this year, and just what the result will be on the mining business no one can foretell.

Reference has been made here to the work of the Bureau of Mines, and gentlemen have contended that that bureau can supply whatever information is needed. No one who is informed will question the good work being done by the Bureau of Mines, but it has no facilities, nor no money, to conduct the investigation contemplated by this resolution. We want to know facts concerning the freight rates being charged producers of ores. These rates are determined by the value of the commodity shipped. Who is in a position to state the value of ores as they come from the mines of the country? Men everywhere engaged in this important work are contending that their freight rates are excessive. Who is able to give us accurate information concerning the necessary costs of smelting the ores? No one. The producers in this country are entitled to that information. Who can tell us about the business of marketing the silver and gold produced in this country? So far as I know no one can give accurate and needed information.

This anomalous condition obtains: More than 80 per cent of the silver of the world is produced on the American continent, yet the price of it is determined every day in London by four brokers who are not engaged in any way whatsoever in the production of silver. England is not a silver-producing country, and yet these four men in the great city of London determine how much our producers receive. Can anyone now suggest a remedy to prevent this peculiar condition? Surely the gentlemen who have opposed this resolution have not suggested any remedy and I feel sure are not in a position to suggest one. All the conditions surrounding the mining industry, particularly those conditions affecting the cost of production, can be determined by a commission of this kind, and, in my judgment, is the only way in which the necessary facts can be obtained.

We have made every effort to extend necessary credit to the farmers and stock growers of this country. A great number of bills have passed this Congress, all of which I have supported. It does seem to me that consideration should also be given to this other great basic industry. There seems to be a peculiar relationship existing between the price of silver and gold and the price of agricultural products. Just what this relationship is seems hard to determine, but it is a fact that whenever a low price is paid for silver the farmers receive a low price for their commodities, and the reverse of this is also true that whenever the mines of the country prosper and the producers of metal are receiving adequate compensation, then the price of agricultural products throughout the United States is high. We know that our commerce, especially with the Orient, is affected to a very great extent by the production and use of silver particularly. There is no question but what the production of silver upon a paying basis greatly increases our commerce with China.

Another fact is also noticeable, that since the cost of producing silver has been so high nearly all of the nations who use silver as a subsidiary currency have debased their currency. A restriction of the use of the precious metals or the debasement of a metallic currency means fiat money. Certainly this country, in view of the conditions that now exist in Europe, ought to take every reasonable step to prevent the further debasement of currency abroad. It ought to do everything possible to stabilize the medium of exchange between this and other countries. While there is in India particularly a parity existing between silver and gold, it can not be denied that both in that country and in China silver is the chief medium of exchange.

It therefore follows from a consideration of these facts that the production of silver and gold in this country has a remarkable influence upon the commerce and business prosperity of the entire world. It is contended by those who are informed that many of the silver producers in this country can not continue operations after the expiration of the Pittman Act; that unless the cost of the production of the precious metal is reduced there will be widespread depression in the mining business if that industry is not permanently crippled.

In view of these conditions I have urged constantly the necessity of making this investigation at an early date. Our Committee on Mines and Mining reported in favor of this resolution unanimously. Some gentlemen on the floor of this House have urged that the expense of this commission ought to be limited. I have no patience with this attitude. It will be limited; this commission will not be unduly extravagant. Mining is one of the big industries of this country. It is the source of much of the wealth of the United States. Millions of dollars have been paid as taxes by those engaged in the mining business, and now Members of Congress seem unwilling to have an investigation made unless the expense of the commission is limited to $15,000. I regard this as a narrow policy, and not only a reflection upon those who will be appointed on the commission but a reflection upon the mining industry itself. This great industry should be helped, and whatever is required to make a full and complete investigation should be appropriated. If this House will take the broad view of this question, I am thoroughly convinced that not only the industry will be stimulated here but other nations will be encouraged in the use of silver, thereby stabilizing their currency. This result is greatly to be desired, and I am sure will go a long way toward restoring normal conditions throughout the world. There is no question in my mind but what the commerce with the Orient will be greatly increased and prosperity and peace insured both at home and abroad.

For these reasons and many others which I could give, if time permitted, I earnestly hope that this Congress will pass this resolution and that that commission will do everything possible to stimulate the great mining industry of America.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who have appeared in opposition to this measure have made a great deal of noise but have not furnished us any facts or any information. The joint commission which is proposed is to consist of Senators and Representatives. Senators and Representatives are those at the time holding a commission as such. Under this resolution no one could be appointed by the President, and I am quite sure none will be appointed by the President, except those holding commissions as Senators or Representatives at the time. So much for the lame-duck talk.

Mr. Speaker, we are tremendously interested as a Nation and as a people in the production of these metals. We are among the greatest producers of them in the world, and yet we seem to have no control whatever over the price of silver. It is highly important that the many questions involved be carefully considered, and if it is not worth the expenditure of $15,000 to have this matter investigated, well, I do not understand its importance. Mr. Speaker, no wonder the country does not have a higher opinion than it has of the Congress when gentlemen rise here in their places and talk about junkets. I have known of several commissions making investigations of subjects to be considered by the Congress, and I have known of none that did not repay the country well in the information that it furnished. [Applause.] Instead of having fewer investigations on the ground, investigations that bring Members and Senators face to face with problems they must solve, we should have more. We should have better laws and better government if we had more investigations of the matters we legislate on by the Members of the House and Senate, and I know of nothing of the sort more important than this commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that in his opinion two-thirds having voted in favor thereof——

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, division.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas demands a division.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 224, noes 17.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the joint resolution as amended was passed.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw in favor of the gentleman from New Jersey.

CLASSIFICATION OF CIVILIAN POSITIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 8928, the reclassification bill, and call it up for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey presents a conference report and calls it up for immediate consideration. The clerk will report the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report, 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. 8928) to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 4 of the amendment, line 17, after the word "classes," insert the following: "In performing the foregoing duties, the board shall follow as nearly as practicable the classification made pursuant to the Executive order of October 24, 1921."

On page 7, line 15, after the word "thereof," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

On page 7, line 21, after the word "ratings," insert the following: ", to the next higher rate within the salary range of the grade."

On page 8, line 11, after the word "shall," strike out the following: "have powers of."

On page 8, line 12, strike out "revision over" and substitute the words "may revise"; and following the word "established" insert the words "or to be established."

On page 8, line 21, after the word "dismissal," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

On page 9, line 6, after the word "dismissals," insert the words "for inefficiency."

On page 10, beginning line 6, strike out everything following the word "board" to and including the semicolon in line 10.

On page 18, line 10, strike out everything after the word "work" to and including line 3, on page 20.

On page 20, strike out everything following the word "judgment," in line 11, to and including line 6, on page 22.

On page 22, strike out everything following the word "operations," in line 17, to and including line 9, on page 25.

On page 25, strike out everything following the word "difficulty," in line 21, to and including line 3, on page 28.

On page 28, strike out everything following the word "work," in line 16, to and including line 4, on page 31.

On page 31, strike out everything following the word "work" in line 20, to and including line 4, on page 34.

On page 34, strike out everything following the word "work" in line 17, to and including line 19, on page 36.

On page 47, line 4, strike out the following: "$2,940, $3,180, $3,420, and $3,660," and insert "$3,000, $3,100, $3,200, $3,300, $3,400, $3,500, and $3,600."

On page 47, strike out the remainder of section 13 beginning with line 5.

On page 47, strike out section 14 and insert the following:

"SEC. 14. That the estimates of the expenditures and appropriations set forth in the Budget to be transmitted by the President to Congress on the first day of the next ensuing regular session shall conform to the classification herein provided, and that the rates of salary in the compensation sched-

ules shall not become effective until the first day of the fiscal year estimated for in such Budget."

THOMAS STERLING,
REED SMOOT,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
FREDERICK R. LEHLBACH,
LOUIS W. FAIRFIELD,
EUGENE BLACK,
Managers on the part of the House.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8928) to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report.

In section 3, creating the personnel classification board and imposing upon it the duty of making the classification, the House amendment to the amendment of the Senate directs the board in performing its duties to follow as nearly as practicable the classification made pursuant to the Executive order of October 24, 1921.

In section 6 the House amendment strikes out the provision permitting the board to authorize appointments at rates above the minimum for the grade.

In section 7 the House amendment limits increases in compensation to the next higher rate within the salary range of the grade.

In section 9 the House amendment clarifies the provision giving to the board power of review and revision over efficiency ratings.

In section 12 the House amendment strikes out the provision making it the duty of the board to consider what rates of compensation consistent with efficiency and economy in the Government service and the maintenance of a reasonable standard of living should be paid to the civilian employees of the Government.

In the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, in the compensation schedules, the House amendments eliminate all the typical tasks.

In the clerical-mechanical service, grade 5, the House amendment increases the rates of compensation from $2,940, $3,180, $3,420, and $3,660 to $3,000, $3,100, $3,200, $3,300, $3,400, $3,500, and $3,600. The House amendment further eliminates the provisos following thereafter.

The House amendment strikes out section 14 and substitutes therefor the following:

"SEC. 14. That the estimates of the expenditures and appropriations set forth in the Budget to be transmitted by the President to Congress on the first day of the next ensuing regular session shall conform to the classification herein provided, and that the rates of salary in the compensation schedules shall not become effective until the first day of the fiscal year estimated for in such Budget."

FREDERICK R. LEHLBACH,
EUGENE BLACK,
LOUIS W. FAIRFIELD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker——

[Cries of "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey ask for a vote?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we want an explanation of this matter. This is a matter involving millions of dollars.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief as possible, and in order to explain what resulted in the conference I deem it best to give a very brief summary of what the bill as it now stands contains and in what respect its provisions differ from the bill as it passed the House in December, 1921. The bill that is before us as a result of the conference and as the result of the series of amendments which you have just heard reported provides that there shall be created a personnel classification board, to consist of a representative of the Budget Bureau, a representative of the Civil Service Commission, and a representative of the Bureau of Efficiency, the representative of the Budget Bureau to be the chairman of this board. It provides that this board shall take the necessary steps to make the classification provided in the compensation schedules to which I will refer later, make the necessary rules and regulations, create classes, and do whatever is necessary in order that the heads of departments under the supervision of this board may allocate their employees to the proper grades and classes and fix the proper salary within the range applicable to the grade or class. It provides that a system of efficiency ratings, uniform throughout the service, under the supervision of the board, must be kept, and promotions, demotions, and dismissals must be made in accordance with the standards set forth in the system. It provides further that promotions may be made only to the next higher salary rate within the range of the grade; that any employee who now is receiving a salary in excess of the highest sum set for the grade to which he is allocated must be reduced to a salary within the range of the grade to which he belongs. These, in brief, are what are known as the administrative provisions of the bill, and I want to say that after the conference the salient provisions as to administration of the bill under consideration are the same as they were in the bill as it was passed 14 months ago, with the exception that in place of the Budget Bureau, that was carried in the bill formerly as the classifying agency, there is now provided this personnel board, of which the Chief of the Budget Bureau or his representative is a part. This is the only substantial change of the bill as it passed the House, with the exception of the compensation schedules which I propose now to state.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I will yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. To what extent, if any, has the conference report extended the provisions for men in the field service? As I understand, originally the report on the House bill related to those in the departmental service.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The provision in regard to the classification of the field service is identical with the provision of the bill which passed the House originally, which only provided that a survey of the field service be made and a classification devised and the employees in the field allocated to their proper positions, that work to be reported to the Congress for its consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then there is no provision——

Mr. LEHLBACH. It is not to put in effect the field classification without first having a report made to Congress.

Now, as to the compensation schedules, there were two sets of compensation schedules drafted in considering this question of reclassification. One was based on the report of the Joint Reclassification Commission and the other was made pursuant to an executive order issued October 24, 1921, by the Bureau of Efficiency. These two compensation schedules in practical effect differ but little one from another, and it is well known, because it has been published in the newspapers widely, that the President of the United States, who is the head of the executive departments of the Government, deemed it wise, in view of the fact that under his order the Bureau of Efficiency had made a reclassification of these compensation schedules and that the work of allocation had been practically completed by that bureau under those compensation schedules, that they be adopted rather than the compensation schedules carried in the bill as it passed the House.

The difference in cost is but little, and the increase in proportion to the pay roll of the employees in the District of Columbia is but a small amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. What increase in the total aggregate of salaries will be entailed by the operation of this new plan?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It is estimated that the total increase in the pay rolls involved in this reclassification is a little over $2,000,000, which is a trifling percentage when you consider the pay rolls of all the departments in the District of Columbia and the municipal employees.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is in addition to the present bonus?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. It is not true that in some of the schedules the difference is as much as 20 per cent between the House schedules and the Senate schedules?

Mr. LEHLBACH. No. I do not believe that there is a basis for that statement. People make their own guess as to where employees are to be allocated in the different grades and draw their own conclusions from that guess, but that is not the classification. I do not believe there are such discrepancies as the gentleman suggests between the compensation schedules of the Bureau of Efficiency and the compensation schedules based on the Reclassification Commission's report.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. In grade 1 in a schedule and grade 2 in the same schedule, is there not a difference between what was in

the bill when it passed the House and what is in the bill as it passed the Senate of from 15 to 20 per cent?

Mr. LEHLBACH. The employees embraced in the grades of one compensation schedule are not necessarily the same employees as those embraced in the grades of second compensation schedule.

Mr. EVANS. Is not the language descriptive of the employees practically the same in both cases?

Mr. LEHLBACH. No; it differs somewhat.

Now, there is just one other change that I desire to call to the attention of the House. As passed by the Senate, the compensation schedules carried long lists of typical tasks that illustrated the grade and the character of service. In the House bill no such typical tasks were included, and it was not considered to be a scientific way of drafting the compensation schedule. Upon the suggestion of the House the Senate receded from that, and the House has taken every one of those typical-task examples out of the bill.

I want to state, Mr. Speaker, in closing that this bill, with the changes in the compensation schedules made at the suggestion of the President himself, who is vitally interested in this matter, and the change of the Personnel Board in place of the Bureau of the Budget, is substantially as it passed the House in December, 1921.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will not the gentleman give us five minutes on that bill?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker, on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey moves the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 218, noes 0.

So the conference report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4280) to provide additional 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 14222) to amend the trading with the enemy act, had requested a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. ASHURST as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FRANK BELCHER.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate bill 3609 for the relief of Frank Belcher.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman from California to make that motion at this time.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] will not be able to attend the funeral of the late W. BOURKE COCKRAN. The Chair therefore appoints in his stead on that committee the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

RESIGNATION FROM A JOINT COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair submits the following communication, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender you my resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Administrative Branch of the Government, effective forthwith.

With great respect, I am sincerely yours,

J. STANLEY WEBSTER.

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY COMMITTEES.

The Chair also appoints the following committees necessary to be appointed at this time. The Clerk will report them.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to law, the Speaker appoints Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. UNDERHILL, and Mr. PARK of Georgia as the temporary Committee on Accounts; Mr. KIESS, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, and Mr. STEVENSON as the Committee on Printing; Mr. MAPES as a member of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Administrative Branch of the Government; and pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 53, Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, Mr. HERSEY, and Mr. MONTAGUE on the Special Joint Committee on Employment of Prisoners in United States Penitentiaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had returned, in accordance of the request of the House, the bill (S. 3874) granting the consent of Congress for a bridge across the Rio Grande River.

MARGARET F. KERR—HUGH S. RYDER.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 569 (Rept. 1759).

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 Margaret F. Kerr the sum of $186.66, and to Hugh S. Ryder the sum of $120, being the amount received by them per month as clerks to the late W. BOURKE COCKRAN.

Mr. IRELAND. This, Mr. Speaker, is the usual resolution, and I move its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4245) to provide the necessary organization of the customs service for an adequate administration and enforcement of the tariff act of 1922 and all other customs revenue laws.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 14429. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn.;

H. R. 14428. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Moorhead, Minn., and Fargo, N. Dak.;

H. R. 14351. An act to authorize bridging the Ohio River at Moundsville, W. Va.; and

H. R. 12378. An act granting the consent of Congress to maintain a bridge across the Rio Grande River.

LEGISLATIVE CLERK.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 565 (Rept. 1760).

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from March 1, 1923, to December 1, 1923, for the services of a legislative clerk, compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum, the said clerk to be appointed by and to be under the direction and control of the acting minority floor leader.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, among the unique things is the spectacle of a Republican offering a resolution for the Democratic minority. This is in a way an unsatisfied, unmade promise to the minority for the very splendid consideration they have given to the majority during this Congress. Several times during this Congress we have requested majority employees which seemed necessary under the conditions and which were granted, and there was no objection made by the minority leader and I can not recall that any objection was made on the special cases in mind by any of the minority. They have been unusually generous, and this resolution I hope will be passed without comment, I am sure without objection from the minority, and I hope my Republican friends will offer no opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

GEORGE A. RUSSELL.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 453 (Rept. No. 1761).

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of $600 to George A. Russell for extra services rendered in the folding room during the Sixty-seventh Congress, this sum being the difference between the salary of a regular folder at $900 per annum and that of bookkeeper at $1,200 per annum.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is for the period of the entire Congress. The recipient of this additional compensation

really served in a dual capacity through the illness and incapacity of others. He served in two places. The Doorkeeper has not been granted a bookkeeper in the folding room, and he carried on the service that is rendered in that room. This resolution is offered on the recommendation of the Doorkeeper, and I think it is really meritorious.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. We have on both sides of the aisle very efficient boys who have served here at $2.50 a day and other special employees of the House not on the rolls. They work loyally night and day. Has the gentleman got a resolution for these employees?

Mr. IRELAND. In what respect? That has nothing to do with this resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman going to offer such a resolution?

Mr. IRELAND. I have no such thing in mind.

Mr. BLANTON. This will be the first Congress that I have seen adjourned without such a resolution.

Mr. IRELAND. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I think there have been several.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

J. W. M. AUSTIN.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution:

House Resolution 544 (Rept. No. 1762).

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, $480 to J. W. M. Austin for special janitor and messenger services rendered for the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry from July 1, 1921, to July 1, 1922.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the figures "$480," and insert "$200."

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is for the janitor who served the Joint Committee on Agricultural Investigation, who worked for over 12 months on their investigations. The committee thought the claim was exorbitant and cut it better than half and recommend the passage of the resolution as amended.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The other day we raised the chief janitor of the House to $2,040 with the bonus. If the gentleman will go downstairs and look at the ceiling opposite the room of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] he will find cobwebs on the ceiling so thick that he can not see the ceiling. I thought after that janitor had his salary raised to $2,040 a year we might get rid of those cobwebs.

Mr. IRELAND. He is only the chief janitor.

Mr. BLANTON. That is in the main corridor downstairs.

Mr. IRELAND. I know that.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should be hypercritical of these allowances made to faithful helpers in connection with our work here. This evening we had occasion to note that the distinguished gentleman from Texas somewhat criticized the Official Reporters of this House.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, not the reporters of this House.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I am very glad to be corrected on that.

Mr. BLANTON. They are the most efficient men we have in this Government.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Not long ago the Washington Post carried a picture in the rotogravure edition of their paper of these gentlemen and they were designated "The sad-faced men" for the reason that they had been compelled through all these years to listen to so many congressional speeches.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTRA COMPENSATION TO CLAYTON F. MOORE AND OTHERS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, for extra services rendered and overtime work performed for the Committee on Ways and Means during the Sixty-seventh Congress, the following sums, namely: To Clayton F. Moore, $1,500; Alice V. Meeker, $500; Frank A. Kidd, $500; Albert Reid, $500; Grace Greenwood, $500; Marguerite A. Curtiss, $300; Carrie O. Rode, $300; Harry Parker, $300; and Samuel Hardy, $300.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of the language in lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "To Clayton F. Moore, $500; Alice V. Meeker, $300; Carrie L. Kidd, widow of the late Frank A. Kidd, $300; Albert Reid, $300; Grace Greenwood, $300; Marguerite A. Curtiss, $200; Carrie O. Rode, $200; Harry Parker, $200; and Samuel Hardy, $200."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman yield to me for five minutes on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. IRELAND. I do not yield at present, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk for a few minutes myself.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this resolution comes to us for additional compensation to the employees of the Committee on Ways and Means for additional work and additional time put in with that committee during the preparation of revenue and tariff bills. No one conversant with the tremendous work that was attempted during the time of the preparation of these bills will deny that the employees were taxed to their utmost, and if they had not possessed an unusual capacity, an unusual knowledge of the facts, figures, and statistics, it would likely not have been possible for the Committee on Ways and Means to have brought forth their bills in the time they did. I grant that almost every committee in this House has favored employees to whom it would like to pay additional compensation, and I am not willing to say that to do so would not be just and right. Their knowledge of their employees is better than mine, and I do not mean to insinuate that it would do an injustice to the others in compensating these. Yet their duties were unusually heavy. For years we have compensated the people who have been assigned from the Pension Department to the Pension Committees here in the House, with no greater reasons for doing it than the attempt now to compensate these employees of the Committee on Ways and Means. The other body—the Senate—gave their Chief Clerk, corresponding to the gentleman mentioned in this resolution, $2,000 for his additional work. The committee thought that the demands were perhaps a trifle too large, though perhaps not inadequate for the service rendered, and perhaps quite worthy of every cent that was asked, but in the knowledge of the other operating committees that are busy in the House to-day and their employees, it was thought that the sums named in the resolution should be cut down proportionately, as they have been.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Will these employees during the long vacation that we are about to have be retained as employees of the committee?

Mr. IRELAND. Oh, certainly everybody knows that. That is a bald argument that is brought out time and again.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I know that the same kind of evasive arguments are usually offered for raids on the Treasury of this sort, and I am going to make the point of no quorum if we are to have legislation of this sort.

Mr. IRELAND. Quite so. Let me answer the gentleman just on that point. Of course, they will have a vacation during the entire summer, and so will the employees of every other committee, and so will the Members of Congress, but these employees worked night and day for several months on these bills.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; and we have our clerks doing the same kind of work in all of our offices.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that we disagree to the Senate amendments on the bill H. R. 14222, to amend the trading with the enemy act, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the House disagree to the Senate amendments on the bill H. R. 14222, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore appointed the following conferees:

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Mr. LEA of California.

EXTRA COMPENSATION FOR CLAYTON B. MOORE AND OTHERS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, to see the Committee on Accounts bring the resolution which is now pending before the House for consideration. The Committee on Ways and Means has a corps of clerks. Those clerks are employed to do the work of the committee. The mere fact that the committee has some work to do occasionally is no justification for giving additional compensation during the period of that work. There are many times the Committee on Ways and Means have nothing of any consequence to do, and yet during all of that period the clerks of the committee are paid the compensation allowed by law. The Committee on Appropriations has a corps of clerks working night and day, 327 days in the year. They ask no extra compensation for overtime work.

Mr. IRELAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Now, an attempt is made to increase the compensation of the clerks of the Ways and Means Committee simply because they have work to do. The Committee on Appropriations reduced the cost of the clerical force for 1924 by a thousand dollars. The Committee on Appropriations has more work to do in any single day than the Committee on Ways and Means does in a year. We take over 20,000 pages of testimony a year, and they do all the indexing and compiling and everything connected with that work, and there is no man anywhere connected with the clerical force who demands or even requests additional compensation. These men are there to work, they do work, they must work, and they are being paid for the work they do, but they get no extra compensation. They are glad to work for what the law provides. [Applause.] And that is what ought to be done with the clerical force of every committee of the House. There is no man here who has more respect for the membership of the Ways and Means Committee than I. Every man on that committee is my friend, and I hope I am his, but I do not propose to stand here as a Member of the House and without a protest see this increase of $4,700 in the expenses of the clerical force of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. IRELAND. There is no $4,700.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what it is.

Mr. IRELAND. There is $2,500.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what is set up here.

Mr. IRELAND. The gentleman did not listen to the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. You have cut it down; but, whatever it is, it ought not to be paid. What is the clerical force for? Is it to sit there during the period of idleness, during the period when the committee has no work to do, and draw pay, and then, perchance, when the committee is called upon to work for a month or two or three or four or six, as the case may be, that then we must pay them for that work regardless of the fact that during more than half the year they have had nothing of any consequence to do? Now, they are going to be idle for nine months. They will get their pay. Is there anybody here who will propose to give them additional compensation for the period in which Congress is not going to be in session because, perchance, they may be compelled to live in Washington during that period? I hope the bill will not pass.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to say to my beloved friend from Illinois, and I mean what I say—he is my friend—but, Mr. MADDEN, the Ways and Means Committee took more hearings on the tariff bill than you say your whole committee took in a whole damn year. [Laughter and applause.] I recommended to the Committee on Accounts the sums to be paid to each of those clerks as was provided for in the bill when introduced. The committee saw fit greatly to reduce that amount. I thank the committee for reporting any amount, because it is a recognition of the efficiency and of the service rendered by the clerks of that committee in the preparation of these great bills. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois I do not discredit at all the clerks of the Appropriations Committee. I know nothing about what they are doing. I would follow the recommendation of my beloved friend from Illinois if he wished to compensate them for some extra services over what they were expected to perform for their regular salary.

Mr. MADDEN. We have no extra services, night or day.

Mr. BLANTON. Good.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend from Texas is always noisy. [Laughter.] There is more noise wrapped up in that little piece of hide than I ever saw in all my life. [Laughter and applause.] Several clerks who are recognized in this resolution, two especially, were detailed from the Printing Office, and one man, who now rests in his silent grave, who died suddenly only a week ago, many times I have seen him at work at his desk in the Ways and Means room as late as 2 o'clock in the morning, having worked all day and up to that time of night saving the people of this country, the taxpayers, thousands of dollars in the printing that was obliged to be sent to the Printing Office from the Ways and Means Committee because of his knowledge of printing. He is dead and gone, and only the day before he died he came to me and said that he had been retired from Government service because of his age and he had but a small pittance left to live upon. He is recognized in this bill when it was introduced. Now his widow, I hope, may get the amount allowed for here, because he was entitled to the amount that has been set forth in this bill allowed for him. I hope every man here will recognize the services rendered by the clerks whose names are mentioned in the bill and will vote for the amount provided. I think they are justly entitled to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. IRELAND) there were—ayes 203, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON and Mr. MADDEN called for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 144, noes 73.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll. As many as favor the resolution will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 113, answered "present" 1, not voting 161, as follows:

YEAS—151.

Ackerman	Fordney	Little	Reber
Arentz	Fuller	Logan	Reed, N. Y.
Beck	Gallivan	London	Roach
Benham	Gensman	Longworth	Robertson
Bixler	Gernerd	Luce	Rodenberg
Bond	Gifford	Luhring	Rogers
Bowers	Glynn	McArthur	Rossdale
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	McFadden	Sabath
Burdick	Gorman	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.
Burton	Green, Iowa	McPherson	Sanders, N. Y.
Butler	Greene, Mass.	MacGregor	Schall
Cable	Hadley	Mapes	Siegel
Campbell, Kans.	Hardy, Colo.	Martin	Smithwick
Campbell, Pa.	Haugen	Mead	Snyder
Cantrill	Hawley	Michener	Stephens
Carew	Hayden	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Pa.
Christopherson	Hays	Moores, Ind.	Swing
Cole, Iowa	Hickey	Morgan	Tague
Collier	Himes	Morin	Taylor, N. J.
Colton	Huck	Mott	Temple
Cooper, Wis.	Hull	Nelson, Me.	Ten Eyck
Coughlin	Humphrey, Nebr.	Nelson, A. P.	Tilson
Crago	Ireland	Newton, Mo.	Timberlake
Crisp	James	Nolan	Underhill
Curry	Johnson, Wash.	Norton	Upshaw
Dallinger	Kelly, Pa.	Parker, N. J.	Vaile
Deal	Kendall	Parker, N. Y.	Vestal
Dempsey	Ketcham	Patterson, N. J.	Volk
Dowell	Kirkpatrick	Paul	Watson
Dupré	Kissel	Perlman	Webster
Edmonds	Knutson	Petersen	Wilson
Fairchild	Kopp	Porter	Winslow
Fairfield	Kreider	Pringey	Wurzbach
Faust	Lampert	Purnell	Wyant
Fenn	Lazaro	Radcliffe	Yates
Fess	Lee, N. Y.	Rainey, Ill.	Young
Fitzgerald	Lehlbach	Ramseyer	Zihlman
Focht	Lineberger	Ransley	

NAYS—113.

Abernethy	Blanton	Dale	Greene, Vt.
Anderson	Bowling	Davis, Tenn.	Hammer
Andrew, Mass.	Box	Dominick	Hicks
Andrews, Nebr.	Briggs	Doughton	Hill
Anthony	Bulwinkle	Driver	Hoch
Appleby	Byrnes, S. C.	Evans	Huddleston
Aswell	Carter	Fields	Hudspeth
Atkeson	Chalmers	Fish	Husted
Bankhead	Chindblom	Foster	Hutchinson
Barbour	Clague	Free	Jeffers, Ala.
Barkley	Clarke, N. Y.	Fulmer	Johnson, Ky.
Beedy	Cole, Ohio	Funk	Jones, Tex.
Begg	Collins	Gahn	Kelley, Mich.
Bell	Connally, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Kincheloe
Black	Cooper, Ohio	Gilbert	Kline, Pa.
Bland, Va.	Cramton	Goldsborough	Kraus

Kunz	Murphy	Rucker	Tinkham
Lankford	Nelson, J. M.	Sandlin	Turner
Larsen, Ga.	Ogden	Shaw	Volstead
Lawrence	Oliver	Shreve	Wason
Lee, Ga.	Parks, Ark.	Sisson	Weaver
Lyon	Perkins	Snell	White, Kans.
McDuffie	Quin	Speaks	Williamson
McSwain	Raker	Sproul	Wingo
Madden	Rankin	Stafford	Woods, Va.
Magee	Reece	Sumners, Tex.	Wright
Mansfield	Ricketts	Swank	
Miller	Robsion	Taylor, Colo.	
Moore, Va.	Rouse	Thompson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 1.

Herrick

NOT VOTING—161.

Almon	Fisher	Leatherwood	Sinclair
Ansorge	Frear	Linthicum	Sinnott
Bacharach	Freeman	Lowrey	Slemp
Bird	French	McClintic	Smith, Idaho
Blakeney	Frothingham	McCormick	Smith, Mich.
Bland, Ind.	Garner	McKenzie	Steagall
Boies	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stedman
Brand	Gould	McLaughlin, Pa.	Steenerson
Brennan	Graham, Ill.	MacLafferty	Stevenson
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Maloney	Stiness
Brooks, Ill.	Griest	Merritt	Stoll
Brown, Tenn.	Griffin	Michaelson	Strong, Kans.
Browne, Wis.	Hardy, Tex.	Mills	Sullivan
Buchanan	Hawes	Mondell	Summers, Wash.
Burke	Henry	Montague	Sweet
Burtness	Hersey	Moore, Ill.	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hogan	Mudd	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon	Hooker	Newton, Minn.	Thomas
Chandler, N. Y.	Hukriede	O'Brien	Thorpe
Chandler, Okla.	Humphreys, Miss.	O'Connor	Tillman
Clark, Fla.	Jacoway	Oldfield	Tincher
Classon	Jefferis, Nebr.	Olpp	Towner
Clouse	Johnson, Miss.	Overstreet	Treadway
Codd	Johnson, S. Dak.	Paige	Tucker
Connolly, Pa.	Jones, Pa.	Park, Ga.	Tyson
Copley	Kahn	Patterson, Mo.	Vinson
Crowther	Kearns	Pou	Voigt
Cullen	Keller	Rainey, Ala.	Walters
Darrow	Kennedy	Rayburn	Ward, N. Y.
Davis, Minn.	Kiess	Reed, W. Va.	Ward, N. C.
Denison	Kindred	Rhodes	Wheeler
Dickinson	King	Riddick	White, Me.
Drane	Kitchin	Riordan	Williams, Ill.
Drewry	Kleczka	Rose	Williams, Tex.
Dunbar	Kline, N. Y.	Rosenbloom	Wise
Dunn	Knight	Ryan	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Langley	Sanders, Tex.	Woodruff
Echols	Lanham	Scott, Mich.	Woodyard
Elliott	Larson, Minn.	Scott, Tenn.	
Ellis	Layton	Sears	
Favrot	Lea, Calif.	Shelton	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. Sinnott with Mr. Brand.

Mr. Graham of Illinois with Mr. Lowrey.

Mr. Darrow with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Bacharach with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Griest with Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. Garrett of Texas.

Mr. French with Mr. Oldfield.

Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Rayburn.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Humphreys of Mississippi.

Mr. Voigt with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. O'Connor.

Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Byrns of Tennessee.

Mr. Boies with Mr. Steagall.

Mr. Summers of Washington with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. Dyer with Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Tyson.

Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Favrot.

Mr. Burtness with Mr. Jacoway.

Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Pou.

Mr. Mudd with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.

Mr. Tincher with Mr. Stedman.

Mr. Kline of New York with Mr. Hooker.

Mr. Mondell with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Crowther with Mr. Lea of California.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Kearns with Mr. Sanders of Texas.

Mr. Hersey with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE CLERK.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution that I send to the Clerk's desk. I am informed that it is necessary as a confirming resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 465, Rept. No. 1764) carrying out the purposes of a House resolution, providing for a legislative clerk to the acting minority leader of the House, adopted March 3, 1923.

Be it resolved, etc., That in order to carry out the purpose of the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on March 3, 1923 (H. Res. No. 565), there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount sufficient for such purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. The Committee on Accounts has no appropriating authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

EMBASSY BUILDING, PARIS, FRANCE.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4594. I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 4594.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 4594) to authorize the Secretary of State to acquire in Paris a site, with an erected building thereon, at a cost not to exceed $300,000 for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, empowered, at a cost not to exceed $300,000 for both site and building or buildings, to acquire in Paris a site, together with the building or buildings thereon, for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States, and the appropriation of the sum of $150,000 is hereby authorized in addition to a like sum heretofore appropriated for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. BLANTON demanded a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Illinois opposed to the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois to demand a second.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object; we might as well be wasting time on this as something else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from New York will take their places as tellers.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported 123 in the affirmative and none in the negative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A second is ordered. The gentleman from New York has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois has 20 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Before the gentleman from New York begins, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has just counted a quorum, not five minutes go.

Mr. BLANTON. It is evident there is no quorum in the Chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. More than half of the Members did not go between the tellers. The Chair has counted a quorum within the last five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a constitutional question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair disagrees with the gentleman in respect to the quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair never could agree with me on a proposition.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to empower the Secretary of State to purchase a building and about an acre and a third of property in Paris for embassy purposes. For about 12 years, since the first act of Congress to authorize the purchase of embassy properties in foreign capitals, the State Department has attempted to purchase embassy properties within the limits of the authorization of previous acts. The authorization was a general authorization, ap-

plicable to all capitals without regard to the size of the city, and it has been limited to $150,000. It is obvious that while $150,000 is sufficient to purchase property for embassy purposes in places of comparatively small population, it is impossible, and it has proven impossible, to purchase property in any large center for any such sum. Indeed, it would be impossible, except for the extraordinary situation existing at the present date, to purchase any property adequate for the purpose at a sum as small as $300,000. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars for Paris has not only been authorized by previous legislation but there has also been a previous appropriation of $150,000, and this increases the amount authorized by an additional $150,000. This same property in 1913, when Assistant Secretary Bliss was in Paris looking for embassy properties, was examined by him, and at that time he was unable to get a price that was not more than $1,000,000. The fact that at this time, if we act at once—and immediate action is required—he can get the property for as low an amount as $300,000 is due in part to the rate of exchange and is also due to some extent to the present financial circumstances of the owner.

I have a letter here from the Secretary of State to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. PORTER, to which I desire to call your attention, and which is as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1923.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: In conformity with the desire you have expressed to know my views regarding the desirability of purchasing in Paris a property which has been offered to the United States ambassador to be used as the American Embassy, it gives me pleasure to inform you that from reports received from Ambassador Herrick an unusual opportunity is offered to acquire a very desirable property at a comparatively small price. It is my understanding that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have been shown photographs and ground plans of this property, which is very conveniently located in the seventh arrondissement, or ward, of the city of Paris. In this same ward are situated 10 out of 15 ministries of the French Government, among which is the ministry for foreign affairs, only a few minutes' walk from the property. There are in the same ward four embassies and three legations of other countries, as well as the chamber of deputies, the war college, and the offices of the military governor of Paris and of Marshal Foch. Within a short distance and in a neighboring ward are the senate and school of fine arts. It will therefore be seen that for the purpose of the embassy the property is particularly well located.

As to its accessibility for Americans and others who have occasion to call at the embassy, it can be easily reached by means of the various rapid-transit systems of Paris, as a subway station is shortly to be opened within 100 yards of the property, while a street-car and bus line run down the Boulevard des Invalides, on which the property faces, and another bus line on a cross street three doors away. The property is about an acre and a third in area and extends through from one street to the large Boulevard des Invalides.

It is important to emphasize that the property is particularly well suited for the ambassador's residence and for offices of the foreign service, as the type of the house is of the style of a large private dwelling, with a suitable building for offices on the street and an intervening courtyard between the two. Beyond the residence is situated a garden which gives onto the boulevard. In this connection it can be added that the ordinary modern house does not afford the facilities for installation of offices which the property now offered to the Government admits of in an admirable manner.

The property would seem to be well situated also as regards its protection from future encroachment of undesirable buildings, as the ministry of colonies is one block south on the Boulevard des Invalides, while the block to the north toward the River Seine is entirely occupied by the buildings of a large school and Government-owned garden and the building of the Rodin Museum. Opposite the entire garden frontage of the property on the Boulevard des Invalides is a square on which is situated a large church. The southern half of the block adjacent to this property is occupied by the buildings and garden of a convent, and there are three private houses with gardens on the northern half. The Chinese Legation is diagonally across the street from the property.

Experience has shown that in order to obtain property suitable for embassy purposes in the large capitals of Europe the sum of $150,000, heretofore authorized by Congress, is insufficient. I earnestly hope that with the present possibility of acquiring exceptionally valuable land on which are erected buildings well adapted to embassy purposes and conveniently located Congress will authorize the sum stated in the bill which Mr. FAIRCHILD has introduced for this purpose.

I am, my dear Mr. PORTER, very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. If we have saved $700,000 since Assistant Secretary Bliss was over there a few months ago, perhaps if we wait for six months longer we will get it for nothing.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Of course, the gentleman well knows, as stated by me a moment ago, that it is because of the extraordinary situation at the present time that this opportunity exists.

Mr. McSWAIN. The two circumstances the gentleman mentioned, to wit, the rate of exchange and the lady's financial circumstances. She may get in worse circumstances, and the rate of exchange may become more unfavorable.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I may say further that more than $300,000 has been offered for this same property by business interests in Paris, who wish to purchase the land, tear down the building which was constructed prior to the French Revolution, and was completed in 1786. There are sentimental attachments to the building that induces the lady who is the owner to prefer to have it purchased by the United States Government for embassy purposes rather than to have it destroyed to make way for business buildings.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is the lot located in the business section of the city?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. It is located in the same ward in which are located 10 of 15 of the French ministries, including the foreign office, and it is in the same ward as the chamber of deputies.

In December, 1922, I was in Paris and visited the property upon the suggestion of Mr. Herrick, the American ambassador. It impressed me, as it certainly would impress any Member of this House having equal opportunity to inspect the premises, as a most desirable purchase in every respect. Our ambassador is alive to the opportunity and is keenly interested to have the dignity of America maintained in the French capital with a suitable embassy building comparable to the embassies of other nations. Since the days of Gallatin, American ambassadors have fully appreciated the disadvantage America suffers in its failure to own suitable embassy properties, and yet Congress failed to act until 1911. Even then the authorization by Congress was too niggardly to permit purchase of suitable properties in any of the leading capitals where property values are high. Only recently we witnessed what to many appeared to be a humiliating spectacle when an American embassy building in London was acquired only through the acceptance by this great country of ours of a gratuity from an American millionaire. The story is told of Joseph H. Choate that one evening when he was taking a midnight stroll along a London street he was stopped by a policeman who inquired, "Where is your home?" Choate replied, "I have none; I am the American ambassador."

In negotiations to secure an appropriate embassy property in Paris, America has a real asset in the person of our present ambassador, whose knowledge of Paris and of embassy needs and whose business ability and training, together with a just pride in America, render him in a special degree of great value to us in the present emergency. If anyone can secure this property, he can. When secured he will be as zealous as a young bride with a new home to make it all that patriotic Americans would desire. I earnestly hope that an American embassy building will be secured in Paris while Myron T. Herrick is the American ambassador to France.

I shall incorporate as a part of my remarks a statement descriptive of the Condé property and of the embassy buildings in Paris of other nations, furnished me in Paris by Ambassador Herrick, as follows:

DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENT OF PROPERTY.

The Hotel de Condé, in the rue Monsieur, near the tomb of Napoleon, was built shortly before the French Revolution for Mademoiselle de Condé, aunt of the Duke d' Enghien, and was designed by Brogniart, one of the famous architects of the time. Major l'Enfant, who planned the city of Washington, was one of Brogniart's pupils.

The Hotel de Condé runs between two streets and contains a fine garden. The residence is situated at the back of a large court, on both sides of which as well as on the side of the street entrance are spacious annexes, serving in former days as a chapel, coach houses, and quarters for the retinue of the princess, all of which would be most suitable for offices of the embassy staff, as well as for those of the military and naval attachés.

The house itself contains art treasures of the epoch of great value, among which are bas-reliefs by Clodion and panels by Boucher. An added sentimental interest for Americans is the fact that this house was for many years during the last century the residence of the distinguished French statesman, the Comte de Chambrun, a descendant of Lafayette and uncle of the recent chargé d'affaires at Washington.

Nearly all large countries, as well as small ones, own their chancery and embassy here, the cost in each case exceeding the appropriation made by our Government. Real estate here is of a value corresponding to that in New York, and the value of the embassies of other countries installed here is about as follows:

The British Embassy and its chancery furnished is worth two and a half to three million dollars at least; probably more. This mansion was the residence of Pauline Bonaparte, Princess Borghese, sister of Napoleon. The property passed by purchase from her possession in 1814, with its costly furniture and ornaments, to the British Government for the use of the embassy, the Duke of Wellington negotiating the sale. The price agreed upon was £32,000, but two months after the battle of Waterloo he sent in a bill to his Government for £2,500 "for repairs to the house, made by my directions when I was ambassador at Paris."

The German Embassy, which is worth about a million dollars, was, during the first Empire, the Paris residence of Prince Eugene de Beauharnais, Viceroy of Italy and stepson of Napoleon I.

The Austrian Embassy, now in the hands of the French Government, is worth approximately two to three million dollars.

The Spanish Embassy, which is worth about $1,000,000, was the home of the Prince de Wagram, who was killed in the late war, the last male descendent of Napoleon's marshal, Berthier.

The Italian Embassy was purchased as a bargain in 1912 or 1913 when I was ambassador here, and I believe it cost about $750,000. It is worth considerably more now.

Poland has recently purchased a fine building.

Belgium has very valuable legation quarters, the figures of which I have not before me.

Holland this last year purchased a building for something like half a million dollars.

The need of an embassy in Paris has been recognized ever since we became a nation. Albert Gallatin said 106 years ago, "The prospect seems good that the United States will purchase a building for its embassy within a year." For 106 years every succeeding envoy has been hoping that this prospect might come true. This embassy, as you know, is the most important in Europe, and it is vitally necessary to have adequate quarters for our growing staff. It is from this embassy that cables for all Europe are distributed.

I have said that Mr. Bliss, Third Assistant Secretary of State, visited the Condé property in 1913. He testified before the committee, and I quote extracts from his testimony, as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF MR. BLISS.

I have been all over the property. Some years ago, in 1913, at the time I was in the embassy I visited it when it was offered for sale. Whenever there was a good property that came into the market, I always examined it to see if it was a possible embassy and made a report to the Department of State. At that time I do not recall what the price of it was, but I think, roughly speaking, it was six or seven million francs, and at that time the franc was at par, which would mean over a million dollars.

Question. What is your opinion as to this price of $300,000?

Mr. BLISS. It is a great bargain; there is no doubt of that.

Mr. Herrick has been in definite negotiations with the owner of the house, who is an elderly woman and who wants to have it preserved, as the chairman just stated, because of its architectural and historical interest.

* * * * * * *

Mr. BLISS. After the meeting of the committee to consider the bill of Mr. FAIRCHILD, in which a subcommittee was appointed, consisting of the chairman of the committee and Mr. FAIRCHILD, a telegram was sent to Mr. Herrick, embodying the views of the committee regarding the matter, directing him to obtain an option on the property. That was covered very fully in the text of the message which was drawn up by the subcommittee. Mr. Herrick replied to that in a day or two.

Question. Is it your understanding from the communications between the State Department and Ambassador Herrick that he is confident that if this bill passes he will be able to secure this property?

Mr. BLISS. I understand from the statement in his telegram that it is very definite that he will have no difficulty in obtaining an option on the purchase of the property by the end of this month.

Question. He feels sure that he will, now that he has acquainted the owner or the owner's attorney with the fact that the United States is the purchaser?

Mr. BLISS. From what Mr. Herrick says in his telegram, I think he has some unwritten understanding with the lawyer of the owner.

* * * * * * *

Question. Can you tell the committee what is the amount of money that is being paid by the United States at the present time in the form of rental for the embassy?

Mr. BLISS. For the embassy the Department of State now pays an annual rental of 86,500 francs. That amounted when I was before the committee the other day—I have not computed that at the rate of exchange at the present time—the other day the rate was 6.920; the franc has gone off a little since then. That does not include the rent paid by the military attaché, I think, for his office. He has offices in the same building, but they are separate, and I should say the rent was about 1,500 francs, roughly estimated.

Question. Does that include the amount paid for the accommodation of the passport office?

Mr. BLISS. The passport offices are 56,000 francs, or $4,480, and the consulate general, since you are asking that question, I will add, pays a rental of 18,000 francs. That is the rental made some time before the war for a period of years, so that it is a very advantageous rate.

Question. It would be very much greater at the present time?

Mr. BLISS. It would be greater now, and he would have to pay a much higher rate than ever to renew the lease of the present consul general's office.

Question. The building area of the Condé property would be sufficient to house all of these offices?

Mr. BLISS. It might be necessary to have separate offices for accessibility more to commercial interests that appeal to the consul general, but part of the consulate general could undoubtedly be housed there.

Question. The question was directed to the area of the building?

Mr. BLISS. There is ample space to increase the building to accommodate all the offices we ever could need.

Question. In the present buildings there is ample space to accommodate all of these offices?

Mr. BLISS. Yes, sir.

* * * * * * *

Mr. BLISS. Property owned by foreign governments for embassy purposes is free from taxation in France, exempted from tax.

Question. The rental figures you gave—do they include rental for the ambassadors' homes?

Mr. BLISS No. The ambassador's home is paid by him personally.

* * * * * * *

Question. This bill will provide a home for the ambassador?

Mr. BLISS. Yes, sir.

* * * * * * *

Question. My understanding of the telegrams that have passed officially between the State Department and Ambassador Herrick is that Ambassador Herrick feels assured and the State Department feels assured that if this bill passes Mr. Herrick will be able to secure this property within the $300,000 to be assigned?

Mr. BLISS. That is our understanding.

A recent letter received by me from the ambassador confirms the information contained in the committee report from which I have freely quoted, and gives additional information of value. It also bears witness to his enthusiastic desire to secure for America a property in keeping with the dignity of our great Nation. I quote from this letter as follows:

It is not difficult to estimate real estate values in Paris, as they are well established. The real estate of this property, consisting of 5,565 square meters of land, regardless of the buildings, is worth, compared with other real estate in this section of the city, the proposed purchase price. The extent of the real estate of the Condé property is another strong argument in favor of its purchase by our Government since such properties, which cover so large an area of ground, are no longer feasible for private ownership in view of the present taxation, from which the United States would be exempt. As far as embassy uses are concerned the buildings of the Condé property are of equal value to that of the land.

I wish it were possible for me to impart to every Member of Congress my enthusiasm for the purchase of the Hotel de Condé. If they could only see and understand the situation here, as you and I do, there would not be an instant's hesitation in taking advantage of this bargain. I am confident of the soundness of my judgment in this matter, for I have been familiar with real-estate transactions throughout my entire business career.

I think I know rather well the needs of my Government, and it is needless for me to tell you that nothing would appeal more to my patriotic interest and devotion than to be permitted to install a dignified embassy and chancery for the United States in Paris, I would even go to the extent of making some personal contribution, as I have indicated, rather than let this remarkable opportunity slip.

The rental of my modest residence in Paris, which you have seen, averages, with the varying exchanges, something more than my salary, and this house is not comparable in importance to any of the embassies or legations which I have heretofore mentioned. I shall be obliged, as I told you, to give up this residence in October, as the owner does not wish to rent it for a longer term, and, thus far, I have not been able to find anything suitable for an embassy for less than $20,000 per annum, approximately.

Should the Hotel de Condé be purchased, I could, by using my furniture, renting and buying additional furniture, occupy the premises, after a fashion, in October. The chancery could be made ready to install the staff, with the military and naval attachés, by the time the lease expires on the quarters now occupied in the rue de Chaillot, the quarters I leased for the chancery before the war. The rent for the chancery in the present location is 85,450 francs, which amounts to the interest at 5 per cent on a very considerable part of the proposed purchase price of the Condé property.

In case the owner of the Hotel de Condé fails to grant the option, as it now appears may be the case, I hope you may so amend your bill as to leave in the hands of the Government an appropriation, not less than the sum mentioned for this property, which may be available later on if some other property comes on the market. In no case can we hope to obtain an embassy worthy of our country for a sum less than the amount I named for the Condé property. The appropriation really should be much larger, for it is not at all probable that so fine a bargain as the Hotel de Condé will occur again.

We were deeply interested in the statement of ex-Ambassador Davis before the Foreign Affairs Committee in connection with the Rogers bill, in which he said that while he lived in London "quietly and modestly" his job cost him three times his salary, his annual expenditures being about $50,000. I have copied and inclose herewith two or three references which ex-Ambassador Page made in his letters to the need of the United States for proper embassies and legations in foreign countries.

One hundred and seven years ago Albert Gallatin wrote, "By another year we shall undoubtedly be installed in a legation owned by the United States Government." There has been awakened in my breast by the recent discussion the same hope that Albert Gallatin had, to the extent that I am willing to stake a forfeit.

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast!
"Man (and nations) never is but always to be blest."

Let us hope that this case will be an exception. At any rate, Congress, should it approve your bill in regard to the Condé property, or if this purchase is not effected amend your bill so as to make the appropriation available for whatever property may come on the market later on, could hardly be accused of acting precipitately after a deliberation of almost a century and a half.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty Members present; a quorum.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the speech made by the gentleman from New York on the question of the necessity for a great embassy building in Paris. I was rather amused when he said, or somebody said for him, that we ought to buy this building now, because it is worth a million dollars and that we could buy it for $300,000. Then I inquired of myself, What does anyone need of an embassy in Paris or any other place worth $1,000,000? Should we buy it because we do not want to appoint an ambassador anywhere except a man who can afford to live in a $1,000,000 building, or is it because we want to curtail the right of men who have brains and have no money to represent us as ambassadors? Of course, it is impossible for one to live simply in one of these palatial embassies.

No one can afford to live in a $1,000,000 embassy unless he is a rich man, to say nothing of the cost of maintaining such a building.

It seems a most ludicrous thing that at this hour of the morning on the 4th day of March——

A MEMBER. The 3d.

Mr. MADDEN. This is the 4th day of March. We are going out of existence as a Congress in a few hours more, and yet we come here at this late hour of the night or early hour of the morning to provide palatial quarters for American representatives in a European city, and yet we refuse as the Congress of

the United States to appropriate money to put up the buildings we need for public business in the country in which we reside. We passed an act not very long ago providing not to exceed $150,000 for any embassy building anywhere in the world. This bill here proposes to double the limit of cost as to Paris. Well, now, if as to Paris, why not as to Berlin? If as to Berlin, why not as to Budapest or as to any other place in the world?

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TEMPLE. How long ago, is the gentleman able to say, was that bill passed?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, several years.

Mr. TEMPLE. Was it about 12 years ago?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but the needs of the embassy situation are not any greater to-day than they were then, and a $150,000 house is big enough for any American to live in anywhere in the world. [Applause.] I am opposed to these bills, and I am opposed to these princes of finance being sent abroad as American ambassadors because of the contributions they make to campaign funds, Democrats and Republicans alike. [Applause.] I want to see the time come when America will take its place as the foremost nation in favor of ambassadors who have brains [applause], and I do not want the dollar to be the only qualification for appointment to ambassadorial positions. I want the man to be educated; I want him to be a gentleman; I want him to be a thorough American representative of America, fit in all the phases of American life.

I do not want him to live in such palatial quarters that I, as an humble, common, everyday American, if by any chance I should find myself in Paris, would not dare call upon him because of the luxury with which he is surrounded. I want to find myself when I approach an embassy of America in Paris or elsewhere to be at least on equal terms with the man who occupies the place. When I go abroad, if I should choose to call upon the American representative, I want to call upon a man who has the time to take off from cutting coupons from his bonds to give me consideration. [Applause.] I do not want an American ambassador to be so skilled in finance that he has no time for diplomacy.

Mr. EDMONDS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would like to call upon me if I lived in a back street or in a back alleyway, where I had to live on account of the scrimping of this country?

Mr. MADDEN. That is where I have always been obliged to live——

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. And I am proud of my humble surroundings. If by any chance I should be so fortunate that I can live in a better, a more commodious place, I do so out of the revenues that I make and not out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman makes many more speeches like the one he just made and the one he made a while ago, he has got to come over on this side of the aisle to be in good company.

Mr. MADDEN. I just picked up a copper cent on the floor, and I hand it to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield for an entirely serious statement?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, indeed; I am serious.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman remind the House—and I am serious—that the greatest ambassador that this country ever sent to the court at Paris was Benjamin Franklin, who went there in his homespun clothes, and his memory lives to-day?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; he was a credit to the Nation, and a splendid record he made. I am proud of his memory, proud of the loan that he secured from France while there; and I say to you, gentlemen of the House, it may seem to be a laughing matter, but it is a very serious matter. I would like to be able to see some of these common, everyday men who served with us in this establishment. Oh, FRANK MONDELL and HENRY COOPER and WALLACE DEMPSEY and Mr. FESS and——

Mr. UPSHAW. Mention some of the Democrats.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. UPSHAW.

Mr. MADDEN. UPSHAW-Paris. [Laughter.] Oh, and BLANTON. Well, gentlemen, to proceed, to start where I stopped, I say that so many of these gentlemen are qualified to be American ambassadors, and I named about an equal number from the Democrat and Republican sides, but unfortunately no matter whether the administration be Democrat or Republican we have always chosen millionaires for Paris. I do not say that they have not rendered good service; but I hope that the time will come when it will not be necessary to pick a millionaire. I had something to do with the fixing of the limit of cost.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MADDEN. In just a moment.

I had something to do, I say, with the fixing of the limit of cost on ambassadorial residences abroad. My colleague, Frank Lowden, when he was a Member of the House, wanted to fix the limit of cost at $500,000. That is the way he felt. He was a multimillionaire; he could afford to move into a house that would cost that. I felt that $50,000 was enough, but I compromised on $150,000. I think that is too much.

Yet our friend from New York [Mr. FAIRCHILD] comes in complacently here to-night, walks up to the captain's desk, and gets permission from the Republican leader to move to suspend the rules and pass this bill, that authorizes the expenditure of $300,000 for an embassy building in Paris, and they say we ought to buy it because the building is worth a million dollars. Now, if the building is worth a million dollars, I submit to you that there is not any ordinary American that could live in it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, the banker of Pennsylvania could live in it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFADDEN. How much did the gentleman provide for greenhouses down in the Botanic Garden?

Mr. MADDEN. Not a dollar.

Mr. McFADDEN. You tried to.

Mr. MADDEN. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BLANTON. No; he cut that out.

Mr. MADDEN. There is not a dollar for it, and even if there were, that is an American institution at home, where every man from the farms in the gentleman's district can come and regale himself by smelling the delicious perfume of the beautiful flowers down there. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield just yet; whereas if he went to Paris, he would not be able to get under the shed of the embassy entrance, because the man who lives in such a luxurious building would be so much of an aristocrat that he would not recognize the plain, ordinary, common, everyday citizen of Pennsylvania far enough to admit him to the embassy building. [Laughter.]

The item that the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to was to establish or rebuild a greenhouse in which to propagate and preserve the rare plants that we were told could not be moved without their dying.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I understand that property in Paris is worth $1,000,000, and is owned by a poor French widow, and if this purchase is made she will thereby be robbed out of $700,000. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. That would be in keeping with the usual generosity of Congress, except where people have claims against the Government that have no justification. I hope we shall not commit this great mistake.

Gentlemen, think of the ordinary man for once. You have not got many people among your constituents at home that live in million-dollar houses; not many. If you had, you would not be here. They would pick somebody else. [Laughter.] Have a little common sense; keep in the ordinary walks of life; do not get above your constituents. Keep on the level with them. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will undertake now, as it is after midnight, to say only a word or two, but not in any way to respond in detail to what has been said by my distinguished friend from Illinois, who speaks from the plutocratic viewpoint. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. No; I speak from a Democratic point of view. I beg the gentleman's pardon. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The committee investigated this matter with a great deal of care. I think we obtained all the information that is available. We reached the conclusion that the purchase of this property as a business proposition is an excellent thing. We believe that the price for which it can be gotten, if the transaction can be quickly consummated, is

considerably less than it is really worth. This conclusion was reached without any dissent at all. The majority and the minority members of the committee unite in the opinion that the purchase ought to be made, and that is the report.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, I do not object to the conclusions reached by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was simply expressing my own views.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have great respect for the views of the gentleman, and I have followed him quite commonly in what he has advised here with reference to expenditures. The gentleman can guard the Treasury against any injudicious expenditure even in this case. The bill simply carries an authorization; an authorization that can not be executed unless the approval is had of the committee over which the distinguished gentleman presides with such great ability. Unless the Committee on Appropriations should be of opinion, upon such investigation as it may make, that the project is injudicious, doubtless that committee will hereafter report the necessary appropriation. [Applause.]

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] very feelingly and eloquently said he wanted this Government to be represented abroad by brains, and that he was opposed to the appointment of millionaires as ambassadors. One of the reasons why only millionaires can serve abroad is that the Government of the United States does not provide any official residences and offices for our ambassadors abroad. [Applause.]

Now, do not take up all my two minutes with that applause. [Laughter.] If the gentleman from Illinois can explain how a man can live on brains and sleep in a house made out of brains in Paris, then there will be no reason for enacting this bill. I have generally followed the gentleman from Illinois on ordinary appropriations, but it is getting to be rather unpopular to do so, measured by the manner in which the House has expressed itself here to-night.

Of course I am not anxious to spend this $300,000. I always regret the necessity for appropriations, but the poor oppressed taxpayer out in Illinois, for whom the gentleman pleads, will be taxed to pay rent in Paris as long as this Government survives, unless we purchase an embassy building. As to the proposed purchase, our committee looked into it. We believed it to be a good bargain.

Personally I do not care whether you pass this bill or not, because I do not expect to hobnob around the embassy in Paris. But I do believe that if this Government wants to provide for the American Embassy in Paris, and to provide offices for the consul general in Paris, a place that will comport somewhat with the dignity and majesty and might of this great Government, you ought to pass this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. No; I can not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If gentlemen want the American ambassador to live in some back alley and subsist on cheese and crackers, vote this thing down; but if you want him to occupy quarters somewhat commensurate with the dignity of the United States Government, you ought to pass this bill, and pass it to-night. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas his expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 170 ayes and 67 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. All those in favor of taking the question by yeas and nays will rise. [After counting.] Forty-one Members have arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has just counted a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, the Chair can arbitrarily rule that way, but to-morrow he will not be able to do so.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words of the gentleman from Texas be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair pays no attention to what the gentleman from Texas says.

MONUMENT TO AMERICAN WOMEN FOR SERVICES IN WORLD WAR.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Joint Resolution 168, now on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take from the Speakers' table Senate Joint Resolution 168 and consider the same. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 168) in relation to a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States of America, its insular possessions, and the District of Columbia in the World War.

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $150,000 as a part contribution to the erection of a memorial building, with equipment, in the District of Columbia to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the patriotic women of the United States of America, of its insular possessions, and of the District of Columbia during the World War. Said memorial to be erected on the land now occupied in part by the Memorial to the Women of the Civil War, the permanent headquarters of the American Red Cross.

SEC. 2. That said memorial shall be a building monumental in design and character and shall be used as a permanent model chapter house for the American Red Cross under the charge of the District of Columbia Red Cross Chapter and shall cost not less than $300,000: *Provided*, That this expenditure shall include complete equipment.

SEC. 3. That the sum hereby appropriated shall not be payable until there shall be raised by private subscription an additional sum of $150,000.

SEC. 4. That the money hereby appropriated shall not be paid until the plan of the proposed building shall have been approved by a commission consisting of the president of the American Red Cross, the Secretary of War, the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library, the chairman of the House Committee on the Library, and a representative of the central committee of the American Red Cross. The plans of the said memorial shall likewise be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The expenditures for said memorial building shall be made under the direction of a commission consisting of the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library and the chairman of the House Committee on the Library. That said memorial building shall remain the property of the United States Government but under the supervision of the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, and the American Red Cross shall at all times be charged with the responsibility, the care, keeping, and maintenance of the said memorial building without expense to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, this bill, as the one preceding, may not be effective for nearly a year, and there is no sense or reason whatever for this House in its present mood, when it can not give proper consideration to legislation, taking up matters of this kind, that present no emergency, and keeping the House here all night, and I object.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio moves to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 168. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GILBERT. I demand a second.

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. BLANTON objected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] will take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were 63 ayes and 38 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote, because there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members present, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Speaker wants to be correct.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is not that number in the Hall. If the Chair does not count the Members elect, there are not 200 in the Hall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has made a count of the Members present.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Chair is not entitled to count Members elect, not Members of this Congress.

Mr. KINCHELOE. A parliamentary inquiry. I feel that the Chair has counted the new Members in place of the lame ducks, and I would like to know if he has counted the old Members as well.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now take a recess.

Mr. SNYDER. That is clearly dilatory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan makes the motion that the House do now stand in recess.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee demands the yeas and nays. All in favor of taking this question by the yeas and nays will rise. [After counting.] Fifty-four Members have risen, a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the House standing in recess will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 57, nays 177, not voting 192, as follows:

YEAS—57.

Abernethy	Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Rayburn
Aswell	Deal	Lampert	Rouse
Atkeson	Dominick	Lankford	Rucker
Bankhead	Doughton	Larsen, Ga.	Sandlin
Barkley	Evans	Lee, Ga.	Sisson
Black	Fields	Logan	Sumners, Tex.
Bland, Va.	Fulmer	London	Tague
Blanton	Garrett, Tenn.	Lyon	Ten Eyck
Bowling	Goldsborough	McDuffie	Turner
Box	Hammer	McSwain	Weaver
Bulwinkle	Hudspeth	Moore, Va.	Wingo
Byrnes, S. C.	Jeffers, Ala.	Parks, Ark.	Young
Collins	Johnson, Ky.	Quin	
Cramton	Kelley, Mich.	Raker	
Crisp	Ketcham	Rankin	

NAYS—177.

Ackerman	Fordney	Lineberger	Robsion
Anderson	Foster	Little	Rodenberg
Andrew, Mass.	Fuller	Luce	Rogers
Ansorge	Funk	McArthur	Rossdale
Arentz	Gahn	McFadden	Sabath
Barbour	Gensman	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.
Beck	Gernerd	McPherson	Scott, Tenn.
Beedy	Gilbert	MacGregor	Shaw
Begg	Glynn	Magee	Shreve
Bell	Greene, Mass.	Mansfield	Siegel
Benham	Greene, Vt.	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Briggs	Griest	Mead	Smithwick
Burdick	Hadley	Michener	Snyder
Burton	Hardy, Colo.	Miller	Speaks
Cable	Haugen	Mondell	Sproul
Campbell, Kans.	Hawley	Moore, Ill.	Stafford
Campbell, Pa.	Hayden	Moore, Ohio	Stephens
Carter	Henry	Moores, Ind.	Sweet
Chalmers	Herrick	Morgan	Swing
Chandler, Okla.	Hickey	Morin	Taylor, N. J.
Chindblom	Hicks	Mott	Temple
Christopherson	Hill	Murphy	Thompson
Clague	Himes	Nelson, A. P.	Tilson
Clarke, N. Y.	Hoch	Nelson, J. M.	Timberlake
Cole, Iowa	Huck	Newton, Mo.	Tincher
Collier	Hull	Norton	Tinkham
Colton	Humphrey, Nebr.	Ogden	Underhill
Connally, Tex.	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker, N. J.	Upshaw
Cooper, Ohio	Husted	Patterson, N. J.	Vaile
Cooper, Wis.	Ireland	Paul	Vestal
Coughlin	James	Perkins	Voigt
Curry	Johnson, Wash.	Perlman	Volk
Dale	Jones, Tex.	Petersen	Volstead
Dallinger	Kirkpatrick	Porter	Wason
Dempsey	Kissel	Purnell	Watson
Dowell	Kline, Pa.	Radcliffe	Webster
Dupré	Knutson	Ramseyer	White, Kans.
Edmonds	Kopp	Ransley	Wilson
Elliott	Kraus	Reber	Wright
Fairchild	Kreider	Reece	Wurzbach
Fairfield	Kunz	Reed, N. Y.	Yates
Faust	Lazaro	Rhodes	Zihlman
Fess	Leatherwood	Ricketts	
Fitzgerald	Lee, N. Y.	Roach	
Focht	Lehlbach	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—192.

Almon	Connolly, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Larson, Minn.
Andrews, Nebr.	Copley	Graham, Pa.	Lawrence
Anthony	Crago	Green, Iowa	Layton
Appleby	Crowther	Griffin	Lea, Calif.
Bacharach	Cullen	Hardy, Tex.	Linthicum
Bird	Darrow	Hawes	Longworth
Bixler	Davis, Minn.	Hays	Lowrey
Blakeney	Denison	Hersey	Luhring
Bland, Ind.	Dickinson	Hogan	McClintic
Boies	Drane	Hooker	McCormick
Bond	Drewry	Huddleston	McKenzie
Bowers	Driver	Hukriede	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Brand	Dunbar	Hutchinson	McLaughlin, Pa.
Brennan	Dunn	Jacoway	MacLafferty
Britten	Dyer	Jefferis, Nebr.	Madden
Brooks, Ill.	Echols	Johnson, Miss.	Maloney
Brooks, Pa.	Ellis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin
Brown, Tenn.	Favrot	Jones, Pa.	Merritt
Browne, Wis.	Fenn	Kahn	Michaelson
Buchanan	Fish	Kearns	Mills
Burke	Fisher	Keller	Montague
Burtness	Frear	Kelly, Pa.	Mudd
Butler	Free	Kendall	Nelson, Me.
Byrns, Tenn.	Freeman	Kennedy	Newton, Minn.
Cannon	French	Kiess	Nolan
Cantrill	Frothingham	Kindred	O'Brien
Carew	Gallivan	King	O'Connor
Chandler, N. Y.	Garner	Kitchin	Oldfield
Clark, Fla.	Garrett, Tex.	Kleczka	Oliver
Classon	Gifford	Kline, N. Y.	Olpp
Clouse	Goodykoontz	Knight	Overstreet
Codd	Gorman	Langley	Paige
Cole, Ohio	Gould	Lanham	Park, Ga.
Parker, N. Y.	Scott, Mich.	Strong, Pa.	Walters
Patterson, Mo.	Sears	Sullivan	Ward, N. Y.
Pou	Shelton	Summers, Wash.	Ward, N. C.
Pringey	Sinclair	Swank	Wheeler
Rainey, Ala.	Sinnott	Taylor, Ark.	White, Me.
Rainey, Ill.	Slemp	Taylor, Colo.	Williams, Ill.
Reed, W. Va.	Smith, Mich.	Taylor, Tenn.	Williams, Tex.
Riddick	Snell	Thomas	Williamson
Riordan	Steagall	Thorpe	Winslow
Rose	Stedman	Tillman	Wise
Rosenbloom	Steenerson	Towner	Wood, Ind.
Ryan	Stevenson	Treadway	Woodruff
Sanders, N. Y.	Stiness	Tucker	Woods, Va.
Sanders, Tex.	Stoll	Tyson	Woodyard
Schall	Strong, Kans.	Vinson	Wyant

So the House refused to stand in recess.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Sinclair (for) with Mr. Burtness (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Snell with Mr. Swank.

Mr. Winslow with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Bixler with Mr. Cantrill.

Mr. Kendall with Mr. Driver.

Mr. Wyant with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Woods of Virginia.

Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Huddleston.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. Fenn with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Fish with Rainey of Illinois.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 6650) providing additional terminal facilities in square east of 710 and square 712 in the District of Columbia for freight traffic.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment, bills of the following titles:

H. R. 1227. An act for the relief of Frank G. Emmes;

H. R. 8221. An act for the relief of the Chinese Government;

H. R. 8733. An act for the relief of Harold L. McKinley;

H. R. 8051. An act for the relief of the Commonwealth & Dominion Line (Ltd.), owner of the British steamship *Port Phillip;*

H. R. 14089. An act granting six months' pay to Harriet B. Castle;

H. R. 9160. An act for the relief of John Anderson.

H. R. 8533. An act for the relief of Joe T. White;

H. R. 10847. An act for the relief of Jacob Dietch;

H. R. 10022. An act for the relief of Eldredge & Mason, of Malone, N. Y.;

H. R. 7027. An act for the relief of Herbert E. Shenton;

H. R. 5020. An act to provide for the sale by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of certain land in the District of Columbia acquired for a school site, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9631. An act for the relief of Edward F. Dunne, jr.;

H. R. 927. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Diminico;

H. R. 7921. An act granting six months' pay to Alice P. Dewey;

H. R. 12053. An act to define butter and to provide a standard therefor;

H. R. 10848. An act for the relief of Estella W. Dougherty;

H. R. 14183. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell a portion of the Federal building site in the city of Duquoin, Ill.;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Charles L. McCulley;

H. R. 12584. An act for the relief of Alice Loeber;

H. R. 514. An act authorizing the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to Josephine H. Barin;

H. R. 13903. An act for the relief of the New York State Fair Commission; and

H. R. 4653. An act for the relief of Allie Melinda Outterside.

JOINT COMMISSION OF GOLD AND SILVER INQUIRY.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 287, creating the joint commission of gold and silver inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri calls from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 287, with a House amendment, disagreed to by the Senate, and moves to agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order. That has to be done by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I think it does, even on the last six days of the sessions. I think it requires unanimous consent for a motion to suspend the rules. This is a request for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was of opinion that it was privileged to agree to the conference asked.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Senate passes a resolution. The House amends it. It goes back to the originating body, the Senate. They disagree to the House amendment and ask for a conference. It is perfectly proper for the House to agree to the conference, to insist upon its amendment, and agree to the conference asked for, so that the two bodies can get together. That is fundamental in arriving at an agreement between the two bodies. What else can be done? Of course, the House can recede and withdraw its amendment. That can be done at any time, but it is so rare that it is never considered. The only thing now before the House, in order to bring the two bodies together, is to either not have a conference and leave the bill die, or to insist on the amendment of the House and agree to the conference asked for.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is quite true, of course, that in order to bring the two bodies together there must be a conference or a recession, but the method of getting the matter to conference——

Mr. STAFFORD. Is privileged.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon, but not even an appropriation bill or a bill of any sort has ever been sent to conference except by unanimous consent or under special rule or by suspension of the rules.

Mr. STAFFORD. With all due deference to the gentleman, he confuses the conditions. He is taking the case of a Senate amendment to a House bill which involves an appropriation, which must be sent either to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, because it is a charge on the Treasury, before it is agreed to, or else to conference under unanimous consent, but that is not this case. I know what the gentleman is referring to. The gentleman is referring to this situation: The House passes a bill. It goes to the Senate. The Senate amends it with a proposal that carries a charge on the Treasury. It comes back, and of course the person having the bill in charge must ask unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference. But in the instant case the situation is reversed. The House amends a Senate bill and the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House and asks for a conference. For the very reason that conference reports are privileged, because they bring the Houses that much nearer to agreement as to their differences, the motion to insist on the amendment of the House and agree to the conference asked for is privileged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is ready to rule. In this case the Senate passed a resolution. The House amended it and sent the resolution to the Senate with a House amendment. The Senate has disagreed to the amendment of the House and sends the resolution back to the House with its disagreement and asks for a conference.

There is therefore a disagreement and it is well settled that when the stage of disagreement has been reached between the two Houses the matter becomes a matter of privilege. Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, page 236, summing up the matter, states:

> This was a case wherein the Senate had disagreed to a House amendment and asked for a conference.
> It is an accepted principle that after the stage of disagreement has been reached a bill is privileged.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, of course the bill is privileged. I am not talking about the privilege nature, but what I am talking about is the method of getting it to conference. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there has never been a bill sent to conference of any character except by unanimous consent or under special rule or by a suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was of the opinion that the rule did not apply during the last six days of the session.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A motion may be made——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is within the gentleman's power, of course, to move to suspend the rules and send it to conference, but it is not in his power to move without suspending the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. May not a Senate bill with a House amendment to which the Senate has disagreed be taken from the Speaker's table as a matter of privilege?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It depends on whether it was on the Union or the House Calendar, but that is not the question before the Chair. It is a question of how to get it to conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the question of agreeing to a conference enters into the question and the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee may hinge upon the question of sending a bill to conference.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly, if I have the floor.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman from Tennessee concedes a motion may be made to suspend the rules?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Now, let me inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee what rule would have to be suspended in order to send this to conference? The gentleman has been recognized by the Speaker; it is a privileged matter. He has been recognized and made a motion. The gentleman from Tennessee says he can move to suspend the rules. What rule is there to suspend in order to send it to conference?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The rules which require that a bill can only go to conference by unanimous consent——

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. What rule is that?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HICKS. Is not the simplest way out of this whole matter to make a motion to suspend the rules and send it to conference?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I do not know any reason why he should make a motion to suspend the rules when nobody has yet pointed out any rule he wants to be suspended. I do not know any reason why this House can not make a motion in the ordinary way; when the gentleman has obtained recognition he is entitled to make the motion. That is the ordinary way to do things. There has been no rule pointed out to be suspended, and I am not in favor of making motions to suspend some rule, unless some gentleman points to what is the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This identical question has been determined. On March 13, 1922—

> Mr. MANN. As I understand the gentleman made the motion, it does not require unanimous consent. It has a privileged status.
> The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). It is a Senate bill with House amendments. The Chair did not understand the gentleman to make the motion; it is privileged. The gentleman from Iowa moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2897, to insist upon the amendments thereto, and to agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

That is this case on all fours. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to insist upon the amendments of the House and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 191, noes 7.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RHODES, Mr. COLTON, and Mr. WINGO.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker pro tempore signed the same:

H. R. 13775. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to credits and refunds;

H. R. 14302. An act to establish and promote the use of the official cotton standards of the United States in interstate and foreign commerce, to prevent deception thereon and provide for the proper application of such standards, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14408. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14144. An act to limit and fix the time within which suits may be brought or rights asserted in court arising out of the provisions of subdivision 3 of section 302 of the soldiers and sailors' civil relief act, approved March 18, 1918, being chapter 20, volume 40, General Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 2722. An act for the relief of W. W. McGrath;

H. R. 13430. An act to amend section 370 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution proposing payment to certain employees of the United States;

H. R. 13612. An act authorizing the issuance of patent to the legal representatives of Miles J. Davis, deceased;

H. R. 13998. An act making section 1535c of the Code Law for the District of Columbia applicable to the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14309. An act to amend section 206 of the transportation act, 1920;

H. R. 14087. An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13004. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the Kansas Electric Power Co., its successors, and assigns, a certain tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth;

H. R. 14135. An act to amend an act approved September 8, 1916, providing for holding sessions of the United States district court in the district of Maine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5918. An act for the relief of the Michigan Boulevard Building Co.;

H. R. 14077. An act to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14435. An act making appropriations to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924;

H. R. 14082. An act to authorize the Valley Transfer Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a line of railway in and upon the Fort Snelling Military Reservation, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 14324. An act to amend section 107 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as heretofore amended;

H. R. 13024. An act for the relief of August Nelson;

H. R. 13774. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to exchanges of property;

H. R. 13810. An act to continue the improvement of the Mississippi River and for the control of its floods;

H. R. 14050. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to income tax of nonresident aliens;

H. R. 14401. An act to amend and modify the war risk insurance act;

H. J. Res. 422. A joint resolution permitting the entry free of duty of certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries;

H. R. 14351. An act to authorize bridging the Ohio River at Moundsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 8928. An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services;

H. R. 12378. An act granting consent of Congress to maintain a bridge across the Rio Grande River;

H. R. 14429. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn.; and

H. R. 14428. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Moorhead, Minn., and Fargo, N. Dak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 2984. An act for the relief of Thurston W. True;

S. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to amend the resolution of December 29, 1920, entitled "Joint resolution to create a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Administrative Branch of the Government";

S. 2051. An act to amend section 3142 of the Revised Statutes, to permit an increase in the number of collection districts for the collection of internal revenue and in the number of collectors of internal revenue from 64 to 65;

S. 4503. An act granting the consent of Congress to Bethlehem Steel Co. to construct a bridge across Humphreys Creek at or near the city of Sparrows Point, Md.;

S. 4592. An act granting consent of Congress to the Eagle Pass & Piedras Negras Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande between Eagle Pass, Tex., and Piedras Negras, Mexico;

S. 4160. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a commission for the purpose of securing information in connection with questions relative to interstate commerce in coal, and for other purposes," approved September 22, 1922;

S. 3580. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.;

S. 4280. An act to provide additional 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;

S. 425. An act authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to fix the salaries of United States attorneys and United States marshals of the several judicial districts of the United States within certain limits;

S. 4216. An act authorizing the sale of real property no longer required for military purposes;

S. 4638. An act authorizing the Great Northern Railway Co. to maintain and operate, or reconstruct, maintain, and operate, its bridge across the Columbia River at Marcus, in the State of Washington;

S. 4117. An act authorizing the closing of certain portions of Grant Road in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 4631. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Bowie and Cass, State of Texas, for construction of a bridge across Sulphur River, at or near Paces Ferry, in said counties and State;

S. 4637. An act for the relief of certain disbursing agents under the Department of Commerce; and

S. 4245. An act to provide the necessary organization of the customs service for an adequate administration and enforcement of the tariff act of 1922 and all other customs-revenue laws.

ADDITIONAL TERMINAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speakers' table House bill 6650, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 6650, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let the Senate amendments be reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the bill may be read so that we can tell what bill it is, there may not be any objection to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will again report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were again read.

Mr. BLANTON. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker pro tempore announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. FOCHT, Mr. ZIHLMAN, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

MONUMENT TO AMERICAN WOMEN FOR SERVICES IN WORLD WAR.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 168, I would like to have the sympathetic attention of the Members here for a minute while I attempt to make a statement. There is no possibility of the Red Cross organization proceeding to collect money required by this bill to build the structure that is authorized by this resolution, down here on Government land, where the present beautiful Red Cross building stands, without this authority being given. If we do not do it before the close of this Congress, the Red Cross authorities can not proceed with the collection of funds. The suggestion has been made that there was no need of our proceeding now, because nothing would be done until a year from now. That is an error as must appear when the situation is understood. The difficulty is that if Congress does not do anything now there can not be anything done by the organization of the American Red Cross in the way of getting ready to meet by private subscription what this bill authorizes in the appropriation of $150,000.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. I did not catch the reading of the resolution. Does it provide for the construction of a new building, or for the enlargement of the present building?

Mr. FESS. The language of the resolution is "to erect a memorial building to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States, and so forth, in the World War."

It is to be erected upon the present ground. It may be an enlargement of the present structure. The Congress in 1913 made an appropriation to build this memorial building if the Red Cross organization would collect the balance of the required amount. Since that was done the Red Cross has collected over $400,000,000 in money and valuable supplies to be applied to the Red Cross work. They have operated since that

in 68 cases of disaster, to say nothing about the great World War.

The statement that Miss Boardman makes as the head of this wonderful institution—which by the way, allow me to say to my Democratic friends, was started under the inspiration of Grover Cleveland when he was President of the United States [applause]—is that 382,000,000 hospital, knitted, and other garments, surgical dressings, and other articles that were needed were made by volunteer women workers in the United States, and that over 40,000,000 refreshment portions were served to traveling troops and to the sick on trains, and something over 15,000,000 in France.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Is this building to be used for the District Red Cross?

Mr. FESS. It is the American Red Cross for the whole United States.

Mr. CARTER. What is that other building?

Mr. FESS. It is to be a memorial to the women of the World War. The present building is a memorial to the women of the Civil War, both North and South.

Mr. CARTER. Is the gentleman certain that it is to be used in this country?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I am. Miss Boardman, in a letter to our committee, gives its purpose:

> This memorial building will provide a very practical and valuable return to the Government. Through our Red Cross chapters last year there was expended $9,000,000 in service to the disabled men, that the Government could not render, and also $1,341,000 for 68 disasters in the United States.
>
> Such work as this the Red Cross will be able to continue only if plans are developed for legitimate peace-time activities by means of which these chapters are kept alive. The proposed memorial building will be utilized as a model chapter house for the development of these plans. There will be no further expense to the Government, as it will be maintained by the Red Cross, which in addition will raise $150,000 for the building.
>
> We do not need any appropriation this year, only the authorization of the appropriation, so that we may begin our work to raise our share of the fund and prepare our building plans.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CHALMERS. Is this building to take the place of the temporary building on the site?

Mr. FESS. The temporary buildings will be removed. It is to cost not less than $300,000. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is to be raised by the Government, and when it is done it is the property of the United States, both the site and the building, just as the present Red Cross building is now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This is to be used wholly by the Red Cross?

Mr. FESS. Yes; wholly by the Red Cross. It strikes me that nothing would appeal to the Members of Congress more deeply than this movement. It is asked by the women of the country; not by any sordid interests of any sort, but by those people who are back of this wonderful movement.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. When is it supposed that this will be finished?

Mr. FESS. Next year. They want to proceed now to raise the $150,000 by collections, and next year this appropriation is to operate. They hope to begin the construction early next year. I hope that this misunderstanding to the effect that there is no need of our doing it now will not lead Congress to deny its support to that effort.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there anything in the Red Cross making their contribution contingent upon appropriation being made later by Congress? We have not had a chance to get a copy of the bill to read it.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman knows very well that the Red Cross association will not go out to make any collections until this authorization of appropriation is made, because they are not people to make any assumption of that kind. I asked Miss Boardman that specific question, fearing we might not get unanimous action on this bill. I said to her, "Why not go on and collect the money now?" She said, "We could not do that. That would be assuming that Congress is going to do what here is requested, and Congress would criticize us very severely, and justly so, if we proceeded on that basis."

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. Where is this building to be constructed relative to the present Red Cross building?

Mr. FESS. I did not ask Miss Boardman whether it is to be attached to the present building or is a separate building.

Mr. RAKER. The only reason I ask the question is that there is a bridge between the main building and they have built a three-story building behind that of stone and concrete. I wondered where they were going to put this building.

Mr. FESS. If you notice the resolution provides that it must be in conjunction with the Fine Arts Commission and also the approval of the Committee on the Library.

Mr. RAKER. I hope the resolution will pass.

Mr. FESS. I can not believe there will be any hesitation on the part of this body to give most enthusiastic support of this outstanding movement to alleviate suffering humanity. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor therefor, the bill was passed.

UNITED STATES MILITARY RESERVATION—FORT DE RUSSY, HONOLULU, HAWAII.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask that the Speaker lay before the House the unfinished business which is S. 3424.

The Clerk read the title of the bill as follows:

An act (S. 3424) to provide for the reclamation of the United States Military Reservation, Fort De Russy, Honolulu, Hawaii.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended. Debate has been exhausted and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LONDON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. When was debate exhausted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On September 18.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Massachusetts in moving to suspend the rules and pass the bill did not move that it be passed with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays the unfinished business before the House, and it is the bill with the amendment pending. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

RESTRICTION AGAINST ALIENATION ON SURPLUS LANDS OF THE KANSAS OR KAW INDIANS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4544) to authorize the extension of the period of restriction against the alienation on surplus lands allotted to minor members of the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma and consider the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider the bill S. 4544. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, it is now the hour of 2 o'clock a. m., and for that reason I object.

Mr. CARTER. Will not the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. How long are we going to sit here?

Mr. CARTER. Let the gentleman from New York explain the bill and, I think, the gentleman from Texas will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw the objection, but I would like to know if we are to be here all night?

Mr. MONDELL. I hope that Members will be patient. The conference report on the Alien Property Custodian bill will be in soon.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Senate adjourned half an hour ago, and is there any reason why we should sit up here waiting for that?

Mr. McARTHUR. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is, the gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SNYDER. This bill is of small moment to the public, but it is of great importance to a small band of Indians, 80 in number, of whom 16 are under restrictions. Recently oil was discovered on the reservation. On the 13th of May, unless the bill is passed, the restriction will have expired and the 16 minors will be without protection. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. SNYDER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 14226) to amend an act entitled "An act to

provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, had requested a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. WALSH of Montana as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 11528) to allow credits in the accounts of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 6577) authorizing the conveyance of certain land in the State of South Dakota to the Robert E. Kelley Post, No. 79, American Legion, South Dakota.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 6196. An act for the relief of Robert E. Danforth;

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of certain homestead entrymen;

H. R. 13751. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent certain lands to Robert E. Wyche, a resident of Caddo Parish, La.;

H. R. 8291. An act for the relief of Trygve Kristian Lode;

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution carrying out the purpose of a House resolution providing for a legislative clerk to the acting minority leader of the House, adopted March 3, 1923;

H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution to authorize the transportation to Porto Rico of a committee representing the Fourth Ohio Infantry, war with Spain;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of William H. Philbrick;

H. R. 13617. An act to dissolve the Colored Union Benevolent Association, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13724. An act for the relief of Hugh Marshall Montgomery;

H. R. 12171. An act to grant certain lands to the city of Skagway, Alaska, for a public park;

H. R. 8871. An act for the relief of Richard Andrews;

H. R. 624. An act for the relief of Albert H. White, Mary E. Fowler, Lorena B. Winkler, E. E. White, and C. A. White;

H. R. 8625. An act to provide for the cession to the State of Michigan of certain public lands in the county of Keweenaw, State of Michigan;

H. R. 14296. An act to authorize the county of Huron, State of Michigan, to convey a certain described tract of land to the State of Michigan for public park purposes;

H. R. 12138. An act for the relief of Frank A. Jahn; and

H. J. Res. 415. A joint resolution to authorize the improvement of the Columbia River at St. Helens, Oreg.

TITLE TO LANDS WITHIN PUEBLO INDIAN LAND GRANTS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3855) to quiet the title to lands within Pueblo Indian land grants, and for other purposes, and to consider the same at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection until I can make an explanation?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let the bill be read first.

Mr. BLANTON. There is a great deal of opposition to this bill, as I understand it.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will let me explain, I think there will be no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is a very well posted man on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, he will not object to the bill.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. I would like to have the gentleman give an explanation.

Mr. SNYDER. This bill is to correct the titles to the Pueblo Indians. There has been a great deal of discussion for several months with regard to this matter. This bill is the outcome of intensive hearings held in the Senate and in the House and it is a compromise. It embodies features that will assist tremendously at this time in straightening out the affairs of the Pueblo Indians. It provides for the appointment of a commission, consisting of the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General, and another to be appointed by the President, to whom the whole matter is to be brought. If these three men can not agree unanimously to any title, then that must be brought to the Congress for adjustment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Is this the bill that we have been propagandized about so much?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. This is a compromise after consideration by all of the parties.

Mr. LITTLE. Which pueblo is this?

Mr. SNYDER. There are 20 pueblos and the bill covers them all.

Mr. LITTLE. Does this settle the title of the lands in the Indians?

Mr. SNYDER. It settles the title in the persons to whom it should go.

Mr. LITTLE. Will white men or Indians get the land?

Mr. SNYDER. Both.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

RADIO PATENTS.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 548, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 548.

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission be, and it is hereby, requested to investigate and to report to the House of Representatives at the convening of the Sixty-eighth Congress, or as soon thereafter as practicable, the facts relating to (a) the ownership of patents covering radio apparatus used in interstate and/or foreign commerce and to all assignments or other contracts concerning such patents; (b) contracts, leases, or agreements in whatsoever form the same may be, or practices, the purpose, tendency, or effect of which is to control or restrict the manufacture, sale, resale, or use within the United States of such radio apparatus or to control or fix the price therefor; (c) contracts, leases, or agreements in whatsoever form the same may be, or practices, the purpose, tendency, or effect of which is to give exclusive rights or special privileges in the reception and transmission in interstate and/or foreign commerce of messages by radio; and (d) such other facts as, in the opinion of the commission, may aid the House of Representatives in determining whether, in the foregoing respects or otherwise on this or related subjects, the antitrust statutes of the United States have been or now are being violated by any person, company, or corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and (e) such other facts as, in the opinion of the commission, may aid the House in determining what further legislation may be advisable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether this resolution will hamper or harass General Harboard?

Mr. EDMONDS. In no way at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Or his radio corporation?

Mr. EDMONDS. I do not know. It may.

Mr. BLANTON. Which are adjuncts of the great American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Mr. EDMONDS. I do not know. During the consideration of the radio bill in the House there was a question raised here as to the ownership of radio patents. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries prepared a House resolution asking the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the situation in regard to these patents and report back to us at the first meeting in December.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FLOOD CONTROL SURVEYS.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 14425) authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of sundry streams with a view to the control of their floods, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations to be made of the following streams with a view to the control of their floods in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and the Sacramento River, California, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917:

Illinois River, Illinois.
West Fork of White River, Indiana.
Skagit River, Washington.
Trinity River, Texas.
Brazos River, Texas.
Colorado River, Texas.
Pond River, Kentucky.
Wabash River, Illinois and Indiana.
Colorado River in the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

The sum of $4,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary is hereby authorized to be expended out of any funds heretofore appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made of the following streams with a view to the control of their floods in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, California, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917:

North Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania and New York, and the sum of $8,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers and the sum of $25,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose: *Provided*, That no money hereby authorized to be appropriated shall be expended unless and until assurances have been given satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will contribute a like sum of $25,000 for the purpose of making the survey hereby authorized; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to receive from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania such sum of $25,000 and to expend the same as the $25,000 hereby authorized to be appropriated may be expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is only an authorization, and it is not worth a thing until there is legislation next winter. There is no earthly sense of taking it up at this time of night.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I renew the point of no quorum, if these gentlemen insist upon bringing up something that is not good until next winter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged report from the Committee on Elections.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. What was done about the point of order of no quorum?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was withdrawn.

Mr. BLANTON. I renew it; we ought to have some mercy on these reporters. They can not work all day and night, too. There are two absent and there are only four right now reporting on the House.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there is a motion pending.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Texas——

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess 15 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there is a motion already pending. I was recognized——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess 15 minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All gentlemen will be seated.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not care to interfere with the bill which is before the House, but there is a conference report being prepared, as I understand, upon the alien-property matter that it is desirable to have disposed of. I do not care to interfere with this, and I am perfectly willing to withdraw the request for a recess of 15 minutes, but if the House is going to get into another squabble and row we had better take a recess now. I will withdraw the request for the time being.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the Chair allow me a minute to make a statement? Mr. Speaker, I have no personal interest in the world in this bill. I was requested by the chairman of the committee in his absence and absence of other majority members of the committee to call up this bill for the Committee on Flood Control. The arrangement was made with the Speaker by gentlemen on the majority side to recognize me for that purpose. I am acting for the chairman of the committee when I make this request, for Mr. RODENBERG. There are two sections of the bill, nine projects. The first section requires no appropriation of money. The Chief of Engineers has the data for four of these in his office, but can not under the law give it to us, and this bill simply requires him to give it to us, so that we may know how much the survey will cost. The five others, all put together, will cost $4,000. It simply authorizes the Chief of Engineers to make a preliminary examination and report. The second section provides for surveys, one in the State of Pennsylvania, which has already appropriated $25,000 to match the $25,000 authorized here; and the other for the Susquehanna, where the preliminary report is already made. The flood condition exists in Pennsylvania, but the cause of the flood is in New York. Pennsylvania can not cure the trouble, because it is beyond her borders. In this item $8,000 is authorized to make the necessary survey.

These two last items in section 2 will have to go over to the next Congress for an appropriation, but the first nine involve 4,000,000 acres of overflowed land and only $4,000 is necessary to make the examination. The money is already appropriated but is not available, but the Secretary of War is authorized in this bill to use it. This simply asks him to make the estimate for us and tell us how much a survey is going to cost.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The second section carries authorization of over $200,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No. The second section carries authorizations of $33,000, and $25,000 of that is to match a sum already appropriated by the State of Pennsylvania, and the other $8,000 is for the Susquehanna River. It authorizes a survey to find out how they can control their floods there, even though the contributing cause may be in the State of New York Now, the authority to appropriate would be only $33,000 for both items in the second section. The first section, in any event, ought to become a law.

Mr. CRAMTON. As to the first section, what good will it be if we pass this now and have that information coming to Congress in December? You can get it in December as well as now.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Oh, no. The money is already appropriated in the river and harbor bill and will be spent before December.

Mr. MONDELL. That bill can not become a law under any circumstances, even if it were passed by the House. There is no possibility of it becoming a law. We have before us Senate bills that ought to be disposed of before that bill—important as it is, that can not become a law—is taken up at the very last moment of the session under suspension of the rules.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I just wanted to state, Mr. Speaker, that I am not part of the organization in the House. I am representing the minority here, but I was requested by the chairman of the committee to present this matter for him in his absence. I can not withdraw it because the gentleman interested asked me to do what the chairman asked me to do, and I have got to do it.

Mr. MONDELL. It can not be considered at this time under suspension of the rules. It is too important a matter, and it can not become a law in any event.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Was there a unanimous-consent request that a second be considered as ordered, and was that without objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was objected to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Then all we have to do is to not second the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky 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. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the Republican minority in Congress during the war supported President Wilson more consistently in his war measures than his own party. The so-called Republican States furnished many more men and much more money to carry on the war than the so-called Democratic States, yet no prominent Republican was appointed by President Wilson to have a part in the direction of these men or the expenditure of the money, and President Wilson in October, 1918, called upon the country to send none but Democrats to the House and Senate. According to President Wilson, none but Democrats need to apply for service in the great law-making body of the Republic. The American people answered this challenge by sending a majority of Republicans to both the House and Senate. President Wilson called the Sixty-sixth Congress into extraordinary session May, 1919, and what did this Republican Congress find?

Although the war had been over for six months, all of the war-time laws were still in force, abridging the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of lawful assembly. President Wilson possessed dictatorial powers over the lives, the liberties, and the property of the American people. The Wilson administration was continuing to make guns, powder, shells, and other war materials, to buy camp sites and to build

Army camps. Billions of dollars were spent in this way during the spring and summer of 1919, and hundreds of millions were being spent for war materials. The railroads, telephone, telegraph, and shipping lines were still under Government control and costing the American taxpayers about $3,000,000 per day. We were technically at war with the Central Powers. We had an immense Army scattered over the globe. We had nearly a million men and women in the civil employment of the Government. Appropriations to run the Government had not been provided for. The soldiers of all the wars were clamoring for relief. Prohibition, woman suffrage, and other important questions were pressing. All of these and many other important questions came up for solution before the new Republican Congress.

SAVED $940,000,000 ON APPROPRIATIONS.

The appropriation bills for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1919, had been passed by a Democratic House, but had not passed the Senate. The new Republican Congress took up and considered these same appropriation bills and passed them, but cut them down and saved the American taxpayers $940,000,000.

The Democratic Secretary of War called upon the Republican Congress to provide a standing army of 576,000 men and provide universal compulsory military training for all of the able-bodied boys of America. This program would have cost the American taxpayers for the Army alone more than $1,000,000,000, or about $10 in taxes for every man, woman, and child in America. The Republican Congress refused to grant compulsory military training and cut down and reduced the Army to 125,000 men. This alone has saved to the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Republican Congress found nearly 1,000,000 men and women in the civil employment of the Government, costing the American taxpayers something like $1,000,000,000 per year. The Sixty-sixth and the Sixty-seventh Congresses and the Republican administration have cut out nearly 400,000 of these useless officeholders.

The new Republican Congress restored the railroad, telephone, telegraph, and shipping lines to their private owners and thereby saved the American taxpayers nearly $3,000,000 per day.

The new Republican Congress passed the resolution proposing to amend the Constitution to give to American women equal suffrage with men.

This same Congress passed over President Wilson's veto the prohibition enforcement law known as the Volstead Act.

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS SAVES $2,500,000,000 MORE.

We must bear in mind that the executive branch of the Government, the branch that does the spending, was in the hands of the Democrats during the whole life of the Sixty-sixth Congress. The executive branch of the Government submits estimates to Congress of the amount of money necessary to run the Government. The Wilson administration did this for the appropriations considered and passed by the Sixty-sixth Congress. The administration claimed they had to have the amount of money fixed in these estimates, but the Republican Congress cut out and reduced these estimates $2,500,000,000. That means $25 of taxes for each man, woman, and child in America. It meant much to the taxpayers of America to have a Republican Congress hold the purse strings of the people at this time.

THE SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS AND THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION.

The Sixty-seventh Congress is at an end and this likewise marks the end of the first half of the Republican administration. These have been two full years for the Republican Congress and the administration. Two most remarkable years in the nature and extent of the problems considered and solved. In order to correctly visualize the accomplishments of the Congress and the administration, it is necessary to consider the problems that confronted us on March 4, 1921. While more than two years had elapsed, yet we were technically at war with our late enemy. There was discord and chaos at home, distrust and confusion abroad. We had just emerged from a period of such wanton waste and extravagance that this Republic had never before experienced. Our national debt of $1,000,000,000 before the war had been increased to more than $26,000,000,000. Nearly 5,000,000 men were out of employment. Our own gold bonds were selling for 84 cents on the dollar. The high war taxes were still in full force. The oppressive war-time laws still ruled the country. Under the Underwood free trade tariff law our country was being made the "dumping ground" for the world. Discontent and mistrust were everywhere present. Bankruptcy was threatened on every hand. The flood tide of foreign immigration had set in. The farming industry was paralyzed. The reaction of the world's greatest destruction of men, money, property, and government had set in. The Republican Party comes on the scene after the storm and after the conflagration to clean up the wreckage. It has been said that it is quite as necessary for the Republican Party to follow a Democratic administration as it is for the ambulance to follow the battle to gather up the dead and wounded and clear away the wreckage. It was the task of the Republican administration to restore peace, bring order to our domestic and foreign affairs, reduce the burden of taxes, relieve the unemployment, restore the Government's credit, put the American farmers on their feet, revive the industries of the country, check the horde of foreign immigration, reduce the Army and Navy, provide for our disabled veterans, clear away the wreckage and rebuild the industrial, social, and political structure of our country on a safe and sound basis. In undertaking this tremendous task we had to meet the active, persistent, and hostile opposition of our Democratic friends in Congress, whose mismanagement of the affairs of the Government had brought about these conditions, as well as a hostile Democratic press. The story of the accomplishment of these great aims by the Republican administration when written will compare favorably with any in the history of the Republic.

PROSPERITY WITH PEACE.

It took a World War to bring prosperity to the Wilson administration. The war over, millions were idle, business paralyzed. The Republican administration under its wise policies has brought prosperity to the land in peace time. Unemployment has disappeared. Billions have been paid on the debts created by the Wilson administration. Uncle Sam's note is worth one hundred cents to the dollar, and the country is in the midst of one of the greatest eras of prosperity that it has ever known. We have the confidence and good will of all of the nations of the world. No commitments have been made that will send our boys to the battle fields of Europe, Asia, or Africa. Our country is free of all entangling alliances.

REPUBLICAN ECONOMY—DEMOCRATIC WASTE.

It is very amusing indeed to hear our Democratic friends in Congress and in the Democratic press say that the Republican Congress has not done anything and the Republican administration has wasted the people's money. The Wilson administration, in wanton and reckless waste of the public money, far surpasses any administration in the history of the Republic. Up until the very day that President Wilson left office his administration was spending more money than the revenues of the country, and the first important step of the Harding administration was to put on foot a policy of rigid economy. The tax burden could not be lifted in any other way. The unthinking tell us of the good times of the Wilson administration. We submit that it is more popular to scatter the people's money all over the country than it is to pay the debts when once created. There was no prosperity in the Wilson administration until the World War came on. Until that time millions were out of employment. The sidetracks everywhere were filled with idle empty cars. It took a World War to bring prosperity to the Wilson administration. Can we boast of a prosperity that was fished out of rivers of blood and a sea of tears? We spent more than $30,000,000,000 during the World War. Of course this vast sum turned loose made money plentiful everywhere, but we were simply borrowing from the future. We have been, are now, and shall continue to pay for that brief period of so-called prosperity. Our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren will be taxed for the Wilson prosperity. By way of comparison, let us notice the Democratic waste and the Republican economy. The Wilson administration expended during the fiscal year of 1919 $18,544,879,955. Only four and one-half months of this period was war, yet in one year the Wilson administration expended nearly five times as much as it cost the Union for four years of Civil War.

During the fiscal year 1920 the Wilson administration expended $6,560,467,533.13. In that one year they expended more than one and one-half times the cost of the Civil War. The last year of the Wilson administration they expended nearly $6,000,000,000. After deducting the sums that will be paid on account of claims arising out of the Wilson administration the Harding administration will expend this year around $3,000,000,000. This includes interest on the war debt, also nearly $400,000,000 as payment on the principal of the war debt, also about $750,000,000 for pensions and compensations for our soldiers and their dependents. So in the last year of the Wilson administration they spent nearly twice as much as we are spending this year under the Harding administration.

The public debt on August 21, 1919, was $26,594,267,878. On February 23, 1923, it was $22,715,338,730. In other words, since the Republican Congress and the Republican administration took charge of affairs we have met all of the expenses of

the Government and have reduced the public debt $3,778,929,148. Every sensible man and woman must confess that this is a record to be proud of, although it may not be as popular to pay the debts of the Nation as it is to borrow from the future and scatter money everywhere. The fact that the Wilson administration was making debts and piling up debts instead of paying them is why our gold bonds—"Uncle Sam's notes"—fell from 100 cents on the dollar to 84 cents on the dollar. The Harding administration has reduced the Army and the Navy, cut off nearly 400,000 of useless officeholders, cut out every item of unnecessary expense, and has put the Government on a sound business basis, and one of the great means to accomplish this purpose was the passage of the Budget law, whereby the closest scrutiny is given to each item of expense of the Government. A Republican Congress passed this law while President Wilson was in office, but he vetoed it.

LIFTING THE TAX BURDEN.

When the Republican administration came into power March 4, 1921, although the war had been over nearly two and one-half years the oppressive war taxes were still in force. The Republican Congress revised the revenue laws and reduced the tax burden for this year nearly $1,000,000,000. The Republican Congress repealed the tax on railroad tickets, on freight rates, and on parcel post, and in this way has saved the American people $300,000,000 per year. Many of the other war taxes have been cut off, causing an additional saving to taxpayers of $120,000,000. The taxes on persons of small incomes were either cut out or reduced. The attempt to greatly reduce the taxes on the very large incomes was defeated.

BEST LAW EVER FOR LABOR.

When the Republican Congress met in April, 1921, it was found that there were more than 13,000,000 persons of foreign birth living in this country. The World War having come to a close, millions were proposing to migrate to this country to escape the war-ridden, tax-burdened, and famine-stricken countries of the Old World. Congress had attempted during President Wilson's administration to restrict foreign immigration, but President Wilson vetoed that measure. The Republican Congress also found that there were about 5,000,000 men out of employment in this country. The millions proposing to come to this country for the most part were coming for one or two purposes—to work or to cause trouble. Millions of our own citizens could not find employment. The Republican Congress got busy and passed the first great foreign immigration restriction law and this was promptly signed by President Harding. I am firmly convinced early in the next session of Congress that foreign immigration will be further greatly restricted. The anti-immigration act is the greatest measure any Congress has passed for labor since the founding of the Republic. What is it that makes good wages? When there is at least one job for each man wanting a job. When there are jobs seeking men instead of men seeking jobs. Through the revival of business and the shutting out of millions of foreign laborers, instead of having 5,000,000 men unemployed, as we had when Mr. Wilson went out of office, to-day there is a shortage of labor, and many of the great employers of labor have during the last few months strongly importuned Congress to open the gates again of America to a large foreign population, but I feel sure a Republican Congress will never repeal any of these restrictions. It is claimed that there are 50 per cent more miners in the mines than are necessary. This is due to the large foreign population in the mines. If this anti-immigration law had been passed 8 or 10 years ago we would not have this oversupply of men in our mines. In nearly every industry men are receiving higher wages to-day than they received during the World War.

The Republican Congress passed the vocational rehabilitation law to train and rehabilitate persons injured in industry, in the mines and on the railroad, in the factory, in the shop, and so forth.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The Republican Congress passed a comprehensive protective tariff law. This was very necessary to protect the Nation's labor and industries. Every reasonable man approves the restriction of foreign immigration. So far as it is possible, the people of this country should run the railroads, mines, shops, factories, and the farms. One of the chief purposes in cutting out foreign immigration is to give employment to Americans; but this would mean little to American labor if we should adopt the policy of free trade and permit shoes, clothing, machinery, agricultural products to be produced in foreign countries and dumped into our own country in competition with American labor and American capital. It would be better for us to permit the foreigners to come to this country and to produce the products here. Restricted immigration and the protective tariff go hand in hand in protecting American labor. Every shipload of shoes produced in Europe and dumped into America takes that much employment from American shoemakers. Every shipload of cattle, sheep, and wool produced in Australia, South America, and Mexico and brought here takes that much away from the farmers and the workers on the farms of America, and what is true of these products is true of any other product that can be produced in our own country. The Republican Party stands for the protection of American labor and American capital and has never been willing to put our workingmen and our industries in unfair competition with the cheap labor of foreign countries.

While many of our Democratic friends in Congress talk of free trade and tariff for revenue only, yet I have observed that most of them vote for a protective tariff when products from their own district or in their own State are involved. This proves to me the soundness of the policy of the Republican Party in favoring protection for the products of the entire Nation. Our Democratic friends talked long and loud that the Fordney tariff bill would kill our foreign trade. For the first month, October, 1922, under the Fordney Tariff Act our exports amounted to $370,718,595. We exported in October, 1921, under the Underwood tariff law $343,330,815. In November, 1922, we exported $380,056,542. In November, 1921, we exported $294,092,219. We can see that our export trade has increased, yet, on the other hand, we will collect in revenues on imports about $600,000,000 per year. We have not hurt our foreign trade. We have greatly increased our revenues and protected American labor and American capital.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESS SOLDIERS' FRIEND.

The Republican Party has always guarded with jealous care the welfare of the soldiers of the Republic and their dependents. As evidence of this interest I call your attention to some of the splendid provisions made by the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Congresses for the soldiers and their dependents:

The act of May 1, 1920, increasing the pensions of Civil War soldiers and their dependents. Under that law all widows of Civil War soldiers receive $30 per month, their children under 16 years of age receive $6 per month, and the soldiers themselves from $50 to $72 per month. Perhaps more than 70 per cent of the veterans of the Civil War are now receiving $72 per month under this splendid law.

The Spanish-American and Philippine War soldiers had been pleading for eight years with the Democratic Congress for relief. The Republican Congress on June 5, 1920, passed an act giving to these soldiers from $12 to $30 per month, according to the degree of disability, and these disabled soldiers may receive this pension, although their disabilities were not incurred in the service, and under this act more than 100,000 soldiers of that war have been benefited.

The Republican Congress on September 1, 1922, passed an act increasing the pensions of widows and dependent parents of soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American and Philippine War from $12 to $20 per month and increased the pension of the children from $2 to $4 per month.

The Republican Congress passed what is known as the Bursum bill, giving to each Civil War soldier $72 per month and $50 per month to their widows. This bill was vetoed by the President.

The pensioners and their dependents of all the wars urged the Democratic Congress for eight long years to pay their pensions monthly instead of quarterly; the Republican Congress passed an act granting this relief, and all of the pensioners and their dependents now receive their pension checks each and every month.

HELPED WORLD WAR SOLDIERS.

The Democratic Congress provided what is known as compensation for the disabled soldiers and sailors of the World War. Under that act a soldier or sailor as much as 10 per cent disabled would receive $3 per month, and if he were totally disabled he would receive $30 per month. A Republican Congress amended this act and fixed the minimum at $8 per month and the maximum at $100 per month, so that these disabled soldiers and sailors now receive from $8 per month to $100 per month instead of from $3 to $30 per month.

The Democratic Congress undertook to provide rehabilitation for the disabled soldiers and sailors of the World War, but the training pay was fixed so low that very few could take advantage of it. The Republican Congress amended this law so that any soldier or sailor with a vocational handicap contracted in the service may take this training, and while taking this training he will receive free tuition, free books, free supplies; and if he is a single man, he will receive, in addition, $100 per month; and if he has a wife, he will receive $120 per month; and if he has a wife and two children, he will receive $152.50 per month. Under this splendid law more than 125,000

young men are in the colleges and universities and industrial plants, taking training and learning to be bookkeepers, lawyers, doctors, preachers, teachers, mechanics, and every other trade and profession.

The Republican Congress has greatly enlarged the benefits of the war risk insurance.

The Republican Congress has provided something like $35,000,000 to build hospitals and sanatoriums to take care of these disabled soldiers and sailors of the World War.

Under all of these splendid provisions for the World War soldier provided by a Republican Congress there is being expended now every year for the World War soldiers and sailors and their dependents nearly $500,000,000. The pensions for the soldiers and sailors of other wars, and their dependents, amount to nearly $275,000,000 annually, and it requires about three-fourths of a billion dollars to take care of the soldiers and sailors of the Republic and their dependents. These benefits have been made possible by the Sixty-sixth and the Sixty-seventh Congresses, under the kindly and wise leadership of the Republican Party. No two Congresses in the history of the Republic have done so much for the soldiers and sailors of our country.

The Republican Congress passed an adjusted compensation bill for the World War soldiers, but this was vetoed by the President. Some of our Democratic friends have tried to make much of this veto, but we must not forget that it was a Democratic Congress that fixed the American soldiers and sailors' pay at $30 per month while in the States and $33 per month for overseas service, and nearly one-half of this sum was necessary to pay insurance and other demands. The Republican minority in Congress at the time made a strong fight to give the soldiers and sailors more pay, but the Democrats voted them down. If that Democratic Congress had given these service men adequate compensation, it would be unnecessary now to have their pay adjusted or give them a bonus. If they had given part of the billions that were wasted and taken by war grafters and war contractors to the soldiers and sailors, it would not be necessary now for the Republican administration to provide a bonus.

Just before the Democratic Congress went out of office in 1919 they voted a $60 bonus for the World War soldiers. This amounted to about $300,000,000, but that same Democratic Congress voted many times this amount about the same time as bonuses to the so-called war contractors for the alleged losses of these war contractors. If that immense sum of money had been given to the soldiers instead of the war contractors there would be no need of a bonus for the soldiers now. Again, if so many billions had not been wasted during the Wilson administration we would have ample money to pay the soldiers' bonus. And we must not forget that President Wilson and his Secretaries of the Treasury, GLASS and Houston, strongly opposed the soldiers' bonus, and the Democratic leaders in the Senate and House have all along strongly opposed a soldiers' bonus, and both of them made strong fights against the bill that the Republicans passed in the House and Senate.

GOOD ROADS.

The present Congress and administration have done much for the country in promoting the cause of good roads. The Federal aid act of November 9, 1921, provides for a great system of highways, intercounty and interstate in character, comprising about 185,000 miles. This great highway system will penetrate nearly every county of the 48 States. It provides for the building of this great system on a 50–50 basis in cooperation with the States, and since the 4th of March, 1921, there has been appropriated and authorized to carry out this plan by the Republican Congress $265,000,000, and an additional $28,500,000 for roads and trails in the Territories and the national forests. It further provides for the maintenance and upkeep of these highways when once constructed. Under this plan when these roads are once constructed they will always be kept in first-class condition.

HELPED THE FARMER.

We have heard much from Democratic spellbinders about the farmers of America losing billions of dollars on account of too rapid deflation under the policy of the Federal reserve bank. The farmers were hit hard on this account, but we must not forget that this deflation took place under the Wilson administration and while the Federal reserve banks were under the control of the Democrats. After the war, on account of the financial distress in nearly all of the other countries of the world, the producers of raw products made America the "dumping ground."

Wool, sheep, and lambs were poured into this country from Australia and South America. Cattle, beef, and hides were shipped here in great quantities from South America and Mexico. Wheat from Canada, eggs from China, fruits and sugar from Mexico and the West Indies, and many other products from Europe. The American farmer was put out of business. Two days after the Republican Congress met in April, 1921, an emergency tariff bill for the benefit of the farmers was reported in the House and within two days more it passed the House and within a month it became a law. Many southern Democrats supported the agricultural tariff bill. They had seen the evil effects of the Underwood free trade law. Since the passage of this act there has been a healthy upward trend of prices for farm products and the farmers are coming into their own again. The American farmers were very much in need of loans at reasonable rates. The Republican Congress revised the powers of the War Finance Corporation and established a credit of a billion dollars for the use of the farmers and other industries of the country. The emergency tariff and this new credit put the farmers on the road to prosperity.

The workmen of the country have been given the right to organize, so that by cooperation they can improve their working conditions and secure better wages. The farmers had never been given this right. The Republican Congress initiated and passed what is known as the farmers' cooperative marketing bill, giving the farmers of the country the right to organize to promote their general welfare and to secure better prices for their products. Under this law the stockmen, the tobacco growers, the wheat growers, and others have organized and are greatly benefiting by reason of this law. The Republican Congress greatly extended the benefits of the farm-loan bank. By the agricultural credit act of 1923 Congress provided for two systems of farmers' banks. One is the National Agricultural Credits Association and the other the Federal intermediate credit banks. These laws provide for the financing of farmers on long-time credits at a reasonable rate of interest.

Gambling in grain futures has been a menace to the farmer; the Republican Congress passed a bill cutting out this pernicious practice. In passing the tariff bill the Republican Congress put potash and fertilizers on the free list. This House passed many other measures favorable to the farmers that did not get through the Senate on account of Democratic filibustering.

THE WOMEN AND CHILDREN CONSIDERED.

The Republican Congress made it possible for the women of America to have equal suffrage with men.

The maternity bill passed by the Republican Congress and signed by President Harding will mean much to the women and children of America.

The creation of a woman's bureau in the Department of Labor is a fine recognition of the great part that women are playing in the economic, industrial, and social life of the Nation.

PROHIBITION—VOLSTEAD ACT.

The Republican Congress, over the veto of President Wilson, gave to America a workable and effective prohibition enforcement law, carrying out the provisions of the eighteenth amendment which had been ratified by 45 out of the 48 States of the Union and which has been approved by the direct vote of the people of nearly 40 States of the Union. Under a ruling of Democratic Attorney General Palmer to the effect that beer and wines could be legally sold, the Congress passed the antibeer and wine act.

THE FOREIGN DEBT REFUNDING ACT.

When the Republican Administration came into power it found foreign Governments owed us about $11,000,000,000. This sum of money was loaned to the foreign countries by the former administration. The law under which these loans were made provided that our Government should take bonds from those Governments as security for these loans, but strange to say, Mr. McAdoo, the Secretary of the Treasury, took no bonds or other security but accepted merely the I O U's with no definite stipulation as to time or other conditions of payments. This money had been loaned for nearly three years, but not a cent of principal or of interest had been collected. In fact, Mr. Bryan and many other Democratic leaders were urging the cancellation of these debts. The Republican administration promptly took the position that there would be no cancellation of any of these debts but that these debtors would have to make arrangements to pay. Under an act of the Republican Congress Great Britain has already arranged to refund her debt, amounting to nearly $5,000,000,000, by paying a substantial sum of interest and giving her bonds for the remainder to be paid at a definite time and at a definite rate of interest. The commission created by Congress is now negotiating with

the other nations looking to the refunding of their debts to us, but of course it now looks as if much of this money will never be collected. For instance, Mr. McAdoo turned over $187,000,000 to a certain Russian who came to this country and claimed to represent the Russian people, but as a matter of fact he did not represent the Russian people, and Mr. McAdoo was so advised by the Russian Government. There are other loans in just as bad shape as this. The foreign debt is one of the hundred or more important matters of unfinished business inherited by the Harding administration from the Wilson administration.

PEACE MADE, OPPRESSIVE WAR LAWS REPEALED.

Because of President Wilson's persistence in combining the treaty of peace with the League of Nations the American people were kept out of a well-earned peace for nearly two and one-half years, and it devolved upon the Harding administration to conclude peace with Germany. It was said by Democratic spellbinders in the campaign of 1920 that unless we accepted the Wilson league and treaty that American rights would not be protected, but who now dares to claim that the Harding administration has not fully protected American rights in the treaty negotiated by him with Germany?

The Republican Congress repealed all of the oppressive war-time laws and restored the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, and freedom of lawful assembly.

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE.

It was said by our Democratic friends in the campaign of 1920 that unless we entered the League of Nations we would be ostracized by all of the leading nations of the world. President Harding and Secretary of State Hughes, desiring to submit a great constructive peace plan to the world and at the same time to discontinue the competition in the building of armaments and lift the burden of war cost, called a disarmament conference to meet in Washington. All of the leading nations of the world promptly and gladly responded. They met, not in Paris but in our own National Capital, not under the flag of many colors of the League of Nations but under the Stars and Stripes, not in the atmosphere of hate, greed, and jealousy of the Old World but in the free wholesome air of the United States, and adopted the great formula promulgated by the Savior—the golden rule—in the relations of this country with other countries and their attitude toward us, and agreed to discontinue the competition in the construction of great navies, and made it possible for America to have less battleships and more good roads. better homes, and better schools. This was the greatest step toward world peace in the history of the world.

DEMOCRATIC FILIBUSTER.

The Republican House passed 144 bills which did not get through the Senate because of the Democratic filibuster in the Senate. Many of these were of very great importance—the antilynching bill, to protect the colored people of the country; bill to prevent corrupt trade practices; bill excluding from the mails fraudulent devices; joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to tax-free securities; the omnibus pension bills; bill to incorporate Disabled American Veterans of the World War; and many other measures of great importance.

PROGRESSIVE FUTURE PROGRAM.

The next Republican Congress no doubt will be called upon to consider many of the measures that failed in the Senate—the antilynching bill, a bill to amend the Constitution so that the holders of billions of dollars of tax-exempt securities will be required to pay their just part of the taxes, a bill proposing to amend the Constitution to prohibit the employment of child labor in industries, a bill to amend the transportation act. I think the Railroad Labor Board should be and will be abolished, freight and passenger rates should be further reduced, the State railroad commission should be given greater powers in dealing with intrastate rates, progressive legislation for the benefit of the farmers, further restriction of foreign immigration, further reduction of taxes, adjusted compensation for the World War veterans, and further relief for the veterans of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and their dependents. Thus far the Republican Congress and the Republican administration have carried forward the policy of reconstruction solely in the public interest, and I think they can be trusted to solve the problems of the future in the spirit of progress and according to the teachings of Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt, McKinley, and the other great leaders of the country.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a privileged report from the Committee on Elections.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

FLOOD-CONTROL SURVEYS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, does the Chair hold that while a gentleman has the floor he can be displaced in this way?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A second has not been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Nobody can be recognized, Mr. Speaker, until some disposition is made.

Mr. DOWELL. I have a privileged report, and I have a right to its consideration now.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I move to suspend the rules. While that motion is pending nothing else is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made. Who made the objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 52, noes 56.

So a second was refused.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I beg to call the attention of gentlemen to this situation: An agreement has been entered into to recess. If gentlemen make a point of no quorum and a count should develop that there is no quorum present, I do not know whether under the rules you could recess or not. I do not know whether you could do anything but adjourn. I do not know what the status of the business is now. I heard that when the conference report upon this alien-property matter had been considered there would be no other business taken up.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If that is correct, I think it is desirable, so far as I am concerned, to consider the conference report on that alien property matter. But if the point of no quorum is made and the count shows that there is no quorum present, the session that is necessary as a business matter and for many other reasons will be off to-morrow and the Congress expires at 12 o'clock to-morrow, and there will not be any turning back of the clock.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if I may suggest, there are some contested-election cases that ought to be disposed of, and they can be disposed of in five minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] has in charge a couple of matters that there can be no objection to, I think. If there is, they ought to be withdrawn. I think at least he should have the opportunity to present them. The gentleman from Minnesota has a resolution that I think no one would object to. If objected to, that is the end of it. These, so far as I know, are the only matters that require attention. We hope that the conference report may be here in the next 10 or 15 minutes. If the House can consider by unanimous consent these other matters in the meantime, I hope it will do so. Of course, the contested-election cases are privileged. We could then take up the conference report and dispose of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there are only three Members against what is known as the teachers' salary bill.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF GARTENSTEIN v. SABATH.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from Committee on Elections No. 3, in the contested-election case of Gartenstein against Sabath.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Jacob Gartenstein was not elected a Representative in the Sixty-seventh Congress from the fifth congressional district of Illinois and is not entitled to a seat therein.

Resolved, That Adolph J. Sabath was duly elected a Representative in the Sixty-seventh Congress from the fifth congressional district of Illinois and is entitled to retain his seat therein.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the report in the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF GARTENSTEIN v. SABATH.

Mr. DOWELL, from the Committee on Elections No. 3, submitted the following report on the contested-election case of Jacob Gartenstein v. Adolph J. Sabath:

Your Committee on Elections No. 3, having had under consideration the contested-election case of Jacob Gartenstein *v.* Adolph J. Sabath, fifth congressional district of Illinois, respectfully submits to the House of Representatives the following report:

At the general election held in the fifth congressional district of the State of Illinois on November 2, 1920, Jacob Gartenstein, the contestant herein, was the Republican candidate and Adolph J. Sabath was the Democratic candidate for Representative in the Congress of the United States. William Newman was the Socialist candidate and received a number of votes. Adolph J. Sabath at said election was declared elected, and a certificate was issued to him accordingly.

On the 21st day of December, 1920, Jacob Gartenstein served notice of contest upon Adolph J. Sabath, setting forth certain grounds of contest and charging fraud, irregularities, errors, and mistakes in the returns from certain precincts at said election, and charging that while the official returns showed Adolph J. Sabath to be elected by a plurality of 298 votes, a true and correct tabulation of the votes cast at the election in said fifth congressional district would show that the contestant, Jacob Gartenstein, was elected by a plurality of more than 1,500 votes.

On January 15, 1921, Adolph J. Sabath, the contestee, served his answer upon contestant, denying the allegations in the contestant's notice and petition and denying that there was any miscounting or mistabulating in the counting of votes in said precincts.

PROOFS NOT PRESENTED IN TIME.

On the 27th day of January, 1921, Abraham Lidsky, a notary public and duly appointed commissioner to take evidence in this case, declared the hearings open, and two witnesses were called, who gave short testimony, generally, to the delivery of ballots to the board of election commissioners and to placing these ballots in the vaults.

On this date, January 27, 1921, at the close of this brief testimony, the hearing was adjourned to February 2, 1921, by stipulation of the parties, the number of days of the continuance to be added to the 40 days allowed by law to complete contestant's proofs.

On February 2, 1921, the hearing was called, and without taking any testimony, at the request of the election commission, the parties by stipulation continued the hearings until the morning of February 8, 1921, with the same stipulation that the continuance should not in any way interfere with the 40 days allowed contestant to complete his proofs.

On February 8, 1921, the case was called and, without taking testimony, by agreement of the parties, and with the same stipulation as to the 40 days, the hearing was adjourned and continued until February 14, 1921.

On February 14, 1921, the case was called and, without taking any testimony, it was stipulated by all the parties that the hearings be continued until March 15, 1921, with the same stipulation relative to the 40 days for taking testimony by contestant.

On March 15, 1921, by agreement of all the parties, the hearing was adjourned until March 18, 1921, without prejudice as to time for taking proof.

On March 18, 1921, without taking any testimony, by agreement of all the parties, the hearing was continued until March 21, 1921, at 10 o'clock a. m., with the same understanding relative to time allowed by statute.

On March 21, 1921, 65 days after the contestee had served his answer upon contestant and 25 days after contestant's time had expired for taking testimony and 90 days after contestant had served on contestee his notice of contest, the contestant actually began taking testimony in the case.

However, on March 23, 1921, after taking a small part of the testimony, at the request of counsel for contestant, hearings were adjourned until March 28, 1921, apparently without stipulation. However, on the 28th a stipulation was made that the continuance should not affect the time for taking testimony.

On April 2, 1921, by stipulation of the parties, the hearings were adjourned by stipulation to April 25, the adjournment not to affect the time for taking testimony by contestant.

On May 3, 1921, adjournment was taken to May 4, and on May 4, without taking any testimony, the case was adjourned to May 5, 1921.

On May 5, 1921, it was stipulated between the contestant and contestee that the time to close proofs on behalf of contestant may be extended from the 12th day of May, 1921, to and including the 16th day of May, 1921.

It will be noted that contestant began taking testimony 25 days after the time for his taking testimony had expired under the statute, and closed his taking of testimony under the various stipulations 80 days after his 40 days for taking testimony under the statute had expired.

On the 22d day of August, 1921, the contestee began taking his testimony, and closed taking his testimony on the 31st day of August, 1921, but this testimony was objected to by contestant because the time had expired for taking testimony.

The section of the statute providing for the taking of testimony in a contested-election case is in the following language:

"SEC. 107. In all contested-election cases the time allowed for taking testimony shall be 90 days, and the testimony shall be taken in the following order: The contestant shall take testimony during the first 40 days, the returned Member during the second 40 days, and the contestant may take testimony in rebuttal only during the remaining 10 days of said period. This shall be construed as requiring all testimony in cases of contested elections to be taken within 90 days from the date on which the answer of the returned Member is served upon the contestant."

While this statute has been held to be directory, and is not binding upon the House, yet under ordinary circumstances the contestant has been required to commence and complete his evidence within the 40 days allowed by statute, and if further time is required it must be granted by the House, and may be granted only after showing a good and sufficient reason therefor. (See Reynolds *v.* Butler, 12th Missouri, 58th Cong.)

From the report in this case we quote the following:

"It is quite true that the statute providing and limiting the time for the taking of testimony is not binding upon this House, which under the Constitution is the only and absolute judge of the qualifications and election of its Members. But as has frequently been held it furnishes a wise and wholesome rule of action and ought not to be departed from except for sufficient cause shown, or where the interests of justice clearly require. It would seem that contestant might have commenced and concluded his testimony in this case within 40 days; certainly he might have commenced. No reason whatever appears upon the record why he could not or did not; but upon the argument before your committee it was stated that counsel for the present contestant were also counsel for Wagoner in his contest and that some, or all of them, were engaged upon that case most of the time. There must, however, have been other counsel in St. Louis quite capable of taking such testimony as was taken in this case." (See also Mapeson *v.* Oates, 47th Cong.; Boles *v.* Edwards, 42d Cong.; Bradley *v.* Slemmons, 46th Cong.)

From the latter case, Bradley *v.* Slemmons, page 339, contested-election cases by Rowell, we quote the following:

"Contestant took testimony in only 3 of the 20 counties of the district and in 2 of these the testimony was taken more than 40 days after the service of the answer to the notice of contest. Contestant claimed that the 40 days allowed by law commenced to run from the first day on which he took testimony, but the committee held that the act of Congress approved March 2, 1875, conclusively showed that section 107 of the Revised Statutes must be so construed as to require the time to run from the date of the service of the answer of contestee. In this case no reason was shown why the 40 days would not be sufficient; indeed, only 18 days were actually occupied by contestant in taking testimony. The testimony taken after the time was of course examined by contestee and the objection only entered after all the testimony was taken, and contestee in his oral argument before the committee had expressed entire willingness to have the testimony considered. But the committee held that 'the people of the district have interests and rights which can not be thus taken from them' and excluded all the testimony except that taken in Jefferson County, which was taken within the time."

In the case under consideration the contestant not only does not show diligence but the record clearly shows without reason or excuse by numerous stipulations undertook to set aside the operation of the statute and practically took no testimony in the 40 days allowed him by statute. Had the contestant come before the House asking for an extension of time to take testimony after the expiration of the 40 days there can be no question this would not have been granted to him, for the record discloses that he had no good reason to ask for extension of time for taking testimony. However, at each date to which extension had been made he stipulated with the contestee for further continuances and extensions, and without asking leave of the House, undertook to set aside the statute limiting time for taking the evidence.

In the case of Bradley *v.* Slemmons, above, while the testimony was not taken exactly by agreement, contestee at the hearing consented to the consideration of the evidence taken after the time had expired, but the committee properly held that "the people of the district have interests and rights which can not be thus taken from them" and the committee excluded all evidence not taken within the time prescribed by the statute.

In the case of Bradley *v.* Slemmons the contestant presented his case on the theory that he was entitled to the 40 days after beginning the taking of his testimony, and so far as the record shows was presenting his case upon that theory. In the case under consideration there was no question of the limitation by the statute, and the record clearly shows that the parties were attempting to set aside the operation of the statute by agreements between themselves. If this action is to be approved by the House, contested-election cases in the future may, by stipulation between the parties, be presented to the House at any time the parties may see fit, and the statute may thus be nullified.

Your committee finds in this case that contestant was not diligent in prosecuting his case, and did not present his proofs within the time prescribed by statute.

INTEGRITY OF THE BALLOTS.

Notwithstanding the findings of the committee relative to the time for taking testimony, your committee has in this case examined the record and the evidence relative to other questions raised in the contest.

Contestant in his petition charges fraud, irregularities, mistakes, etc., in a number of the precincts in the fifth congressional district and charges that a large number of votes cast for contestant in said district were not counted for him but were wrongfully counted for contestee and that by reason thereof contestant was wrongfully defeated for the office of Representative in Congress, to which he had been duly elected. Contestant further charges in his petition that the contestee did not receive the plurality of votes cast, but that contestant received a larger and greater number of the lawful votes cast in said district at said election than did the contestee.

Before a recount of the ballots may be had in an election contest proof of inviolability of the ballot boxes and their contents is necessary.

We will here submit a small part of the record and evidence relative to the preservation and care of the ballots in this case:

On page 38 the record discloses the following testimony given by one of the witnesses who produced a ballot box in the third precinct of the tenth ward in the city of Chicago before the commissioner taking testimony:

"Mr. AYERS. What is this other box?

"Mr. CURRAN. That came out of the vault, too, with the other one.

"Mr. STAFFORD. I object to this other box being offered in evidence; there is nothing material about it.

"Mr. AYERS. I also call your attention to another box or packing case, and ask you to describe for the benefit of the record what it appears to be made of.

"Mr. ARNOLD. Made out of cardboard.

"Mr. AYERS. And I will ask you to measure that box and give its dimensions as near as you can.

"(Mr. Arnold measures box.)

"Mr. ARNOLD. Thirteen inches wide, 18 inches long, 13 inches deep.

"Mr. AYERS. Now, you say it is made of cardboard; about what thickness is the cardboard?

"Mr. STAFFORD. We object to any testimony about this package, there being nothing to show it is in any way connected with the election in question.

"Mr. ARNOLD. I should judge it to be about three-sixteenths of an inch thick.

"Mr. AYERS. What condition is it in with reference to being opened or closed?

"Mr. ARNOLD. It is tied with a rope.

"Mr. AYERS. Well, but is it open or is it closed?

"Mr. ARNOLD. It is open.

"Mr. AYERS. Now, I will ask you to look on the top side as the package rests now on the table and read what is on the box, if there is anything to be read.

"Mr. ARNOLD (reading): '3 precinct, 10 ward.'"

On page 39 the following stipulation is entered into relative to this box:

"Mr. AYERS. It is stipulated that the box in question is a one-piece box, and that it was opened at one end, and is now closed by folding in the four sides of the box at that open end, and that it has some sealing wax on the end of the box; also a rope around the box with some sealing wax on the knot, which is also at the folded end of the box.

"Mr. STAFFORD. Yes."

On page 47 the record discloses the following testimony given by witness who produced a ballot box in the sixth precinct of the tenth ward before the commissioner taking testimony:

"Mr. STAFFORD. Now, this rope is loose all around the box, isn't it?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Yes; it is loose.

"Mr. STAFFORD. It is not fastened except at the ends, tightly, except at the ends; it is not fastened tightly around the box?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Well, the rope is loose, but it is tied.

"Mr. STAFFORD. The rope could be slipped off the box, couldn't it, as it now stands? Try it and see.

"Mr. ARNOLD. Yes.

"Mr. STAFFORD. The rope could be slipped off without untying and, as a matter of fact, I have done it without disturbing any of the sealing wax; so that the rope could have been untied on that box and then put back in the position in which it is now without any retying or untying. Is that right?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Yes.

"Mr. STAFFORD. Now, when the rope is so disconnected by releasing the sealing wax on the bottom and on the flaps, the top of that box could be lifted right off, couldn't it?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Yes.

"Mr. STAFFORD. As a matter of fact, there is nothing on the seal or the wax to show who put it on—just a gob of wax that anybody could put on?

"Mr. AYERS. Well, I object to the last part of the question. The testimony shows the box had been locked in the vault and that everybody could get into that vault.

"Mr. STAFFORD. I mean so far as the putting of the wax on is concerned. I am talking now so far as the box appears to have been sealed. There is nothing peculiar about the sealing wax to make that wax other than what anybody could put on; there is no seal; no stamp. It is the kind of wax that anybody could put on any time.

"Mr. ARNOLD. Yes."

On page 49 the record discloses the following testimony given by witness who produced a ballot box in the eighth precinct of the tenth ward before the commissioner:

"Mr. AYERS. Now, I will ask you what that is that is before you; what it looks like.

"Mr. ARNOLD. It looks like a ballot box to me.

"Mr. AYERS. And will you describe what condition it is in?

"Mr. POLLACK. I object as a conclusion to his stating that it looks like a ballot box. He can describe the box, but not state his conclusion.

"Mr. ARNOLD. Well, there are two parts of the box. It is in two sections. It is tied with a rope; a telescope box, but it does not come together; there is a piece of paper around it, all around where it telescopes together."

Further, on page 51, is the following:

"Mr. POLLACK. I object to the removal of the rope and the taking off of the paper until I have asked certain questions regarding it. The paper that you testified as to being about the box you said was all about it; you mean that it was around—it extended around the so-called ballot box in one direction?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Yes.

"Mr. POLLACK. And does not cover it entirely?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Not all the way round; no—not the whole ballot box.

"Mr. POLLACK. This rope that is around it is not sealed in any way, no sealing wax on it?

"Mr. ARNOLD. No sealing wax on it; it is tied, that is all.

"Mr. AYERS. It is tied with a large number of knots, isn't it? How many knots does there appear to be in that rope?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Four.

"Mr. POLLACK. These names that you read on the outside of the box that were written in script, you don't know who wrote them?

"Mr. ARNOLD. No, sir.

"Mr. POLLACK. You are not familiar with the signatures?

"Mr. ARNOLD. No, sir.

"Mr. POLLACK. And you don't know whether those people bearing those names were, as a matter of fact, judges of election or not?

"Mr. ARNOLD. No, sir.

"Mr. AYERS. You spoke of the knots in the rope; some of those knots are made where the rope in wrapping it around the box crosses at right angles the same rope in going another direction, do they not?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Two of them do—two of them.

"Mr. POLLACK. And the other knots, Mr. Witness, do not so cross?

"Mr. ARNOLD. No; they are just tied in knots.

"Mr. AYERS. Now, after having removed the paper, I will ask you if the two ends of the box that you have described as being a telescope box, if they come together?

"Mr. ARNOLD. No; they do not.

"Mr. AYERS. About how much do they lack of coming together?

"Mr. ARNOLD. Two inches.

"Mr. AYERS. And state whether or not the box appears to be filled so as to hold it apart in that condition.

"Mr. ARNOLD. It does.

"Mr. POLLACK. I will ask, Mr. Witness, if the two sections of this box which are apart appear to be sealed together in any way?

"Mr. ARNOLD. No; they are not sealed."

On page 64 the record discloses the following testimony given by Witness Arnold, describing a ballot box in the seventeenth precinct of the tenth ward before the ballot box was opened:

"Cross-examination by Mr. STAFFORD:

"Q. Is it not possible to remove the entire strip from the bottom of the box without further untying?—A. Yes.

"Q. And in that way to entirely open the box—the string from the box so that the box may be opened?—A. Yes.

"Q. So that in order to open the box as it stands now, neither the strings nor the flaps would have to be detached?—A. Well, one would have to be detached.

"Q. Is it not possible to open the box without that?—A. I do not think so.

"Q. Well, we will take the string off and see. [Opens box.] It is possible, is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. So that the box as it was brought in here could have been absolutely opened without any force whatever and without cutting any rope or destroying any of the supposed fasteners?—A. Yes.

"Q. That is all."

On page 66 the record discloses the following testimony given by Witness Arnold, describing a ballot box in the eighteenth precinct of the tenth ward before the ballot box was opened:

"Q. Now describe the box.—A. It is a telescope box—two parts it is. It is tied with a rope at the top that does not go over the bottom.

"Mr. STAFFORD. About an inch between the top and bottom, isn't there?—A. Yes, sir. The rope goes through the bottom of the box with one knot; there is sealing wax on the knot; there are two pieces of paper, printed matter, stuck on the flaps of the box, which gives instructions how to seal it.

"Q. Are they the same as has been read into the record previously?—A. They are.

"Q. Does the rope go around the box one way or two ways?—A. The rope goes around two ways.

"Q. Between the top and bottom can you see through to see any of the contents inside?—A. You can.

"Q. Does the box appear to be full, or otherwise?—A. It appears to be full.

"Q. As you look through the crack between the top and bottom what do you appear to see inside?—A. Papers.

"Q. Well, do they look like ballots, or some other kind of papers?—A. Well, they appear to me as ballots.

"Q. Can you see whether they are folded or not?—A. They are folded; yes, what I see of them.

"Mr. AYERS. Take the witness.

"Cross-examination by Mr. STAFFORD:

"Q. The two flaps are not attached to the bottom part of the box?—A. They are not.

"Q. The rope can be removed, can it not, without untying it?—A. Yes.

"Q. And the two pieces taken apart and contents removed without in any way breaking or forcing the knot with the seal on it?—A. Yes.

"Q. As a matter of fact, the papers within could be slipped out through the opening?—A. I don't think so.

"Q. But there would be no trouble in slipping the rope off and putting back again?—A. No.

"Q. And if that were done the box would have the same appearance as it now has?—A. Yes.

"Q. Well, we object to any further evidence in regard to this box or its contents—one more question, Mr. Witness: You say that the flaps have a printed slip on stating how the box should be sealed. Is that box sealed in accordance with those printed directions?—A. No; it is not.

"Q. That is all."

On page 91 the record discloses the following testimony given by Mr. Arnold relative to the ballot box in the third precinct of the eleventh ward:

"Q. Now, describe the condition of the box.—A. There is a rope that goes around it twice.

"Q. One way or more?—A. Two ways; goes around it once two ways, and the rope goes through the bottom of the box; there is a knot on the bottom; no sealing wax on it; there are two flaps, one on each end, which are loose.

"Cross-examination by Mr. STAFFORD:

"Q. One minute about the box—these flaps, Mr. Witness—there is no evidence that the flaps have ever been fastened or pasted to the bottom of the box, is there?—A. No, sir.

"Q. Or no evidence of any sealing wax anywhere about it?—A. No, sir.

"Q. It is also possible to remove the rope without untying the knot, isn't it, by slipping it over the edge?—A. By using a little force.

"Q. It could be done?—A. Yes."

On page 98 the record discloses the following testimony given by Mr. Arnold relative to the ballot boxes in the eleventh precinct of the eleventh ward:

"Cross-examination by Mr. STAFFORD:

"Q. This box is not in any way sealed?—A. Not that I see.

"Q. The rope that you say goes around it could be slipped off the box without in any way untying it?—A. Yes.

"Q. And the papers could have been taken out and put back in?—A. As far as I can see.

"Q. There is nothing to have prevented somebody getting out the contents and putting them back in, as you see it now?—A. As I see it now.

"Q. You don't know anything about the handwriting on the box; don't know who put it there?—A. I don't."

On page 102 the record discloses the following testimony given by Mr. Thompson relative to the ballot box in the twelfth precinct of the eleventh ward:

"Q. Now, is there any rope around the box?—A. Yes, sir; rope

"Q. How many ways?—A. Two ways.

wrapped around the box.

"Q. Well, is that endways and sideways?—A. Endways and sideways.

"Q. Are there any knots in the rope?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. How many knots do you see in the rope?—A. One knot.

"Q. And is there any sealing wax on that knot?—A. Yes, sir; there is.

"Q. State whether or not the flaps at the end of the box are fastened or loose.—A. They are loose.

"Cross-examination by Mr. STAFFORD:

"Q. Mr. Witness, this rope around the box is so loose that you can slip it off without untying it, isn't it?—A. Yes; it is.

"Q. And be slipped off without touching the sealed knot?—A. Yes; it could be.

"Q. It could be, and the top removed without touching the knot, and then returned to its present condition?—A. Yes."

On page 120 the record discloses the following testimony given by Mr. Arnold relative to the ballot box in the seventeenth precinct of the eleventh ward:

"Cross-examination by Mr. STAFFORD:

"Q. Mr. Arnold, this cord that you say goes around this box is not sealed in any way with wax or otherwise; just knotted?—A. Just knotted.

"Q. And the cord can be slipped off without in any way breaking it or untying it?—A. Slipped off——

"Q. Slipped off, so that the box could be opened and closed without interfering with the knot?—A. Yes.

"Q. You know nothing about the box except as it is handed to you here?—A. No, sir."

On page 175 the record discloses the following testimony given by Mr. Arnold relative to the ballot box in the twentieth precinct of the twentieth ward:

"Q. Are the flaps sealed on this box?—A. No, sir.
"Q. Is any part of this box bursted?—A. One end of it is bursted.
"Q. Can you see any folded papers on the inside?—A. Certainly.
"Q. Are there any other figures on the box?—A. 20/20.

"Cross-examination by Mr. Schiller:

"Mr. ARNOLD. All you need to do is just lift the top off and remove the ballots without the slightest break?—A. Yes, sir.
"Q. And the ballots are there?—A. Yes, sir.
"Q. Do you know the signatures on the top of this box?—A. No, sir.
"Q. Do you know anything about the box?—A. I know it is a ballot box.
"Q. That is only an assumption on your part?—A. No; not an assumption.

"Redirect examination by Mr. Ayers:

"Q. Do you think you have worked in this office long enough to know a ballot box when you see it?—A. Yes.
"Q. Are there any other packages besides this ballot box in this precinct?—A. There is one bundle.
"Q. What are the wrappings, if any, on this bundle?—A. There is no wrapping at all; only a rope around the package with two knots in it.
"Q. Does the bundle appear to contain any folded ballots?—A. It does.

"Cross-examination by Mr. Schiller:

"Q. Do you know what precinct this bundle refers to?—A. Only from what I read off the ballots.
"Q. There is no other identification?—A. No.
"Q. These ballots can be slipped out of this bundle very easily, could they not?—A. Yes."

On page 194 the record discloses the following testimony given by Mr. Arnold relative to the ballot box in the twenty-eighth precinct of the thirty-fourth ward:

"Q. What is the condition of the box in reference to any part of it being broken or otherwise?—A. One corner of the top is ripped open.
"Q. What appears to be the condition of the box in reference to the contents taking up the full capacity of the box; can you tell anything about that?—A. The top comes over the bottom about 2 inches; it appears to be full—you can't get it down any farther.

"Cross-examination by Mr. Schiller:

"Q. Mr. Arnold, do you know where this box came from?—A. No.
"Q. Do you know anything about it?—A. Only that it is a ballot box.
"Q. And these signatures you have just read, do you know anything about them?—A. No.
"Q. Don't know if they are genuine or not?—A. No.
"Q. This rope is very loosely tied around, isn't it—can be slipped off very easily?—A. Yes; can be slipped off.
"Q. And the box opened?—A. Yes.
"Q. There is no sealing wax of any kind on this box?—A. None that I see."

The above record is set out to show the general condition of the ballots and ballot boxes as they were presented to the commissioner taking testimony.

The proofs in this case show that the judges of election, after counting and canvassing the ballots, placed them in boxes and delivered them to the election commissioners' office. The delivery of these ballots began at 8 or 9 o'clock on the evening of the election and continued until the afternoon of the following day. The evidence discloses that the ballot boxes in some instances were not of sufficient size to hold all the ballots cast in the precinct, and when this happened the ballots were folded and tied with a rope and the bundle was delivered with the ballot box to the commissioners' office. The evidence shows these ballots remained in the office of the election commissioners for some time and that a number of employees were designated to handle the ballots and store them in the vault on the floor above. A number of these were temporary employees.

Mr. Curran, who stated that he was custodian of the ballots and in charge of the vaults of the election commissioners, at the close of his testimony, page 27 of the record, testified as follows:

"Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Curran, one question, please. These ballots that you have just been talking about, have they been in a separate vault from all the others or were they in the vault in which other ballots for other offices have been placed?
"A. There are other ballots in that same vault.
"Q. Has the vault been opened for the purpose of examining any of these other ballots?—A. No, sir.
"Q. The vault has not been opened at all since you last testified for anybody whatever?—A. No; it was not.
"Q. Well, do you know whether it was or not?—A. Well, I know it was not.
"Q. Has the vault been opened for any purpose since the ballots were originally put in there?—A. Yes.
"Q. And people have gone in and out of that vault since that time for other purposes, apparently?—A. Yes, sir.
"Q. So that there have been people in and out of the vault where these ballots were stored since these ballots were put in there?—A. Yes, sir.
"Mr. AYERS. Is that all?
"Mr. STAFFORD. That is all."

The law of the State of Illinois relative to the canvass of votes is as follows:

"Immediately after making such proclamation and before separating, the judges shall fold in two folds and string closely upon a single piece of flexible wire all ballots which have been counted by them, except those marked 'Objected to,' unite the ends of such wire in a firm knot, seal the knot in such manner that it can not be untied without breaking the seal, inclose the ballots so strung in a secure canvas covering and securely tie and seal such canvas covering with official wax impression seals to be provided by the judges, in such manner that it can not be opened without breaking the seals, and return said ballots, with the package containing the ballots marked 'Defective' or 'Objected to' in such sealed canvas covering to the proper clerk or to the board of election commissioners, as the case may be, etc."

It is well settled that before resort can be had to the ballots as means of proof, absolute proof must be made that the ballots offered are the identical ballots cast at the election; that they had been safely kept as required by law; that they are in the same condition they were when cast; that they had not been tampered with, and that no opportunity had been had to tamper with them. The burden of making this preliminary proof rests upon the party who seeks to use the ballots as evidence. (English *v.* Hilburn, 53d Cong., Rowell, p. 486.)

In order to command confidence in a recount "it is necessary for the contestant first to establish the identity of the ballot boxes, and, secondly, show that these boxes had been so kept as to rebut any presumption that they had been tampered with." (Butler *v.* Layman, 37th Cong.) In this case the minority report was adopted by the House. We quote from this case (Rowell, p. 173) as follows:

"The minority found that neither the identity of the boxes nor the integrity of their contents was satisfactorily established. It is always necessary for the party claiming under the recount to rebut a reasonable presumption that the ballots have been tampered with. And in this case where a direct charge of crime was made against the election officers, the truth of this charge was collaterally involved in the contentions of the contestant, and it was hence necessary for him to sustain those contentions by the same degree of proof as would be required in a criminal trial. But the minority held that it had not been sustained even by a preponderance of the evidence. The boxes were kept by the custodians, who were magistrates or aldermen, in their public offices or private houses, where they could easily have been tampered with by anyone. They were sealed mostly by having melted wax poured on the knots of the tape, without any impression. Such a seal might easily have been imitated. It was difficult to identify them before they were opened, and after they were opened the fact that the ballots in them corresponded somewhat nearly with the returns of the precincts they were supposed to belong to, did not show their identity, especially in the three cases where the variations were considerable."

The law regards with jealousy and suspicion recounts of ballots and is slow to sanction any change from results originally declared to results effected by such recounts. The rules of law governing recounts of ballots are plain and positive. Before courts or legislative bodies will give weight to results of recounts of ballots, it must be shown absolutely that the ballot boxes containing such ballots had been safely kept; that the ballots were undoubtedly the identical ballots cast at the election; and when these facts are established beyond all reasonable doubt, then full force and effect are given to the developments of the recount. In this case the committee found the evidence sufficient and accepted the results of recounts. (Acklen *v.* Darrall, 45th Cong.)

The temptation to tamper with and change the ballots after an election is so great, especially when the election is close and a slight change will elect the one and defeat the other candidate, that courts and the House have uniformly required the party offering the ballots to overcome the official count made at the time of the election to show that the ballots have been kept strictly as required by law. Upon the person offering the ballots is cast the burden of showing that the ballots offered for recount are the identical ones cast at the election and have been in no way tampered with or changed. (Wallace *v.* McKinley, 48th Cong.)

The returns of election officers are prima facie correct, and a recount showing a different result can not be regarded unless it affirmatively appears that the ballots recounted are the same as those originally counted and in the same condition.

The record in this case not only does not show that the ballots were folded, wired, and sealed when presented to the commissioner taking testimony, as required by law, but the proofs affirmatively show that in a number of the precincts the ballot boxes were not tied and sealed, as required by the Illinois statute. In some instances at least the evidence clearly shows that the ballot boxes were not at all sealed when taken from the vault, but were tied and bundled together in such manner that the boxes could be opened and closed without disturbing the appearance of the ballot boxes.

With the ballots and ballot boxes in this condition, and with the evidence of Mr. Curran that people were in and out of the vault where these ballots were kept, it seems to your committee that the proofs of the integrity of the ballots have not been established. Therefore your committee holds that proofs of the proper and legal preservation of the ballots have not been established in this case.

THE BEST EVIDENCE MUST BE OFFERED.

Contestant, in order to establish his claim of error and miscount, called certain witnesses who were clerks in the election commissioner's office. These witnesses were called upon by contestant to go through the ballots in a number of the precincts in the fifth congressional district and announce to another witness, who kept tally of the votes announced for Member of Congress in the precinct, which witness afterwards read the results of the tally to the commissioner taking depositions. In this manner the contestant went through a number of the precincts in said fifth congressional district. By the count in this manner the vote of the contestant increased in the various precincts over that of contestee until by this count contestant had increased his vote in the precincts thus counted to overcome the plurality designated by the contestee in the official count. Something like half of the precincts by this method were recounted.

The ballots in these various precincts were before the commissioner, but contestant did not have them identified, nor were they offered in evidence. But, over the objection of contestee, the witnesses were directed to count the ballots in the above manner and report the result of the count to the commissioner taking testimony.

The election board, under the law, is presumed to have made correct returns in this election. (See Larrazola *v.* Andrews, 60th Cong.) From this opinion we quote the following:

"When under all the forms of law a person has been duly returned and certified as elected to a seat in Congress the legal presumption is that the sworn officers of the law have performed their duties and that the returns are correct. In order successfully to impeach that return, the contestant must do more than raise doubts as to its correctness. Upon him there rests the burden of proving the falsity or error of that return. The proof offered in this case is not sufficient for that purpose."

Your committee is of the opinion that the primary evidence of the votes cast for the candidates for Representative in the Congress of the United States in this district was the poll books and ballots themselves, and that the official count by the election officers should not be set aside by the testimony of a witness who merely looked at the ballots and testified to the results.

Upon a proper showing and upon the production of the ballots properly protected and preserved, contestant was entitled to a recount of these ballots. But this proof should be established by the best evidence, and the ballots being present should have been offered in evidence as the best evidence in the case. The House will not set aside the official count except upon positive proof that the official count was incorrect.

A RECOUNT SHOULD INCLUDE ALL THE BALLOTS.

In this case the witness who went through the ballots examined only those in perhaps half of the voting precincts in the district. It has been held that a recount, if had, should include the ballots in all of the precincts in the district.

If it is reasonable to suppose that there was error in counting ballots in certain precincts, it would be equally reasonable to assume that there were errors in counting in the remaining precincts. If any recount is ordered, it should be of all of the ballots cast in the district. (Galvin v. O'Connell, 61st Cong., Supplement Election Cases, p. 39.) We quote from the opinion on page 40:

"The contestant asked that about 1,500 ballots cast in said election precincts be ordered recounted by the committee and the House, and the contestee insists that in case this is ordered the order include the whole number of 25,000 ballots cast. On this the committee rules as follows: 'It is the opinion of the committee that if on the evidence submitted it would be reasonable to suppose that there was error in judgment in the counting of the ballots cast in the wards and precincts mentioned by the contestant, it would be equally reasonable to assume that there were errors in judgment in the counting of the ballots in the remaining wards and precincts, and that, if any, all of the ballots cast at said election, aggregating 35,669, should be ordered for recount by the committee and the House.'"

Where some of the ballots had not been preserved, the committee denied recounting the balance of the ballots. (Murphy v. Haugen, 53d Cong., p. 58, Supplement; Canton v. Siegel, 64th Cong., p. 92, Supplement; Brown v. Hicks, 64th Cong., p. 93, Supplement.)

The committee can only report cases on the evidence furnished by the parties. We can neither make the evidence nor improve the quality nor supply the deficiency of that furnished. (See Goode v. Epps, 53d Cong., Rowell, p. 469.) In this case contestee had a majority of 868 on the returns and received the certificate. We quote from the opinion in this case the following:

"Most of the returns appear to have been thrown out because the ballots or poll books were not properly sealed or the returns were irregular, ambiguous, or not delivered by the proper official. The committee went over the evidence in detail and complained that contestant had not in most instances produced the best evidence available."

In the case under consideration the ballots were the best evidence of the votes cast for each candidate for Member of Congress. The ballots are not in evidence and are not therefore before the committee. No attempt was made by contestant to offer these ballots to be canvassed by the committee, but contestant seeks in this case to overthrow the official canvass of the votes by the legally constituted election boards by calling a witness to go through the ballots and report the tally to the commissioner selected by contestant to take testimony.

Where a witness testified that he compared the poll lists, entry lists, or lists of persons struck from the registry list of a county, and presented a list of names which he said were found on the poll list but not on either of the other lists, the committee held that "these statements made by the witness are inadmissible. The papers themselves are the best and only evidence of what they contain if they are admissible for any purpose. The committee must make the comparison and can not take the statements of the witness as to the result of his comparison." (Finley v. Bisbee, 45th Cong., Rowell, p. 326.)

Where votes were proved to have been illegal but the evidence that they were cast for contestee was the testimony of persons who had compared the numbered ballots with the poll list, the ballots themselves not being produced in evidence, the evidence was considered insufficient to justify the deduction of the votes from the vote of the contestee. (See Gooding v. Wilson, 42d Cong., Rowell, p. 276).

The recount in this case should have included all of the ballots in all of the precincts in the fifth congressional district. The ballots not having been offered in evidence by contestant, your committee thinks the evidence in this case is not sufficient to set aside the official returns.

For the reasons set forth in this report your committee recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That Jacob Gartenstein was not elected a Representative in the Sixty-seventh Congress from the fifth congressional district of Illinois and is not entitled to a seat therein.

"*Resolved*, That Adolph J. Sabath was duly elected a Representative in the Sixty-seventh Congress from the fifth congressional district of Illinois, and is entitled to retain his seat therein."

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF PARILLO v. KUNZ.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 1 in the contested-election case of Parillo against Kunz.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Dan Parillo was not elected a Member of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-seventh Congress from the eighth congressional district of the State of Illinois and is not entitled to a seat herein.

Resolved, That Stanley H. Kunz was duly elected a Member of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-seventh Congress from the eighth congressional district of the State of Illinois and is entitled to his seat herein.

The resolutions were agreed to.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE OF PARILLO v. KUNZ.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

At the election held in the eighth congressional district of the State of Illinois on November 2, 1920, according to the official returns Stanley H. Kunz, the contestee, who was the Democratic candidate, received 15,432 votes; Dan Parillo, the contestant, who was the Republican candidate, received 14,627 votes; and Harry C. Stockbridge, who was the Socialist candidate, received 1,334 votes. As a result of these returns Stanley H. Kunz, the contestee, was declared elected by a plurality of 805 votes over his Republican opponent, Dan Parillo, and a certificate of election was duly issued to him by the secretary of state of Illinois.

On December 21, 1920, the contestant, in accordance with law, served on the contestee a notice of contest in which it was alleged that errors and mistakes had been committed in the count of the ballots in certain precincts of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth wards of the city of Chicago, comprising 44 of the 107 precincts constituting the eighth congressional district. The contestant claimed that a recount of the votes cast in the above precincts would disclose that the contestant was duly and legally elected.

On January 12, 1921, the contestee served on the contestant an answer denying all the allegations contained in the contestant's notice and alleging that a recount of certain other precincts therein mentioned would show a gain in the contestee's plurality.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE.

The testimony in the case was duly printed and the contestant filed an abstract of record as required by the rules of the committee and also a printed brief and argument. The contestee filed no brief. Although the committee gave the contestant and his counsel an opportunity to appear before the committee and argue his case, he declined to do so, stating that he desired the case to be decided upon the printed record and brief.

FINDINGS OF FACT.

Most of the facts in this case are not in dispute. The contestee's answer was served on the contestant January 12, 1921. The act of Congress approved March 2, 1875 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 18, ch. 119, p. 338), provides that all testimony in contested-election cases shall be taken within 90 days from the date on which the answer of the returned Member is served upon the contestant and that the contestant shall take his testimony during the first 40 days thereof. In this case, therefore, the law required that the taking of all testimony should be completed on April 12, 1921. As a matter of fact, however, no testimony was taken by either party within the 90 days required by law. On February 8, 1921, a stipulation was entered into by the parties that the taking of evidence on the part of the contestant should be commenced on February 28, 1921. On February 28, 1921, it was again stipulated by the parties that the time for taking evidence for the contestant might be continued until April 18, 1921, and on that date the taking of evidence was commenced before Guy C. Crapple, a notary public, in the office of the board of election commissioners in Chicago. By agreement of counsel the wards and precincts in dispute were then taken up in numerical order and the ballots recounted. On October 10, 1921, over seven months after the law required the contestant's testimony to be concluded and almost six months after the law required that the taking of all testimony should cease, the contestant closed his case, and on December 5, 1921, it was agreed that the taking of evidence by both parties should close, this latter date being almost eight months after the time fixed by Congress had expired.

The recount showed that Stanley H. Kunz had received 14,733 votes and Dan Parillo 14,487 votes—a plurality of 246 votes for Stanley H. Kunz, the contestee. At the conclusion of the taking of all the evidence, counsel for the contestant moved to strike out of the recount the entire vote of 19 precincts in the sixteenth ward and of 7 precincts in the seventeenth ward on the strength of the testimony of Howard A. Rounds, a handwriting expert, who testified that, in his opinion, some of the pencil crosses on certain of the ballots in these precincts were made by persons other than the voter himself. Your committee does not consider that the evidence sustains the contention of the contestant and finds that there is no reason why the returns from the precincts in question should be rejected.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Section 107 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act of March 2, 1875, explicitly provides that all testimony in contested-election cases shall be taken within 90 days from the date on which the answer of the contestee is served upon the contestant. It has been the invariable practice of the House of Representatives to require the taking of the testimony within the time required by law, except where the time has been extended for good and sufficient reasons. In the Missouri case of Reynolds v. Butler (Moore's Digest, p. 28) in the Fifty-eighth Congress the unanimous report of the Committee on Elections No. 2, after reciting facts showing a lack of diligence on the part of the contestant and stating that he had not commenced taking evidence within 40 days from the time of serving notice on the contestee, thus states the law:

"It is quite true that the statute providing and limiting the time for the taking of testimony is not binding upon this House, which under the Constitution is the only and absolute judge of the qualifications and elections of its Members. But, as has frequently been held, it furnishes a wise and wholesome rule of action, and ought not to be departed from except for sufficient cause shown or where the interests of justice clearly require. It would seem that contestant might have commenced and concluded his testimony in this case within 40 days; certainly he might have commenced. No reason whatever appears upon the record why he could not or did not; but upon the argument before your committee it was stated that counsel for the present contestant were also counsel for Wagoner in his contest, and that some or all of them were engaged upon that case most of the time. There must, however, have been other counsel in St. Louis quite capable of taking such testimony as was taken in this case."

In the Arkansas case of Bradley v. Slemons in the Forty-sixth Congress (Rowell's Digest, p. 339), although the contestee offered no objection, the Committee on Elections excluded all evidence not taken within the time prescribed by the statute.

In the present case the contestant not only does not show due diligence, but the record clearly shows that without any reason or excuse whatever he undertook by a series of stipulations to set aside and ignore the clear and explicit provision of the statute. No testimony whatever was taken by the contestant until April 18, 1921, six months after the entire 90 days allowed by the act of Congress for the taking of all the testimony in the case had expired. In this case there is no excuse whatever for the contestant not commencing to take his testimony within 40 days from the service of the contestee's answer, as required by law. If he had started to take his testimony immediately after serving his answer, and for good and sufficient reasons had been unable to complete his testimony before the expiration of the 40 days allowed him by law, and had then asked the House of Representatives for an extension of time, he undoubtedly would have received an extension. In this case, however, as a matter of fact, the record discloses that he had no reason whatever for asking any extension of time, and that all of his testimony might have been taken within the 40 days, and that all the testimony on both sides of the case might have been taken within the 90 days required by law.

Your committee, therefore, finds that in this case the contestant deliberately ignored the plain mandate of the law without any reason or excuse, that he has offered no evidence which can legally be considered by your committee, and that he has no standing as a contestant before the House of Representatives.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

Your committee, therefore, finds that the contestant, not having complied with the provisions of the law governing contested-election cases, has no case which can be legally considered by your committee or by the House of Representatives. Moreover, even if he had fully complied with the law, your committee finds that, as a matter of fact, he has failed to prove the allegations contained in his notice of contest; that there is no evidence warranting the rejection of any of the precincts of the district; and that the recount of votes, which he alleged would show that he had been elected, according to his own figures, still shows that the contestee was actually elected by a plurality of 246 votes.

For the above reasons your committee recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That Dan Parillo was not elected a Member of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-seventh Congress from the eighth congressional district of the State of Illinois, and is not entitled to a seat herein.

"*Resolved*, That Stanley H. Kunz was duly elected a Member of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-seventh Congress from the eighth congressional district of the State of Illinois, and is entitled to retain his seat herein."

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF GOLOMBIEWSKI *v.* RAINEY, FROM THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 2 in the contested-election case of Golombiewski *v.* Rainey, from the fourth congressional district of Illinois.

The Clerk read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That John Golombiewski was not elected a Representative from the fourth congressional district of the State of Illinois, and is not entitled to a seat herein.

Resolved, That John W. Rainey was duly elected a Representative from the fourth congressional district of the State of Illinois, and is entitled to retain a seat herein.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the report in the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF GOLOMBIEWSKI *v.* RAINEY, FROM THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. LUCE, from the Committee on Elections No. 2, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Elections No. 2, to which was referred the contested-election case of John Golombiewski *v.* John W. Rainey, from the fourth congressional district of the State of Illinois, reports as follows:

The result of the election in this district, November 2, 1920, was officially announced to be:

John W. Rainey	23,230
John Golombiewski	21,546
Charles Beranek	2,753

Golombiewski took steps to contest the election and to that end secured a recount in 90 out of 159 precincts in the district. By the recount Rainey lost 1,008 votes and Golombiewski gained 321, leaving Rainey with a plurality of 676, irrespective of 179 ballots laid aside as challenged.

Thereupon Golombiewski, through counsel, submitted to the House printed brief and argument, the record of testimony, and an abstract thereof; and Rainey, through counsel, submitted brief and argument. The contestant rested his case upon the allegation that the fraudulent marking of ballots after they had been cast in 16 specified precincts indicated a degree of corruption warranting the exclusion of all the ballots cast in those precincts. His abstract of testimony failed to comply with the rules adopted by the committees on elections in that it did not by definite citation aid the committee in learning just what testimony was relied upon, unless we are to suppose that a tabulation of figures accepted by both parties could be in and of itself sufficient to prove fraud and mistakes by showing that 179 ballots were challenged. By this tabulation it appears that the challenged ballots were confined to 16 precincts. In each of 12 of these less than 10 ballots were challenged, and in the other 4 the percentage of challenged ballots was not large enough in and of itself to indicate that degree of gross corruption which has hitherto been held by the House to be necessary for the total exclusion of a poll.

This is one of three cases from the city of Chicago which were referred respectively to your three committees on elections. The issues involved and the circumstances are much the same in all three cases. The report of the Committee on Elections No. 3 in the case of Gartenstein *v.* Sabath, submitted December 20 last, and the report of the Committee on Elections No. 1 in the case of Partillo *v.* Kunz, submitted January 15 last, contain discussion of the effect of violating statutory requirements, of incomplete recounts, and of the evidence that should be offered under conditions such as here prevailed, together with analysis of testimony and citation of precedents, all of which apply as well to the present case, and to rehearse them here would be needless repetition. It should, however, be added that in this case counsel for the contestant has failed to proceed beyond the filing of the required documents, repeated inquiries from your committee as to whether he desired a hearing having been wholly ignored.

In view of all the circumstances, your committee recommends to the House the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That John Golombiewski was not elected a Representative from the fourth congressional district of the State of Illinois, and is not entitled to a seat herein.

"*Resolved*, That John W. Rainey was duly elected a Representative from the fourth congressional district of the State of Illinois, and is entitled to retain a seat herein."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 14324. An act to amend section 107 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as heretofore amended;

H. R. 14082. An act to authorize the Valley Transfer Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a line of railway in and upon the Fort Snelling Military Reservation in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 14135. An act to amend an act approved September 8, 1916, providing for holding sessions of the United States district court in the district of Maine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13004. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the Kansas Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, a certain tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth;

H. R. 14309. An act to amend section 206 of the transportation act, 1920;

H. R. 14087. An act for the creation of an American battle monuments commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13774. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to exchanges of property;

H. R. 7851. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge, district attorney, and marshal for the western district of South Carolina, and for other purposes,'" approved September 1, 1916, so as to provide for the terms of the district court to be held at Spartanburg, S. C.;

H. R. 8086. An act to prohibit the shipment of filled milk in interstate or foreign commerce;

H. R. 11477. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Freeburn Toll Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River in Pike County, Ky.;

H. R. 13205. An act for the relief of the American Trust Co.;

H. R. 5018. An act to authorize the widening of First Street NE., and for other purposes;

H. R. 13554. An act authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a dam and appurtenant intake and outlet structures across or in the Potomac River at or near Williamsport, Washington County, Md.;

H. R. 11939. An act to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 13024. An act for the relief of August Nelson;

H. R. 13810. An act to continue the improvement of the Mississippi River and for the control of its floods;

H. R. 13612. An act authorizing the issuance of patent to the legal representatives of Miles J. Davis, deceased;

H. R. 13998. An act making section 1535c of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia applicable to the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution proposing payment to certain employees of the United States;

H. R. 13775. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to credits and refunds;

H. R. 6577. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain land in the State of South Dakota to the Robert E. Kelley Post, No. 70, American Legion, South Dakota;

H. R. 14226. An act to preserve the status of persons awarded compensation under the act approved September 17, 1916;
H. R. 14222. An act to amend the trading with the enemy act;
H. R. 11528. An act to allow credits in the accounts of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States;
H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution to authorize the improvement of the Columbia River at St. Helens, Oreg.;
H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to provide an additional appropriation for the Federal Farm Loan Board for the fiscal year 1924;
H. R. 14408. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes;
H. R. 14401. An act to amend and modify the war risk insurance act;
H. J. Res. 422. Joint resolution permitting the entry free of duty of certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries;
H. R. 14050. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to income tax of nonresident aliens;
H. R. 5918. An act for the relief of the Michigan Boulevard Building Co.;
H. R. 8733. An act for the relief of Harold L. McKinley;
H. R. 8221. An act for the relief of the Chinese Government;
H. R. 8533. An act for the relief of Joe T. White;
H. R. 9160. An act for the relief of John Anderson.
H. R. 14089. An act granting six months' pay to Harriet B. Castle;
H. R. 8051. An act for the relief of the Commonwealth & Dominion Line (Ltd.), owner of the British steamship *Port Phillip;*
H. R. 297. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Diminico;
H. R. 5020. An act to provide for the sale by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of certain land in the District of Columbia acquired for a school site, and for other purposes;
H. R. 10022. An act for the relief of Eldredge & Mason, of Malone, N. Y.;
H. R. 10847. An act for the relief of Jacob Dietch;
H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Charles L. McCulley;
H. R. 10848. An act for the relief of Estella W. Dougherty;
H. R. 12053. An act to define butter and to provide a standard therefor;
H. R. 7921. An act granting six months' pay to Alice P. Dewey;
H. R. 13903. An act for the relief of the New York State Fair Commission;
H. R. 514. An act authorizing the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to Josephine H. Barin;
H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of certain homestead entrymen;
H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution to authorize the transportation to Porto Rico of a committee representing the Fourth Ohio Infantry, war with Spain;
H. R. 7027. An act for the relief of Herbert E. Shenton;
H. R. 9631. An act for the relief of Edward F. Dunne, jr.;
H. R. 1227. An act for the relief of Frank G. Emmes;
H. R. 14183. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell a portion of the Federal building site in the city of Duquoin, Ill.;
H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to appoint a subcommittee, to consist of not more than eight members of the Committee on Agriculture, to join with a like committee of five heretofore appointed by the Senate to investigate problems relating to reforestation, and for other purposes;
H. R. 8928. An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services;
H. R. 12378. An act granting the consent of Congress to maintain a bridge across the Rio Grande River;
H. R. 14429. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn.;
H. R. 14428. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Moorhead, Minn., and Fargo, N. Dak.;
H. R. 4653. An act for the relief of Allie Melinda Outterside;
H. R. 12584. An act for the relief of Alice Loeber;
H. R. 12138. An act for the relief of Frank A. Jahn;
H. R. 14296. An act to authorize the county of Huron, State of Michigan, to convey a certain described tract of land to the State of Michigan for public-park purposes;
H. R. 8625. An act to provide for the cession to the State of Michigan of certain public lands in the county of Keweenaw, State of Michigan;
H. R. 624. An act for the relief of Albert H. White, Mary E. Fowler, Lorena B. Winkler, E. E. White, and C. A. White;
H. R. 8871. An act for the relief of Richard Andrews;
H. R. 12171. An act to grant certain lands to the city of Skagway, Alaska, for a public park;
H. R. 13724. An act for the relief of Hugh Marshall Montgomery;
H. R. 13617. An act to dissolve the Colored Union Benevolent Association, and for other purposes;
H. R. 745. An act for the relief of William H. Philbrick;
H. R. 8291. An act for the relief of Trygve Kristian Lode;
H. R. 13751. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent certain lands to Robert E. Wyche, a resident of Caddo Parish, La.;
H. R. 6196. An act for the relief of Robert E. Danforth;
H. R. 14144. An act to limit and fix the time within which suits may be brought or rights asserted in court arising out of the provisions of subdivision 3 of section 302 of the soldiers and sailors' civil relief act, approved March 18, 1918, being chapter 20, volume 40, General Statutes of the United States;
H. R. 13430. An act to amend section 370 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;
H. R. 14302. An act to establish and promote the use of the official cotton standards of the United States in interstate and foreign commerce; to prevent deception therein and provide for the proper application of such standards; and for other purposes;
H. R. 2722. An act for the relief of W. W. McGrath;
H. R. 14077. An act to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes;
H. R. 14351. An act to authorize bridging the Ohio River at Moundsville, W. Va.; and
H. R. 14435. An act making appropriations to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On March 3, 1923:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution proposing payment to certain employees of the United States;
H. R. 5018. An act to authorize the widening of First Street NE., and for other purposes;
H. R. 14309. An act to amend section 206 of the transportation act, 1920;
H. J. Res. 422. Joint resolution permitting the entry free of duty of certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries;
H. R. 7851. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge, district attorney, and marshal for the western district of South Carolina, and for other purposes,'" approved September 1, 1916, so as to provide for the terms of the district court to be held at Spartanburg, S. C.;
H. R. 11477. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Freeburn Toll Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River, in Pike County, Ky.;
H. R. 2722. An act for the relief of W. W. McGrath;
H. R. 5918. An act for the relief of the Michigan Boulevard Building Co.;
H. R. 13430. An act to amend section 370 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;
H. R. 13554. An act authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a dam and appurtenant intake and outlet structures across or in the Potomac River at or near Williamsport, Washington County, Md.;
H. R. 13998. An act making section 1535c of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia applicable to the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;
H. R. 13810. An act to continue the improvement of the Mississippi River and for the control of its floods;

H. R. 14050. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to income tax of nonresident aliens;

H. R. 14077. An act to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14135. An act to amend an act approved September 8, 1916, providing for holding sessions of the United States district court in the district of Maine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14144. An act to limit and fix the time within which suits may be brought or rights asserted in court arising out of the provisions of subdivision 3 of section 302 of the soldiers and sailors' civil relief act approved March 18, 1918, being chapter 20, volume 40, General Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 14324. An act to amend section 107 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as heretofore amended;

H. R. 14401. An act to amend and modify the war risk insurance act;

H. R. 14408. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14435. An act making appropriations to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924;

H. R. 8086. An act to prohibit the shipment of filled milk in interstate or foreign commerce;

H. R. 11939. An act to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 13004. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the Kansas Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, a certain tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth;

H. R. 13024. An act for the relief of August Nelson;

H. R. 13205. An act for the relief of the American Trust Co.;

H. R. 13612. An act authorizing the issuance of patent to the legal representatives of Miles J. Davis, deceased;

H. R. 13774. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to exchanges of property;

H. R. 13775. An act to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to credits and refunds;

H. R. 14082. An act to authorize the Valley Transfer Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a line of railway in and upon the Fort Snelling Military Reservation in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 14087. An act for the creation of an American battle monuments commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14302. An act to establish and promote the use of the official cotton standards of the United States in interstate and foreign commerce, to prevent deception therein and provide for the proper application of such standards, and for other purposes;

H. R. 297. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Diminico;

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution to authorize the improvement of the Columbia River at St. Helens, Oreg.;

H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution to authorize the transportation to Porto Rico of a committee representing the Fourth Ohio Infantry, war with Spain;

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution carrying out the purpose of a House resolution providing for a legislative clerk to the acting minority leader of the House, adopted March 3, 1923;

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to provide an additional appropriation for the Federal Farm Loan Board for the fiscal year 1924;

H. R. 514. An act authorizing the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to Josephine H. Barin;

H. R. 624. An act for the relief of Albert H. White, Mary E. Fowler, Lorena B. Winkler, E. E. White, and C. A. White;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of William H. Philbrick;

H. R. 1227. An act for the relief of Frank G. Emmes;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Charles L. McCulley;

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of certain homestead entrymen;

H. R. 4653. An act for the relief of Allie Melinda Outterside;

H. R. 5020. An act to provide for the sale by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of certain land in the District of Columbia acquired for a school site, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6196. An act for the relief of Robert E. Danforth;

H. R. 6577. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain land in the State of South Dakota to the Robert E. Kelley Post, No. 70, American Legion, South Dakota;

H. R. 7027. An act for the relief of Herbert E. Shenton;

H. R. 7921. An act granting six months' pay to Alice P. Dewey;

H. R. 8051. An act for the relief of the Commonwealth & Dominion Line (Ltd.), owner of the British steamship *Port Phillip;*

H. R. 8221. An act for the relief of the Chinese Government;

H. R. 8291. An act for the relief of Trygve Kristian Lode;

H. R. 8533. An act for the relief of Joe T. White;

H. R. 8625. An act to provide for the session to the State of Michigan of certain public lands in the county of Keweenaw, State of Michigan;

H. R. 8871. An act for the relief of Richard Andrews;

H. R. 8733. An act for the relief of Harold L. McKinley;

H. R. 8928. An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services;

H. R. 9160. An act for the relief of John Anderson;

H. R. 9631. An act for the relief of Edward F. Dunne, jr.;

H. R. 10022. An act for the relief of Eldredge & Mason, of Malone, N. Y.;

H. R. 10847. An act for the relief of Jacob Dietch;

H. R. 10848. An act for the relief of Estella W. Dougherty;

H. R. 11528. An act to allow credits in the accounts of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States;

H. R. 12053. An act to define butter and provide a standard therefor;

H. R. 12138. An act for the relief of Frank A. Jahn;

H. R. 12171. An act to grant certain lands to the city of Skagway, Alaska, for a public park;

H. R. 12378. An act granting the consent of Congress to maintain a bridge across the Rio Grande River;

H. R. 12584. An act for the relief of Alice Loeder;

H. R. 13617. An act to dissolve the Colored Union Benevolent Association, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13724. An act for the relief of Hugh Marshall Montgomery;

H. R. 13751. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent certain lands to Robert E. Wyche, a resident of Caddo Parish, La.;

H. R. 13903. An act for the relief of the New York State Fair Commission;

H. R. 14089. An act granting six months' pay to Harriet B. Castle;

H. R. 14183. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell a portion of the Federal building site in the city of Duquoin, Ill.;

H. R. 14222. An act to amend the trading with the enemy act;

H. R. 14226. An act to preserve the status of persons awarded compensation under the act approved September 17, 1916;

H. R. 14428. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Moorhead, Minn., and Fargo, N. Dak.;

H. R. 14429. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Red River between Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn.;

H. R. 14296. An act to authorize the county of Huron, State of Michigan, to convey a certain described tract of land to the State of Michigan for public park purposes; and

H. R. 14351. An act to authorize bridging the Ohio River at Moundsville, W. Va.

COMPENSATION FOR UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14226) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties," and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and move that the House agree to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN IOWA.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4614) to amend section 81 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the

judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, a similar House bill being on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up a Senate bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 81 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as amended by the act of February 28, 1916, and the act of April 27, 1916, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 81. The State of Iowa is divided into two judicial districts, to be known as the northern and southern districts of Iowa.

"The northern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Allamakee, Dubuque, Buchanan, Clayton, Delaware, Fayette, Winneshiek, Howard, Chickasaw, Bremer, Blackhawk, Floyd, Mitchell, and Jackson, which shall constitute the eastern division of said district; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Jones, Cedar, Linn, Iowa, Benton, Tama, Grundy, and Hardin, which shall constitute the Cedar Rapids division; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Emmet, Palo Alto, Pocahontas, Calhoun, Carroll, Kossuth, Humboldt, Webster, Winnebago, Hancock, Wright, Hamilton, Worth, Cerro Gordo, Franklin, and Butler, which shall constitute the central division; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Dickinson, Clay, Buena Vista, Sac, Osceola, O'Brien, Cherokee, Ida, Lyon, Sioux, Plymouth, Woodbury, and Monona, which shall constitute the western division.

"Terms of the district court for the eastern division shall be held at Dubuque on the fourth Tuesday in April and the first Tuesday in December, and at Waterloo on the second Tuesdays in May and September; for the Cedar Rapids division, at Cedar Rapids on the first Tuesday in April and the fourth Tuesday in September; for the central division, at Fort Dodge on the second Tuesdays in June and November, and at Mason City on the fourth Tuesdays in June and November; and for the western division, at Sioux City on the fourth Tuesday in May and the third Tuesday in October.

"The southern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Louisa, Henry, Des Moines, Lee, and Van Buren, which shall constitute the eastern division of said district; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Marshall, Story, Boone, Greene, Guthrie, Dallas, Polk, Jasper, Poweshiek, Marion, Warren, and Madison, which shall constitute the central division of said district; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Crawford, Harrison, Shelby, Audubon, Cass, Pottawattamie, Mills, and Montgomery, which shall constitute the western division of said district; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Adair, Adams, Clarke, Decatur, Fremont, Lucas, Page, Ringgold, Taylor, Union, and Wayne, which shall constitute the southern division of said district; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Scott, Muscatine, Washington, Johnson, and Clinton, which shall constitute the Davenport division of said district; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Davis, Appanoose, Mahaska, Keokuk, Jefferson, Monroe, and Wapello, which shall constitute the Ottumwa division of said district.

"Terms of the district court for the eastern division shall be held at Keokuk on the sixth Tuesday after the fourth Tuesday in February and the eighth Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September; for the central division, at Des Moines on the tenth Tuesday after the fourth Tuesday in February and the tenth Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September; for the western division, at Council Bluffs on the fourth Tuesday in February and the sixth Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September; for the southern division, at Creston on the fourth Tuesday after the fourth Tuesday in February and the third Tuesday in September; for the Davenport division, at Davenport on the eighth Tuesday after the fourth Tuesday in February and the second Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September; and for the Ottumwa division, at Ottumwa on the second Tuesday after the fourth Tuesday in February and the fourth Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September.

"The clerk of the court for said district shall maintain an office in charge of himself or a deputy at Davenport and at Ottumwa for the transaction of the business of said divisions."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in 8-point type an address delivered by my colleague, Representative EWIN L. DAVIS of Tennessee, at the twenty-fourth annual Jackson Day banquet in Norwalk, Ohio, January 30, 1923.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Speaker, having been granted unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in 8-point type an address delivered by my colleague, Representative EWIN L. DAVIS of Tennessee, at the twenty-fourth annual Jackson Day banquet in Norwalk, Ohio, January 30, 1923, I insert said address as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. EWIN L. DAVIS AT THE JACKSON DAY BANQUET IN NORWALK, OHIO, JANUARY 30, 1923.

ANDREW JACKSON.

This occasion would be incomplete without a reference to that peerless Democrat and great American whose memory and achievements we are celebrating. Beyond an interest as a Democrat, an American, and even a Tennessean, I feel a personal interest in Old Hickory by reason of the fact, if you will pardon a personal reference, that the Army with which he conquered the Creek Nation and won his remarkable victory at the Battle of New Orleans was mobilized in the district which I have the honor to represent and was made up largely of ancestors of many of my present constituents; and he resided for a time in the district I now represent.

Born of poor parentage, his father dying before he was born, Andrew Jackson was compelled to make his own way in the world; but he acquired such an excellent education in the school of experience, by keen observation and intelligent reading, that one of his biographers expressed his opinion that Jackson was the finest letter writer this country has produced; and the late Congressman James D. Richardson, who compiled "The Messages and Papers of the Presidents," gave it as his mature judgment that Jackson's state papers were the greatest of all our Presidents.

By sheer force of intellect, unalloyed patriotism, indomitable will, and invincible courage he displayed qualities of extraordinary versatility and leadership. By his thirty-third birthday he had served as United States district attorney, Representative in Congress, United States Senator, Supreme Court judge, and major general.

Commonwealth builder, soldier, jurist, statesman, diplomat, President, he was preeminent in them all.

Like all great men of positive character and fearless action, he had many bitter foes and was the victim of much unjust slander. Only recently we are getting histories and biographies which do full justice to Andrew Jackson and his great achievements. He is now generally recognized as having been truly a great President. He so impressed himself upon the history of our country that we speak of the "Jackson period." One of his greatest contributions was to make our Government responsive to the will of the people. As has been aptly said, Jefferson established a Government of the people and for the people, and Jackson completed the process by making it a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people. He did much to strengthen the principles of national unity. While a strong advocate of local self-government and State rights, yet he was equally opposed to any abuse of the principle of State rights. Without previous training, he demonstrated his ability to cope with the situation in any field of endeavor. When he became President many old and vexatious questions with foreign countries were pending, all of which he soon satisfactorily adjusted, and when he retired from the Presidency he did not bequeath to his successor a single pending controversy with a foreign nation. It is unnecessary to state that his foreign policy was different from that of the present administration.

His sterling party service has furnished us the descriptive term "Jacksonian democracy," and Democrats throughout the Nation pay him homage every year as we are doing to-night. It was Jackson who established the custom of party platforms, his purpose being to take the people into the confidence of party leaders rather than to confuse and deceive the people, as too many modern platforms are designed to do.

Although he had many tilts with the Senate, which contained such giants as Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Adams, Crawford, and Benton, yet Jackson was always able to hold his own and never lost the confidence and support of the people, even retaining same to such an extent that after he retired from office he named two of his successors.

THE BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS.

Jackson's marvelous military achievements have transmitted to posterity the privilege of celebrating Jackson Day. Perhaps he is best known to the general public because of his military genius and success. We shall pretermit comment upon his remarkable campaigns against the Indians and briefly describe the Battle of New Orleans. Such a description would be incomplete without reference to the conditions leading up to that famous victory. During the first two years of the War of 1812 the British victories over our Armies had not only been complete but disastrous and humiliating—we had not won a single battle. The enemy had captured the city of Baltimore, and in turn had captured and partially burned the National Capital. Our President and the seat of government had been driven from Washington. The martial spirit of the Nation seemed to have been largely broken; our morale was at a low ebb. England was in a state of glorification. Many sections of our country were demanding peace at any price. The President had sent a commission of five notable men to Europe to seek peace. They had been haughtily received, and the British demanded most unreasonable terms, including a cession of that territory now comprising the great Middle West. These were the conditions when Andrew Jackson was commissioned a major general and authorized to appoint his subordinate officers and mobilize an army, but the Federal Government provided no means with which to do it. It is

with pride that I point to the fact that the old Volunteer State of Tennessee met the emergency, and through its legislature appropriated $300,000 for the equipment and expenses of an army to be raised by Jackson. So far as I am aware this is the only instance since the establishment of our Government that a State has made an appropriation for the national defense. Whereupon General Jackson quickly mobilized an army of 5,300 men at Fayetteville, Tenn.

General Jackson in five successive battles completely subdued the Creek Nation, who were stanch allies of the British and had been overrunning the entire South, murdering, burning, and pillaging. General Jackson and his army then repaired to New Orleans, where he was joined by about 700 men who had gone down the river on boats and rafts. Consequently Jackson had about 6,000 raw troops, sturdy frontiersmen, wearing coon-skin caps, hunting shirts, and armed with squirrel rifles. He was confronted by General Pakenham, with over 12,000 trained and seasoned British troops, who had fought under Wellington and many of whom later covered themselves with glory at Waterloo in combat with Napoleon's legions. Upon his arrival at New Orleans, Jackson began attacking the British at night on December 23, 1814, and kept it up until the final battle on January 8, 1815, when he and his troops won their final and miraculous victory, killing a large number of British troops and driving the remainder in disorder from the field. The deadly aim of the Tennessee frontiersmen was evidenced by the fact that General Pakenham was killed; Gibbs, who succeeded him, was killed; and Lambert, who succeeded Gibbs, had his horse shot from under him. The most remarkable feature of this wonderful victory was that the Americans sustained a loss of only six killed and seven wounded.

In concluding my reference to Andrew Jackson I wish to suggest that his greatness and patriotism were manifested in his dying moments, when he said, "May my enemies find peace; may the liberties of my country endure forever."

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

Democrats are justly proud of the heritage left by Andrew Jackson. As did he, so all genuine Democrats believe that all political power should abide with the people and that they are entitled to a voice in their Government. As did Jefferson and Jackson, so all Democrats believe in the doctrine of equal rights for all and special privileges for none. We believe that the proper function of government is to do those things which will result in the greatest good to the greatest number. We are opposed to class favoritism. We insist that it is wrong to tax all of the people for the benefit of a few of the people. We say that it is no function of government to rob the masses in order to enrich the classes.

The Democratic Party is the oldest political party in existence. It has endured, and will in future endure, because it is founded on fundamental, eternal principles of right and justice.

It was entirely natural that the author of the Declaration of Independence should subsequently be the founder of the Democratic Party and give to the world the basic tenets of Democracy. It was likewise in the natural order of things that the father of our Federal Constitution should subsequently become a great Democratic President. The adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, embodying the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing civil and religious liberty, was largely due to the persistent efforts of those true Democrats, Jefferson and Madison.

The Democratic Party has been the only consistent champion and defender of the great principles embodied in those immortal documents. Perhaps because of its steadfast adherence to those principles and its refusal to barter its convictions and its interest in all the people for the financial support of special classes, the Democratic Party has been in the minority much of the time since the Civil War. However, it has ever been an alert sentinel and a virile champion of the rights of the masses and a fearless critic of the iniquities of the Republican Party. One of the crowning glories of the Democratic Party is that it can sustain defeat and still hold steadfast to its principles.

Lack of time forbids a review of the glorious history of the Democratic Party. It is sufficient to state that during our national life the Democratic Party has, with the exception of the abolition of slavery, taken the lead in every important political and industrial reform and constructive achievement and in the acquirement of all contiguous territory.

THE WILSON ADMINISTRATION.

I shall not even take time to review the great achievements in peace and in war of the last Democratic administration under the matchless leadership of Woodrow Wilson. However, during the first two years of that administration there was placed upon the statute books more great, constructive, beneficial legislation in the interest of all the people, particularly agriculture and labor, than has been enacted by the Republican Party during all of its history. While the Republicans bitterly denounced and strenuously opposed all of those great constructive measures, including the income tax law, the Federal reserve banking system, and the farm-loan system, yet those laws have proven so wise and beneficent that the Republicans have not dared repeal a single one of them, although they have had complete control of both branches of Congress for nearly four years and also the executive branch for nearly two years.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The Republican Party, at least as now constituted and controlled, is diametrically opposed to those great Democratic principles to which I have referred. It believes in, practices, and feeds upon special privilege and class favoritism. Bankrupt in principles, its guiding policy is to win at whatever cost. "The fleshpots" are its goal.

I shall deal briefly with the present administration, because the preservation of Democratic principles depends on eternal vigilance and merciless exposure of the insidious forces that would prevent their application.

THE 1920 CAMPAIGN.

During the 1920 campaign the Republicans rallied to their banner divers conflicting elements by promising each of them all they desired. They appealed to every group and every class. No party ever promised as much and subsequently achieved as little. I am reminded of the story of former Senator and Gov. Bob Taylor, of my own State. Back in the days when the money question was the paramount issue and every candidate was required to announce whether he was for the gold standard or the free coinage of silver Governor Taylor was a candidate for office. On one occasion he was making a speech and indicated that he was about to conclude, without having made any reference to the money question. A man in the audience called out, "Bob, tell us how you stand on the money question"; to which Bob replied, "Yes; I am glad you reminded me of that; I will be glad to tell you; I am for a little more gold, a little more silver, a little more greenback, and a little sprinkle of counterfeit."

There was never such a campaign of deception and confusion as that of 1920. The result was that the American electorate went on an inglorious political drunk, and has since been enjoying the morning after.

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN PROMISES BROKEN.

I shall not attempt to even enumerate all the promises made by the Republicans in that campaign which they have broken. It would take too long. However, I shall call attention to a few of those broken promises.

They promised to reduce taxes, and yet they have only shifted some of the taxes from the wealthy on to the backs of the toiling masses.

They promised to reduce governmental expenditures, and yet the appropriations for the current year in each and every department of the Government are larger than they were last year, and are larger in the aggregate by a half million dollars than they were the year before we entered the war, and this is true after eliminating from consideration every dollar that can be directly or indirectly traceable to the war. In other words, instead of economizing and retrenching the Republicans are increasing the expenses of running the Government. As a result of the reduction of the taxes of the profiteers and the wealthy classes and of Republican extravagance we are confronted with an enormous deficit, the appropriations for the year exceeding the revenue by nearly $900,000,000.

They promised us prosperity, and instead we have had industrial depression, business stagnation, and agricultural bankruptcy.

They promised to relieve the farmer, and they have done that. They have relieved him of about everything he had. Taking 100 per cent in 1913 as a basis, the average purchasing power of all farm products in terms of all other commodities during the eight years of the last Democratic administration was 105 per cent, and during the two years of the present Republican administration has been 67 per cent, and only 68 per cent on January 1, 1923.

They promised to put the business men on their feet, and have done that in large measure, because many of them who under Democratic prosperity were enabled to ride around in automobiles are now compelled to walk.

They promised employment for everybody at good wages, and yet since Harding went into office there have been over 6,000,000 men out of employment at the same time and millions more working on part time. That situation has been somewhat relieved by the building revival throughout the country, not

due, however, to anything the Republicans have done but due to the fact that there was a suspension of building operations during the war and for some time afterwards.

They promised to increase commerce, and yet since they went into power our foreign commerce has fallen off $7,500,000,000 a year.

In an effort to appease the natural disappointment and discontent of the people they have adopted the Coue method and give out frequent fulminations to the effect that returning prosperity has arrived or is just around the corner. However, normalcy seems to be having serious tire trouble somewhere along the way. Recent authentic statistics show that the business failures in the United States during the past year were the largest on record, amounting to 22,400, an increase of 11.9 per cent over 1921, and 164 per cent over 1920. Prior to that time under Democratic administration there were practically no failures.

ONLY PLEDGES KEPT BY REPUBLICANS.

However, I shall desist from a further enumeration of their broken pledges, and, as I want to be more than fair to the Republicans, I shall call attention to the only pledges which they have kept—two in number—and only one of them a promise to the public.

During the 1920 campaign you will recall that they denounced President Wilson and his administration in unmeasured terms. They criticized him severely because, although the head of his party, he had taken the lead in party matters; they upbraided him bitterly because, although the chosen Chief Magistrate of the Nation, he had taken the lead in governmental affairs. They proudly boasted that they presented a candidate who would not do these things. They proposed to set up some sort of political sanhedrin of elder statesmen and "master minds," perhaps permitting the President to sit in as an observer. Candidate Harding acquiesced in this sort of a program, and he is the only man who ever ran for President who had as one of the chief planks of his platform a promise that, if elected, he would only be a figurehead President. However, he has kept that pledge, and I want to be fair enough to give him full credit for it.

He has certainly not departed from that policy in an effort to protect the interest or promote the welfare of the people. About the only instances in which he deviated were: First, to save Newberry when he was about to be unseated; second, to jam through the iniquitous ship subsidy bill in the interest of the Shipping Trust and in defiance of public will; third, in an effort to have the Congress reduce the higher surtax on net incomes of over $66,000 from 65 per cent to 33 per cent, or at least to 40 per cent, although the Democrats, with the aid of the progressive Republicans, stopped this reduction of the tax on wealth at 50 per cent; and, fourth, to prevent the passage of the soldier compensation bill by the Senate in the Sixty-sixth Congress, and to veto such a bill passed by the Sixty-seventh Congress, after President Harding had declared on October 20, 1920, as follows:

> Well, I am very happy to say to you that the House passed the bonus bill, and the Senate has it under consideration, and I have no doubt the Senate will pass it. I, myself, think it ought to pass it, if you want to know my views.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE IN COMPLETE CONTROL.

The only policies which the present administration has had were correctly characterized in an editorial appearing last June in that great Republican paper, the New York Globe, as follows:

> The Republican Party made its first great fight in behalf of human liberty in order that Government of, by, and for the people might not perish from the earth. The high priests of privilege now in Washington are endeavoring to destroy the principles which Lincoln bequeathed.

The voice of the people is no longer heard and heeded by those in authority in the National Capital. There has never been a time in history when the great predatory interests, seeking and receiving undeserved favors from their Government, have been more completely in control.

As stated, during the 1920 campaign the Republicans made only two pledges which they have kept. I have explained their only public pledge which they kept, the promise that Harding would be a figurehead President. The other pledge they made was to take care of the special-privilege interests which had contributed so generously to the Republican campaign fund. I shall call attention to only a few of the numerous instances in which that pledge has been kept.

They passed a revenue bill in which they repealed the excess-profits tax, thereby relieving the war profiteers and post-war profiteers of $500,000,000 per annum. In the same measure they attempted to cut half in two the surtax on net incomes in excess of $66,000 per annum, and did succeed in effecting a reduction from 65 per cent to 50 per cent; this relieved the very wealthy of a large additional amount of taxes and carried no reduction whatever in the surtax on incomes under $66,000 per annum. As a result of this favoritism to the big profiteers and the multimillionaires, a large deficit naturally resulted. In his message vetoing the soldier compensation bill President Harding assigned as one of the reasons for his action the fact that we were unable to pay such compensation and were now confronted with a deficit of $670,000,000 this year and prospects of an even larger deficit next year. Members of the Appropriations Committee at the time called attention to the fact that our deficit for the present year would be $850,000,000, which fact was more than corroborated by a recent statement of the chairman of the Budget committee, who stated that the deficit against which the Budget Committee had been fighting was in reality $896,000,000. It is true that this deficit has been reduced, but how? First, by the issuance last October of $500,000,000 of 30-year Government bonds—the first bonds issued by the Government since we were in the midst of war, more than three years ago. The chairman of the Budget Committee also explains that reductions have been effected by the sale of surplus war materials, Shipping Board property, and securities held by the Government. However, there still remains a large deficit.

FORDNEY-M'CUMBER TARIFF ACT.

Most of all, the Republican Party has rewarded their campaign contributors by the passage of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, which imposes import duties an average of 50 per cent higher than any other tariff bill ever enacted. Time forbids a detailed discussion of this subject, but I do wish to remind you of a few outstanding features. It has been conservatively and scientifically estimated that this bill permits the various manufacturing industries favored thereby to sell their commodities on the basis of factory prices for over $6,340,000,000 per annum higher than would otherwise be the case. It is shocking to contemplate what this will cost the ultimate consumer who buys at retail prices. This enormous and unjust additional burden is imposed upon the American people under the false pretense of meeting the alleged differential between the foreign and American wage cost. And yet this bounty to private interests amounts to 50 per cent more than the total wage cost that enters into the production of the articles in question. According to the last Federal census, the sum total paid in the United States during the year 1919 for wages to labor employed in the production of all the articles protected by this bill amounted to only $4,159,155,551. During that year all factories were running at full capacity and labor was paid as high wages as were ever paid in this country. This bill imposes large import duties on numerous articles which were already sold much cheaper abroad than in this country. It imposes heavy duties upon innumerable articles which were then and are now absolutely controlled by trusts and monopolies, four of which trusts are now under indictment in Federal courts for conspiring together to charge arbitrary and excessive prices.

THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF.

The Fordney-McCumber tariff bill practically builds a wall around this country, so far as manufactured products are concerned. It not only permits the American manufacturers to exploit the domestic consumers in the manner and to the extent stated, but it almost destroys a foreign market for our surplus farm products. Most of that surplus has in the past been sold in Europe. We have acquired nearly all of their gold so that they can not continue to buy our farm products unless they can sell us some of their manufactured products in exchange.

Take wheat as an example: In 1912, the last year under the previous Republican administration and under the operation of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act, we exported 79,689,404 bushels of wheat. In 1913, the first year of the Wilson administration, we exported 142,879,597 bushels of wheat. Our wheat exports increased to 332,464,976 bushels in 1915, which, of course, was during the war in Europe. However, in 1919, the last year of the Democratic administration, we exported 287,401,579 bushels of wheat. Last year—1922—under this Republican administration, with the largest United States wheat production in history, with the exception of four years, we exported only 164,691,565 bushels of wheat, notwithstanding the fact that the export production of wheat in Russia and the Danube States is only about 13,000,000 bushels per annum as compared to 555,000,000 bushels before the war.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has just completed a series of studies to determine what the farmer gets out of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law and what he pays as the result of that law. They find the total tariff gain to farmers by reason of that law to be $124,800,000, and that it imposes a tariff cost to farmers of $94,900,000 on farm products alone, and a tariff cost to all consumers of $391,700,000 on farm products.

Consequently the net gain to agriculture on farm products alone amounts to a little less than $30,000,000 per year, at a cost to consumers of more than thirteen times that sum.

How does the farmer fare when it comes to the tariff on manufactured commodities, which are "protected" much more generously and effectively than agricultural products and which the farmers must all buy?

According to the Federal census of 1920 our rural population constituted 48.6 per cent of our entire population, and our farm population constituted 29.9 per cent of our whole population. It may be reasonably assumed that the farmers purchase their proportionate part of manufactured commodities. Wherefore it is seen that the tribute wrung from the farmers of the country by the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act amounts to the enormous sum of over $1,900,000,000 per annum. In other words, the way this infamous law benefits the farmer is by permitting all of the farmers to pay out $63 for the privilege of seeing some farmers get $1 back.

This bill was so indefensible that it was bitterly denounced from one end of the country to the other, not merely by Democratic and independent journals but even by nearly all of the great Republican dailies.

OPPOSITION TO THE FORDNEY-MCCUMBER TARIFF BILL.

It was so utterly bad that even the friends of a scientific protective tariff rebelled. The official organ of the American Protective Tariff League addressed a postal card to the Members of Congress in July, 1922, as follows:

A WARNING FROM A REPUBLICAN TO REPUBLICANS.

At the last general election the voters pronounced in favor of a protective tariff, but they most certainly did not vote for monopoly. Embargo is monopoly, and the voters will not stand for it. Woe to the party which is guilty of fastening the embargo monopoly upon the country, for it will go down to defeat before the just fury of an outraged electorate. (American Economist, organ of American Protective Tariff League.)

There has never been a time in history when any measure sponsored by any administration was so repudiated and condemned by the press and so many leaders of that party.

In fact, the opposition and the denunciation were so pronounced and so widespread that it was agreed among the administration leaders that it should be held in conference and its passage deferred until after the November, 1922, elections, with the understanding that each Republican Member of Congress should go before his constituency and build up a tariff bill which would meet the local situation and explain that the bad features of the bill would be eliminated before final passage. However, this cunning scheme encountered a snag. The campaign was approaching and the Republican contribution gatherers were sent out to collect funds so essential for conducting a Republican campaign. The promised beneficiaries under the tariff bill refused to "cough up" and plainly told the Republican leaders that they would have to deliver first.

Administration leaders held a political council of war and decided that it was better to take their chances with the wrath of the people rather than to undertake to conduct a campaign without their customary sinews of war, so that it was agreed to jam the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill through the Senate before the election. At that time, after 16 months' consideration under Republican efficiency (?), the bill had reached the stage where there were 2,400 differences between the House and the Senate, many of which had been considered almost insurmountable. However, in the face of the approaching election and the political necessity of action, the Republicans got together and composed those differences almost overnight and jammed through the monstrosity.

This bill was so absolutely rotten that it became an orphan even before its passage—FORDNEY, author of the House bill, having been frightened out of the race for reelection, and MCCUMBER, the author of the Senate bill, having been overwhelmingly defeated in the primary of his own party at the very time that he was daily undertaking to defend his bill on the floor of the Senate.

Having thus built a tariff wall around the country, and by this bill having practically destroyed our foreign commerce, the Republican leaders have since busied themselves in an effort to pass another special-privilege measure, the ship subsidy bill, under the guise of building up our foreign commerce. With one hand they destroy our foreign commerce and with the other pretend to promote our foreign commerce. This incongruous situation results from the fact that in each instance they are favoring special classes.

THE SHIP SUBSIDY BILL.

While the ship subsidy bill does not impose as heavy burdens upon the people, yet it is even more vicious in principle and in form than the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill—and that is about the hardest thing I can say about it. President Harding has described this ship subsidy bill as his pet measure and, under the hypnotic influence of Albert D. Lasker, chairman of the Shipping Board, has exerted every influence to effect its passage, even going so far as to advise Members of Congress to vote for it in direct defiance of the expressed will of their constituents. This is the outstanding instance of his departure from his campaign pledge—that he would only be a figurehead President.

In his message to Congress, transmitting the veto of the soldier compensation bill, President Harding, after referring to the enormous deficit facing us, continued:

To add to our pledges to pay, except as necessity compels, must seem no less than governmental folly. Inevitably it means increased taxation, which Congress was unwilling to levy for the purposes of this bill, and will turn us from the course toward economy so essential to promote the activities which contribute to the common welfare.

Within three days after delivering that message President Harding announced that he would call an extra session of Congress after the election for the purpose of passing this ship subsidy bill providing for the payment of enormous subsidies to the Shipping Trust.

The Springfield (Mass.) Republican, the leading Republican paper of New England, declared editorially:

The President has waited nearly a year and a half before seriously functioning as the leader of his party in Congress, and his first venture will be a melancholy one if his heart is really set upon the enactment of the ship subsidy bill.

Under the provisions of this bill it is contemplated that our ships, which cost the people about $3,000,000,000, will probably be sold for $200,000,000; the Government will lend $125,000,000 to recondition those ships or build others, and then pay the owners approximately $750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years, the bill authorizing 10-year subsidy contracts. In other words, we would be giving the ships away and paying the recipients over $500,000,000 to operate them for the next 10 years. Nearly all of the subsidies would go to the fast passenger liners instead of to the cargo vessels which carry our products. For instance, according to the admission of a Shipping Board representative, made at the hearings on the bill, a 5,000 gross ton cargo vessel would receive a subsidy of $7,500 per annum, whereas the *Leviathan* could draw a subsidy of $1,800,000 per annum.

As vicious as the bill is in principle, it is even more vicious in form. It confers most autocratic and unprecedented power upon the Shipping Board. It affords boundless opportunities for favoritism, graft, and corruption. It authorizes them to lend the $125,000,000 revolving fund to whom they please and on 15 years' time. It authorizes them to sell the ships to whom they please and on whatever conditions they please, or to refuse to sell them even to American citizens. It authorizes them to grant or to withhold the subsidies and to increase them up to doubling the basic subsidies. Under the provisions of this remarkable bill the Shipping Board is authorized to usurp powers properly belonging to and now exercised by the President, six Cabinet officers, the Budget Committee, the Congress, and the judiciary.

This extraordinary bill confers more power on the Shipping Board than good men ought to want and more power than bad men ought to be given. The bill is so framed as to avoid annual appropriations. Instead of the Shipping Board coming to Congress each year for necessary appropriations to carry out the provisions of the bill, as all other departments of the Government are required to do, the bill is admittedly so framed as to avoid this, it directing the Secretary of the Treasury to credit to the merchant marine fund certain receipts and "all moneys in the fund are hereby permanently appropriated for the purpose of making such payments" of voyage subsidies "upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Shipping Board." The proponents of the bill boldly admit that this is for the purpose of preventing a repeal of the bill by subsequent Congresses elected by the people.

Although it was vigorously pressed as an administration measure, the President exerting all possible pressure to effect its passage, yet this bill was shown to be so iniquitous that the Republican majority of 169 in the House dwindled to 24 on the passage of the bill, and it was then only saved by the 82 "lame ducks" who voted for it.

The administration is now engaged in trying to put this bill through the Senate by the aid of "lame ducks" there, as they know such a bill will stand no chance in the next Congress, which was elected with this as an issue.

In control of both branches of Congress since March 4, 1919, and with 169 majority in the House and 24 majority in the Senate, and in complete control of the executive branch of the Government since March 4, 1921, the Republicans have failed to function in the interest of the people. President Harding

and his administration have utterly failed to cope with the vital domestic and foreign problems with which we are confronted. With agriculture prostrate and business stagnated, the Republicans have been unable or unwilling to extend a helping hand. What few efforts that have been made to meet the problems have been under the goading of the Democrats and a few progressive Republicans, but the results have been so niggardly as to be ineffective.

The difficulty has been that the "master minds" have been hostile to legislation in the interest of the people, or have been unable to agree among themselves upon any definite policy looking to the relief of the masses. The result has been that the President has hesitated, vacillated, and "wiggled and wobbled."

LACK OF FOREIGN POLICY.

The Republican national platform of 1920 declared in part as follows:

Never has our Nation been confronted with graver problems. The people are entitled to know in definite terms how the parties purpose solving these problems. To that end the Republican Party declares its policies and program to be as follows:

The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war.

And yet the present Republican administration has had no foreign policy except one of cowardice. With all Europe in a state of turmoil and chaos, a portion of it at war and the remainder on the verge of war, we sit supinely by, although this powerful Nation should and could be the great moral leader of the world, and without incurring any risk could contribute more than all other forces combined toward bringing about political tranquillity and consequent financial, industrial, and commercial stability in Europe. The administration admits our vital interest in European affairs by sending so-called unofficial observers to sneak in the back door of every European conference, but the Republicans refuse to play any manly part, as they promised in their 1920 platform they would do.

The indifference and helplessness of the administration was clearly evidenced in a signed article by one of the staff correspondents of the Washington Star, a loyal administration paper, which in its issue of January 6, 1923, declared:

What President Harding branded "a record congregation" assembled at the White House yesterday for the semiweekly press conference. Hopes of important comment on the grave European situation were the attraction. The scribes, especially the group of foreign correspondents attached to the Washington corps, were amazed to be told that notwithstanding the Old World crisis, the Cabinet for the first time since the Harding administration took office assembled, but adjourned without meeting, because no business was submitted for discussion.

With Europe in the throes of its most nervous week end since the war, it was not sufficiently important for Cabinet consideration. However, there was important business for consideration of the Cabinet the following week, but it was not the portentious European situation. It was a grave domestic problem. In order that I may not be charged with being unfair I shall quote from the same loyal Republican paper, the Washington Star, which in a front-page article appearing in its issue of January 12, 1923, described this Cabinet meeting as follows:

HOUND DOG HOLDS CENTER OF STAGE AS CABINET MEETS.

A hound dog in the Grand Canyon National Park has his day as a topic of debate at the usual Friday session of President Harding's Cabinet.

The dog belongs to the park postmaster, and the Post Office Department has contended that he is needed for company. But the Interior Department, which manages national parks, has a standing rule against dogs on all such reservations.

To-day the long and bitter controversy came to a head. Postmaster General Work eloquently drew a picture of the lonely postmaster who loved his dog. Secretary Fall, also a lover of dogs, replied that sympathy must not be permitted to override the stern provisions of the law.

However, the President, with characteristic positiveness and decision, rose to the occasion and met the situation, as further described in said article, as follows:

The President was said by Cabinet members to have decided at first in favor of the dog, but later to have indicated that he would not make a final ruling until he had received more detailed information.

The New York World, in its issue of January 9, 1923, correctly and aptly describes the foreign policy of this administration as follows:

COWARDICE AS A FOREIGN POLICY.

In foreign relations Mr. Harding is afraid of everything. He is afraid of commitments, as he calls them. He is afraid of entanglements, He is afraid of responsibilities. He is afraid of obligations. He is afraid of the Senate. He is especially afraid of the battalion of death. He is afraid of his own record as Senator. He is afraid to be consistent, and he is afraid to be inconsistent. He is afraid to act and he is afraid not to act. And in consequence no human being in all the world knows what the foreign policy of the United States will be from day to day.

It is possible to devise a foreign policy that rests only on cowardice, for Mr. Harding has proved that it can be done. But the net result of it all is that the political and economy condition of the civilized world is far worse than it was the day that Mr. Harding took office. In fact, all Europe is on the verge of collapse. If that is really what the American people voted for in 1920, that is what they have to show for it.

Yes; in 1920 a large majority of the people voted for a change, and there is no question that they got it. They exchanged eight years of Democratic prosperity for four years of Republican adversity.

ADMINISTRATION HONEYMOON.

No administration ever went into power with as large a majority or as splendid an opportunity for service as the present Republican administration, and no administration was ever so quickly and so completely discredited. The honeymoon was delirious and hilarious, but the aftermath has been something awful.

BREAKDOWN OF REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION.

Their failure has been so palpable and so pronounced that not only have the leading Republican journals been bitterly denouncing the administration, but even many administration leaders have publicly admitted its shortcomings. WILLIAM R. WOOD, a Republican Congressman from Indiana and the chairman of the Republican national congressional committee, in a speech on the floor of the House declared:

I know the very serious condition that is prevailing throughout the land. I am only speaking the truth when I say that the people of this country employed in every vocation and in every character of business are giving this Congress hell. They are doing it because we have done nothing to stimulate business. They are doing it because we have done nothing to give employment to the unemployed. They are doing it because we have done nothing to benefit the farmer and stimulate the prices of the farmers' products.

In a public address Secretary of War Weeks declared that "the Congress has never been at as low an ebb as it is to-day." Leading Republicans and Republican papers, as well as everybody else, echoed this sentiment with approval. It is perfectly natural that this Congress has reached the lowest ebb of any Congress in history because it contains more Republicans than any other Congress ever contained. Why, it got so bad that even Daddy Harding indorsed a Democratic candidate for the Senate in Iowa.

The method employed by the present administration is apparently that of an old quack doctor who once practiced in the mountains of east Tennessee. His specialty was curing fits, and, consequently, his services were in much demand, that being the Republican section of Tennessee. He was sometimes called to attend other cases, and if he did not know the trouble or what to do, his plan was to throw the patient into fits and then cure him of the fits. Doctor Harding and his quack associates have thrown this country into fits, but they are now unable to cure the fits.

Reactionary Republicanism is not a cure for any ill that may afflict the body politic; in fact, it is a malady itself. How long will it take the people to learn that no situation can be so bad that relief will be afforded by Republican success?

SOLE HOPE LIES IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

There are numerous able, progressive, and patriotic members of the Republican Party who are utterly out of sympathy with the reactionary policies of the present administration, but, unfortunately, they are not exercising any effective influence on party action. It is becoming more evident daily that the sole hope lies in the Democratic Party, the only party which has steadfastly manifested its friendship for all the people.

Coming from Washington, the national clearing house of political information, I bring to you good tidings. The Democratic camp fires are burning brightly throughout the Nation. The people are in open revolt against this special-privilege-favoring Republican administration, against its do-nothing policy. The Democrats are ready and eager for the fray.

After 18 months of the Harding administration, with a minimum of achievement and a maximum of failure, with pledges unfulfilled, with the Grand Old Party breaking into factions, with rapidly multiplying administration scandals, and with the influential papers and many leading members of their own party severely condemning the administration, we can well understand why President Harding uttered the despairing wail, "There are times that I wish for a little while that I were not President of the United States," and why, at the recent homecoming in Marion, he said to his home people that he would welcome the day "when I can come back to you and stay permanently."

Our friendship for the President is such that we intend to see that his wishes shall be fully gratified at the first opportunity—in 1924.

DEMOCRATIC VICTORY IN 1924.

Will Rogers has said that the Democrats in most of the States failed to notify the Republicans that they were going to hold an election last November. However, that result was only a gentle reminder of what will happen in 1924, when the American people will rise in their majesty and throw off the Republican yoke with which they are burdened, and restore to power the Democratic Party, which gave them the most unprecedented prosperity in all the history of this Republic.

PRESENCE OF CLERKS AND STENOGRAPHERS IN GRAND JURIES.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4438) to amend section 1025 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, a similar House bill having been reported on the calendar.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that bill being considered now.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the bill for the present.

RETURN OF ALIEN ENEMY PROPERTY.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 14222) to amend the trading with the enemy act, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not know what the parliamentary inquiry is. I am against this bill, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is up to the majority, who are responsible for legislation, to produce a quorum. We had a bill up here awhile ago that involved an appropriation of only $4,000 for a preliminary survey of 4,000,000 acres of land, to reclaim it, and the majority leader objected to it, and I am against this Alien Property Custodian bill and I insist upon the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Davis, Minn.	Kahn	O'Brien
Andrew, Mass.	Denison	Keller	O'Connor
Anthony	Dickinson	Kelley, Mich.	Ogden
Appleby	Drane	Kelly, Pa.	Oldfield
Atkeson	Drewry	Kennedy	Oliver
Bacharach	Driver	Kiess	Olpp
Bankhead	Dunbar	Kindred	Overstreet
Barkley	Dunn	King	Paige
Bell	Echols	Kirkpatrick	Park, Ga.
Bird	Ellis	Kitchin	Patterson, Mo.
Bixler	Faust	Kleczka	Pou
Black	Favrot	Kline, N. Y.	Pringey
Blakeney	Fenn	Kline, Pa.	Rainey, Ala.
Bland, Ind.	Fisher	Knight	Rainey, Ill.
Bland, Va.	Frear	Langley	Reed, W. Va.
Boies	Free	Lanham	Riddick
Bowers	Freeman	Larson, Minn.	Riordan
Brand	French	Lawrence	Roach
Brennan	Frothingham	Layton	Robertson
Britten	Fuller	Lee, Ga.	Robsion
Brooks, Ill.	Fulmer	Lehlbach	Rodenberg
Browne, Wis.	Gallivan	Linthicum	Rose
Buchanan	Garner	Longworth	Rosenbloom
Burke	Glynn	Lowrey	Rouse
Burtness	Goodykoontz	Luhring	Rucker
Butler	Gorman	McArthur	Ryan
Byrnes, S. C.	Gould	McClintic	Sanders, N. Y.
Byrns, Tenn.	Graham, Pa.	McCormick	Sanders, Tex.
Campbell, Pa.	Green, Iowa	McKenzie	Schall
Cannon	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Scott, Mich.
Cantrill	Griffin	McPherson	Sears
Carew	Hardy, Tex.	MacLafferty	Shelton
Chandler, N. Y.	Hawes	Madden	Sinclair
Clague	Hayden	Maloney	Sinnott
Clark, Fla.	Hays	Mapes	Slemp
Classon	Herrick	Martin	Smith, Mich.
Clouse	Hogan	Merritt	Smithwick
Codd	Hooker	Michaelson	Snell
Collins	Huddleston	Mills	Steagall
Connolly, Pa.	Hutchinson	Montague	Stedman
Copley	Jacoway	Moore, Ill.	Steenerson
Crisp	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Va.	Stevenson
Crowther	Johnson, Miss.	Moores, Ind.	Stiness
Cullen	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mudd	Stoll
Darrow	Jones, Pa.	Nolan	Strong, Kans.
Sullivan	Tillman	Ward, N. Y.	Wise
Summers, Wash.	Tincher	Ward, N. C.	Wood, Ind.
Swank	Towner	Weaver	Woodruff
Taylor, Ark.	Treadway	Webster	Woods, Va.
Taylor, Colo.	Tucker	Wheeler	Woodyard
Taylor, Tenn.	Upshaw	White, Me.	Wyant
Thomas	Vinson	Williams, Tex.	Yates
Thorpe	Walters	Williamson	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 215 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the joint resolution I desire to offer for the RECORD two tables showing the extraordinary decline in the production of gold and silver in the world and in the United States since the year 1915.

The gold production in the United States declined from $101,035,700 in 1915 to $49,096,000 in 1922, or 51.41 per cent. The silver production in the United States declined from 74,961,075 ounces in 1915 to 53,052,441 ounces in 1921, or 29.2 per cent.

I offer these tables and ask unanimous consent that they be published in the RECORD:

Gold production of the world by continents, United States Mint Reports, 1915–1921.

[In dollars.]

Continents.	1915	Per cent of world production.	1921	Per cent of world production.	Increase (+) decrease (−) 1921 from 1915	Per cent of increase (+) decrease (−) 1921 from 1915.
United States	$101,035,700	21.5	$50,067,307	15.2	−$50,968,393	−50.5
Canada	18,977,901	4.1	19,108,506	5.8	+130,605	+.7
Mexico	6,559,275	1.5	14,239,711	4.3	+7,680,436	+117.1
North America	126,572,876	27.1	83,415,524	25.3	−43,157,352	−33.3
Central America	2,970,271	.6	2,500,000	.8	−470,271	−15.7
South America	15,087,570	3.1	13,794,238	4.2	−1,293,332	−8.6
Europe	29,163,231	6.2	1,365,565	.4	−27,797,666	−95.8
Australia	48,988,177	10.4	[1]20,736,596	6.3	−28,251,581	−57.7
Asia	28,090,895	6.0	21,409,069	6.5	−6,681,826	−23.9
Africa	217,851,898	46.6	186,694,109	56.5	−31,157,789	−13.8
Total for world	468,724,918	100.0	329,915,101	100.0	−138,809,817	−29.6

[1] Australasia.

1. The 1922 gold production of the British Empire decreased about $15,000,000, as estimated by Joseph Kitchin in the Annual Bullion Letter of Samuel Montagu & Co., of London. Based upon this estimated British decline, the world's gold production for 1922 was estimated at $315,000,000 by H. N. Lawrie, managing director American Gold and Silver Institute, as published in the Annual Review Edition, Engineering and Mining Journal Press, January 20, 1923.

2. Table compiled and computed by H. N. Lawrie, managing director American Gold and Silver Institute.

Silver production of the world by continents, United States Mint Reports, 1915–1921.

[In fine ounces.]

Continents.	1915	Per cent of world production.	1921	Per cent of world production.	Increase (+), decrease (−), 1921 from 1915.	Per cent of increase (+), decrease (−), 1921 from 1915.
United States	74,961,075	41.9	53,052,441	30.2	−21,908,634	−29.2
Canada	26,625,960	14.9	13,134,926	7.5	−13,491,034	−50.8
Mexico	39,570,151	22.1	64,513,540	36.8	+24,943,389	+63.0
North America	141,157,186	78.9	130,700,907	74.5	−10,456,279	−7.4
Central America	2,920,496	1.6	2,000,000	1.1	−920,496	−31.5
South America	13,687,464	7.7	15,065,610	8.6	+1,378,146	+10.1
Europe	10,107,556	5.7	7,990,662	4.6	−2,116,894	−20.9
Australia	4,295,755	2.4	[1] 9,446,363	5.4	+5,150,608	+119.8
Asia	5,494,004	3.1	8,903,316	5.1	+3,409,312	+62.0
Africa	1,188,039	.6	1,161,376	.7	−26,663	−2.2
Total for world	178,850,500	100.0	175,268,234	100.0	−3,582,266	−2.0

[1] Australasia.

Table compiled and computed by H .N. Lawrie, managing director American Gold and Silver Institute.

Several Members asked permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlemen who desire to extend their remarks in the RECORD please make their requests to-morrow morning?

Mr. LITTLE. But I may not have an opportunity to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from Kansas extending his remarks in the RECORD? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

CONFERENCE REPORT, TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I believe the report has not been made to the House, and I ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the statement in lieu of the report.

The statement was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14222) to amend the trading with the enemy act 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 2 and 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That no insurance partnership, association, or corporation, against which any claim or claims may be filed by any citizen of the United States with the Alien Property Custodian within 60 days after the time this paragraph takes effect, whether such claim appears to be barred by the statute of limitations or not, shall be entitled to avail itself of the provisions of this paragraph until such claim or claims are satisfied"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert: ": *Provided, however*, That this subsection shall not affect any rights which any citizen or subject may have under paragraph 1 of this subsection"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 7, 8, 9, and 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendments insert "3"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment and insert:

"SEC. 23. The Alien Property Custodian is directed to pay to the person entitled thereto, from and after the time this section takes effect, the net income, dividend, interest, annuity, or other earnings, accruing and collected thereafter, on any property or money held in trust for such person by the Alien Property Custodian or by the Treasurer of the United States for the account of the Alien Property Custodian, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe; but no person shall be paid, under this section, any amount in excess of $10,000 per annum."

And the Senate agree to the same.

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. 14222) to amend the trading with the enemy act, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendment No. 1: This amendment permits the return of all the money or other property to a woman who was a daughter of a resident citizen of the United States and herself a resident or a former resident thereof, or a minor daughter or daughters of such woman, she being deceased; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment permitted the return of all the money or other property earned by an enemy or ally of an enemy while he was a bona fide resident of the United States, if at the time of the return of his money or other property he is a bona fide resident of the United States; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 3: This amendment provides that an enemy insurance partnership, association, or corporation shall not be entitled to the return under this paragraph unless it has satisfied claims against it filed by a citizen of the United States within 60 days after the passage of this act; and the House recedes with an amendment making clerical changes.

On amendment No. 4: This amendment requires that a partnership, association, other unincorporated body of individuals, or a corporation must be controlled or that 50 per cent of the interest or voting power must be owned at the time its money or other property was taken over by the Alien Property Custodian, as well as at the time it is returned, by citizens or subjects of nations, States, or free cities other than Germany, Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 5: This amendment is intended to safeguard the rights of any person under paragraph (1) prior to the passage of this act. The House recedes with an amendment making clerical changes.

On amendment No. 6: This amendment requires the presentation of evidence with respect to attorney's fees to the President rather than to the Alien Property Custodian; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10: These amendments provided that the fees of any agent, attorney, or representative of a person entitled to the return of money or property under this act must not exceed 1 per cent of the value of such property. The House bill placed a limitation of 10 per cent on such fees. The House recedes with an amendment to each of these amendments placing 3 per cent as a maximum.

On amendment No. 11: This amendment requires the giving of satisfactory evidence to rebut any presumption of expatriation to the President rather than to the Alien Property Custodian; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 12: This amendment struck out the section in the House bill authorizing the return of future net income, dividends, interest, annuities, and other earnings. The House recedes with an amendment which restores the section, but with a limitation on the amount of such net income, dividends, interest, annuity, and other earnings which may be paid to any one person of $10,000 per annum.

On amendment No. 13: This is a clerical amendment; and the Senate recedes.

HENRY F. ASHURST,
ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
THOMAS STERLING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

WALTER H. NEWTON,
WILLIAM J. GRAHAM,
CLARENCE F. LEA,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and move the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move a recess under the prior order of the House.

Mr. KINCHELOE. On that I ask a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the House stand in recess under its prior order.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Where the conferees have receded with an amendment, that amendment has to be adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the House now recess under its prior order.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order—I was on my feet—that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KINCHELOE. But I was within my rights, notwithstanding the Chair's decision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes a. m.) the House took a recess until 10 o'clock a. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted by unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD and print the so-called "slacker lists," I desire to call attention to a letter from the Adjutant General's Office, dated February 28, 1923.

It is my intention to insert these lists on the 5th day of each month until all of the names are printed. No good soldier will be injured by the publication of his name in these lists; but, on the contrary, if his military record is one to be proud of, the publication will only serve to call attention to that record. If by mistake the names of good soldiers have not been eliminated from the record, it will be my pleasure and duty to insert in the RECORD the facts in each individual case and to see that the facts are brought to the attention of the Secretary of War, who is as anxious as any soldier of the late war with Germany to have the records correct. Mistakes ought to be corrected while the men are living and while there is evidence to substantiate any valid claim as to service.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 28, 1923.

Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have the honor to transmit herewith for publication in a March issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD lists of alleged draft deserters, which lists were released by the War Department for publication between January 5 and February 4, 1923, both dates inclusive. A copy of the statement to be printed at the head of the lists is also herewith.

There is also transmitted herewith for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of the names of registrants which have been removed from the lists of alleged draft deserters heretofore published in the RECORD, the reasons for such removals being set forth in the second paragraph of the statement which is to precede the lists in the RECORD.

Very respectfully,

ROBERT C. DAVIS,
The Adjutant General.

The following names have been removed from the lists of alleged draft deserters heretofore published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since the publication of such names:

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HARRISON, STATE OF IOWA.

189 Merle Clyde Card (Merle C. Card), Route No. 3, Missouri Valley, Iowa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF WICHITA, STATE OF KANSAS.

1803 Mike E. Loder, 503 West Avenue, Jenkinstown, Pa. (Wichita, Kans.).
Mikel E. Loder, 340 North Market Street, Wichita, Kans.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TIPTON, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

1129 Edgar Nolen, Brighton, Tenn.

The men whose names appear below, and who were under the jurisdiction of the local boards names, were, according to the public draft records, classified and reported by the draft authorities as deserters from the military service of the United States. The lists in which these names were originally included have been given at least one month's publicity.

The name of any man who, since the publication of the lists, has been found to have actually served in either our own forces or in those of the Allies during the period between May 18, 1917, and November 11, 1918, is not included; nor is that of any man who, though he rendered no service during the period mentioned, has, since the publication of his name, been found to have been erroneously inducted or to have been erroneously certified as a deserter, nor that of any man who is known to be no longer living.

Every reasonable effort has been made by the War Department to eliminate from these lists names which, for any of the aforementioned reasons, should not appear thereon. Should it develop, however, that certain of the names listed below should, for any of these reasons, likewise be removed, notice to that effect will be published in each such case in a later issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MISSISSIPPI, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

4933 Lynk Adams, Marie, Ark.
223 J. C. Adkins, 396 West Second, Memphis, Tenn.
2275 Jesse Adkins, Jackson, Miss.
1845 Willie Adkins (Atkins), Burdette, Ark.
2263 John Akins (Adkins), Wilson, Ark.
284 Joseph Allen, Joiner, Ark.
1584 Tony Almond, Evadale, Ark.
299a Charlie (Chas.) Anderson, Waradell, Ark.
2190 Robert Anderson, Wilson, Ark.
4427 Samuel Anderson, Corona, Tenn.
4259 Robert Andrews, Atlanta, Ga. (Evadale, Ark.).
350 Tom Andros (Andrews), Amorel, Ark.
1605 Preston Armstrong, Driner, Ark.
1283 Edward Arnold, Blytheville, Ark.
3751 George Arnold, Blytheville, Ark.
1607 Buster Arthur, Marie, Ark.
2465 Willie Ashbury (Asberry), Osceola, Ark.
5056 Ed Atkins, Osceola, Ark.
1104 Curtis Ayers (Ayres), Wilson, Ark.
3782 Jesse Bailey, Osceola, Ark.
2618 Isaac Baker, Osceola, Ark.
2285 Elton Ballew (Belew), Archillion, Ark.
2578 Rainer Banks, Frenchmans Bayou, Ark.
4922 Charles (Charlie, (Charley) Barker, Shelton, Miss. (Sherman, Miss.).
4439 William G. H. Barner (William H. G. Barnes), Blytheville, Ark.
2405 Fred Barnes, 209 Cor. E. C. S., Blytheville, Ark.
387–386 Milton Barnes, Marie, Ark.
4246 Sam Batts (Betts), Mazrn, Ark.
526 Jim Baughman, Marie, Ark.
2707 Will Bell, Pecan Point, Ark.
3562 Richard Belts, Huffman, Ark.
4579 Charles (Charlie) Bender, Wilson, Ark.
1571 Ambrose Berry, Osceola, Ark.
4782 William (Willie) Berry, Bell, Ark.
1298 Leonard Bert (Lenord Burt), Blytheville, Ark.
4262 Burdine Bishop, Etowah, Ark.
4588 Will Black, Yarbo, Ark.
4816 Cottrell Blackman (Blanchard), Osceola (San Souci), Ark.
2439 Abe Boggett (Baggett or Baggatt), Dyersburg, Tenn.
3394 Henry Bolton, Aneson, Ark. (Wilson, Ark.)
4300 James Bolton, Ducansby, Miss.
676 Lacey Boon (Boone), Marie, Ark.
4610 Carter Boone, Lexora, Ark.
890 Will Bonner (Will Lucas Boner), Blytheville, Ark.
2630 Will Borney (Barney), Blytheville, Ark.
1904 Ike Boyce, Wilson, Ark.
487 Bea Boyd, Burdette, Ark.
605 Levanie (or Levinel) Bradley (Leveneal Bradley) (Levenial Bradly), Osceola, Ark.
2880 Charles (Charley) Brady, Wilson, Ark.
4400 Collie (Couley) (Coolie) Brantley, Armorel, Ark.
3466 George Bridges (George Bridges, jr.), Dill, Ark.
3187 Will Briggs, Jainer, Ark.
3155 Berry Brooks, Modena, Ark.
1413 John Brooks, Blytheville, Ark.
2737 Conrad Allen Brown, Manila, Ark.
4273 Elbert Brown, Blytheville, Ark.
1608 George Brown, Brighton, Tenn.
152 George Brown, Blytheville, Ark.
3977 Lewis (Louis) Brown, Osceola, Ark.
3735 Major Brown, Yarbro, Ark.
447 James Bryant, Evadale, Ark.
5053 Oscar Bryant, Hickman, Ark.
343 Walter Burnside, McFerren, Ark. (Carthage, Mo.).
3153 Marvin E. Burton (Marvin Elmor Burton), Yarbro, Ark.
2240 Homer Butler, Wilson, Ark.
280 George Caldwell, Blytheville, Ark.
727 George Carpin (Carpets), Osceola, Ark.
1708 Fred Carter, Greenville, Miss.
3648 John Casion, Driner, Ark.
2313 Walter Chambers, Carson, Ark.
4869 Mathew (Matthew) Champion, Nodena, Ark.
847 Quincy Chandler, Burdette, Ark.
2652 Richard Chandler, Blytheville, Ark.
1770 John Church, Osceola, Ark.
177 Eb (Ed) Clark, Carson, Ark.
4940 Henry L. Clark, box 22, Finley, Tenn. (Hy L. Clark, Archillion, Ark.).
1848 Joseph Thurman Clark, Pecan Point, Ark.
2887 Samuel G. Clark (Samuel C. Clarke), Blytheville, Ark
4645 Osby Clay, Carson, Ark.
614 Cleveland Clayton (Claxton), Madison Parish, La.
3181 Oscar Clifton, Wilson, Ark.
8 Ashley Collins, McFerren, Ark.
1795 Henry Columbus, Caruthersville, Mo.
912 Henry C. Conner (Henry Clay Conner), Osceola, Ark.
3703 Clyde Cook, Archillon, Ark.
998 George Cook, Wilson, Ark.
3268 Lewis (Louis) Cook, Butler, Ark.
1063 Mose Cook, Burdette, Ark.
363 Parker Cooper, Wilson, Ark.
1098 Will Cooper, Armorel, Ark.
4886 Jim Coss (June Goss), Pecan Point, Ark.
3330 Clarence Crawford, Whitton, Ark.
3944 Ben Crofton, Joiner, Ark.
3126 Edward Cross, Wilson, Ark.
2996 Jason Cunningham, Wilson, Ark.
120 Boyd Curn, R. F. D. 1, Osceola, Ark.
3321 Alex. (Alx.) Curtis, Wardell, Ark.
3806 Jack Dalton, Blytheville, Ark.
108 Frank Davis, Joiner, Ark.
158 Frank Davis, Osceola, Ark.
4453 Henry (Henery) Davis, Deckerville, Ark.
114 John Davis, Frenchman Bayou, Ark.
3785 John Davis, Wilson, Ark.
2664 Wavery Davis, Marie, Ark.
377 Will Davis, Whitton, Ark.
4905 Rayford Dean, Wilson, Ark.
3550 Thomas H. Dickerson (Tom Henry Dickerson, Thomas Henry Dickerson), R. F. D. 1, Blytheville, Ark.
3473 Isaac Dickson (Dixon), Wilson, Ark.
3524 Lewis (Louis) Dodson, Wardell, Ark.
1849 Robert Driver (Drier), Pecan Point, Ark.
185 Henry Duncan, Wilson, Ark.
3614 Will Dupree, Wilson, Ark.
3739 Jobe (Tobe) Eaton Wilson, Ark.
4234 Samuel E. Eaton (Samuel Edgar Eaton), Lepanto, Ark.
771 Earnest Ebenhardt (Ernest Eberhard), Osceola, Ark.
3318 Ray Edmond (Edmon), Osceola, Ark.
954 Charlie (Charley) Edwards, Bassett, Ark.
2177 Miles E. Eldridge (Miles Scott Eldredge), Osceola, Ark.
4474 Jim Ellis, Blytheville, Ark.
3900 Newvern (Vemeren) Epps, Wilson, Ark.
921 George Evans, Rosa, Ark.

4995 George E. Farnell (George Ellis Farnmel, Farnell, G. E. Trammel), Wilson, Ark.
4325 Will Felton, Osceola, Ark.
4799 Frank Finch, Gosnell, Ark.
3218 Lige Fishback, Blytheville, Ark.
1408 John Fisher, Joiner, Ark.
4715 Willie Fisher, Scavender, Ark.
4572 Wesley Flowers, Evadale, Ark.
762 Willie Flowers, Evadale, Ark.
3058 Sun (Son, Sam) Foley, Osceola, Ark.
3632 Eddie Ford, Wilson, Ark.
2082 Irvin Ford, Osceola, Ark.
4224 Melvin (Melfin) Ford, Osceola, Ark.
2713 Andrew Fort, Wilson, Ark.
4982 Jimmie Foster, Darcy, Miss.
2464 Charlie (Charley) Fowler, Memphis, Tenn. (Barfield, Ark.).
281 Felix Franklin, Evadale, Ark.
404 Davis (Dave) Frazier, Nodena, Ark.
3108 John E. Frazier (John Eula Frazier), R. F. D. 1, Blytheville, Ark.
2371 Clarence Freeman, Canton, Miss.
157 Monroe Freeman, Blytheville, Ark.
2680 George Gaines, Osceola, Ark.
449 James Galladay (Gallady), Mane (Marie), Ark.
4775 Harry L. Garrett (Harry Lee Garrett) (Garrett), Luxora, Ark.
4575 Robert Gary or Grary, Osceola, Ark.
3853 Johnnie (Johnie) Gaston, Osceola, Ark.
1855 Manuel Ghoulston, Osceola, Ark.
2260 George Gibony (Giboney), Bassett, Ark.
4792 Alias Gibson (Gipson), Huffman, Ark.
1570 Lee L. Gilbert, Wilson, Ark.
4189 Thomas Gilchrist (Gilcrist), Rodney, Miss. (Barfield, Ark.).
1554 Jerry Gill, Barfield, Ark.
1954 George Gillespie, Nodena, Ark.
470 Jerry Goles (Gales), Coldwater, Miss.
760 John Goodman, Blytheville, Ark.
3726 Charlie (Charles) Gord, Wilson, Ark.
3548 Fred Gordon, Keiser, Ark.
2150 John Gordon, Modena, Ark.
1390 Carroll Edward Gough, Osceola, Ark.
4740 Sam Gowan (Cowan, Cowans, Sammie Cowan), Burdette, Ark.
471 Albert Green, Barfield, Ark.
1892 B. Green (Bee Green), Pecan Point, Ark.
5050 Sullivan Green, Luxora, Ark.
1108 Jake Greer, Lake Providence, La.
2698 Royer L. Grice (Roger Lee Grice), Blytheville, Ark.
1931 Ed Griffin, Germantown, Tenn.
869 Willie Groves, Osceola, Ark.
3428 Elbert Hammels (Hamells, Hamell), Kaiser, Ark.
4401 Edgar Handley, Armorel, Ark.
3950 Chester Hard, Frenchman Bayou, Ark.
1790 U. R. Harden (Vastan Roland Harden), Hornersville, Mo.
695 Ben Hardman, Dell, Ark.
2568 Frank Hardin, Osceola, Ark.
809 Green Hargett (Garrett, Jno. Green Hargett), R. R. 1, Bx. 135, Blytheville, Ark. (Driver, Ark.).
3619 Will Harnes (Harmes, Harris), Carson, Ark. (Wilson, Ark.).
2819 John E. Harper (John Esker (Eskel) Harper), Osceola, Ark.
2890 Monroe Harper, Osceola, Ark.
3408 Linewl Harrell, Dell, Ark.
2644 Ned Harrell (Harell), Carson, Ark.
2741 Charles (Charlie) Harris, Luxora, Ark.
71 James Rex Harris, Sikeston, Mo.
4102 Will Harris, Wilson, Ark.
2355 Will Harris, Nodine, Ark.
2385 Lewis Harvey (Louis Harvy), Pecan Point, Ark.
47 Jim Hayman (Hammond), Osceola, Ark.
4597 Oliver Hefner, Wilson, Ark.
1056 Arnold Henderson (Arnold Henderson, jr.), Nodena, Ark.
2511 Frank Henderson, Sardio, Miss.
3880 Monroe Henderson, Armorel, Ark.
2648 Robert Henderson, McFerren, Ark.
1504 Evans, Henry, Blytheville, Ark.
1706 Tom Henry, Barfield, Ark. (Clarksdale, Miss.)
3682 Thomas Herman (Hermon), Burdette, Ark.
3095 Clarence Hicks, Burdette, Ark.
1986 William Hicks, Luxora, Ark.
3035 Clinton Hicombottom, Carson, Ark.
2498 James Hightower, Blytheville, Ark.
341 Andrew Hill, 409 Collenville, E. St. Louis, Ill.
3197 Floyd Hill, Bassett, Ark.
2873 Jesse (Jessie) Hill, Goldchest, Tenn. (Barfield, Ark.).
2165 Quitman Hodges, Murray, Ky.
346 Elisha Holden, Golden Lake, Ark.
1476 Howard Holmes, Joiner, Ark.
1097 Brown Hopper, Wilson, Ark.
3052 Will Houston, Osceola, Ark.
4533 Will Howard, Archillion, Ark.
4187 Oscar Hudleston (Huddleston), Blytheville, Ark.
2884 Alvin Hudson, Wilson, Ark.
164 Charley (Charles) Hudson, Osceola, Ark.
819 Joe L. Hudson (Joe Lee Hudson), Burdette, Ark.
138 George Huff, McCrory, Ark.
952 Judge Huffman, Wilson, Ark.
2284 Asa (Oley) Hunt, Barfield, Ark.
2146 Walter Hunter, Burdette, Ark.
376 George Hutchinson, Blytheville, Ark.
4156 Willie Hutchinson (Hutcherson), Wilson, Ark.
4639 Israel Isom, Osceola, Ark.
3633 David (Daniel) Jackson, Bassett, Ark.
4962 Elvin Jackson, Pecan Point, Ark.
720 Eyeris Jackson, Osceola, Ark.
4748 Leroy Jackson, Luxora, Ark.
117 Nigh (Uri) Jackson, Pecan Point, Ark.
69 Pete Jackson, Wilson, Ark.
4872 Stonewall Jackson, Bubble, Ark.
2954 Clyde James, Nodena, Ark.
213 Sam James, Wilson, Ark.
2619 Fennimore C. James (Fenimore Cooper James), Yarbro, Ark.
585 Will Jefferson, Huffman, Ark.
3967 Arthur Jenkins, Deans Island, Ark.
3704 Charles (Charley) Little John, Wilson, Ark.
1520 Arthur G. Johnson (Arthur Guy Johnson), Manila, Ark.
4880 Charles Johnson, Armorel, Ark.
324 Frank Johnson, Armarelle, Ark.
2850 George Johnson, Osceola, Ark.
2351 Henry Johnson, Osceola, Ark.
1510 John A. Johnson (John Albert Johnson), Rosa, Ark.
4913 Leroy Johnson, Bassett, Ark.
613 Ledge (Lige) Johnson, Armorel, Ark.
4953 Wesley Johnson, Burdette, Ark.
4245 Will Johnson, St. Thomas, Ark.
4822 Will Johnson, Huffman, Ark.
3574 William Johnson, Keiser, Ark.
1250 Barfield (Garfield) Jones, Hanville, Ala.
4851 Charles Fred Jones, Blytheville, Ark.
3644 Earl (Earle) Jones, Pecan Point, Ark.
69 Ed Jones, Osceola, Ark.
3097 Eddie Jones, Wilson, Ark.
4559 Elijah Jones, Rosa, Ark.
3792 Floy (Floyd) Jones, Keiser, Ark.
3997 Henry Jones, Golden Lake, Ark.
3166 Jessie (Jesse) Jones, Wilson, Ark.
4166 John Jones, Burdette, Ark.
1525 Phillips (Phillip, Phillipps) Jones, Driver, Ark.
2261 Richard Jones, Blytheville, Ark.
1654 Sam Jones, Dell, Ark.
4177 Will Jones, Luxora, Ark.
129 Willie Jones, Hickman, Ark.
2529 Will Jordan (Jordon), Wilson, Ark.
4014 Scott Joshua (Johnson), R. F. D. 1, Osceola, Ark.
4909 Henderson Keats (Keets), Evadale, Ark.
3712 Jesse Key, Burdette, Ark. (Oxford, Miss.).
796 Thomas King, Butler, Ark.
1092 Oscar A. Kruse (Oscar Arsey Kruse) Leachville, Ark.
1109 Manford Ladd, Manila, Ark.
2185 Jack Cantrif Lantrif, Wilson, Ark.
4387 Earnest (Ernest) Lawson, Frenchmans Bayou, Ark.
2872 George Lee, Wilson, Ark.
4802 R. L. Lemicx (Denice Lemicx), Osceola, Ark.
2519 James C. Leverette (Jas. Clifford Levereth, James C. Levereth), Blytheville, Ark.
1237 Willis (Willie) Lewis, Armorel, Ark.
4795 John Lingo, Driver, Ark.
2497 Will Little, Huffman, Ark.
166 George Lockett (Locket), Blytheville, Ark.
4706 Nathaniel Logan, Evadale, Ark.
3507 Frank J. Longstreet (Frank Jones Longstreet), Luxora, Ark.
2345 Crockett C. Loolas (Crockett Loolass, Crockett C. Lovelace), Blytheville, Ark.
1628 Balduy Looney (Baldwyn Looney), Evadale, Ark.
4910 Charles Lowe, Joiner, Ark.
3257 Ossie (Osia, Ossia) Lux, Pecan Point, Ark.
703 Tom Lyle, Wright, Miss.
3768 Charles Edward Lynch, Luxora, Ark.
483 Virgie Lyons, Blytheville, Ark.
310 Nathan McAfee, Burdette, Ark.
750 John McCoy, Huffman, Ark.
3510 Robert E. McCrany (Robert Buckley McCraney), Blytheville, Ark.
1888 Carl McCullum, Burdette, Ark.
4516 William McDonald, Armorel, Ark.
2241 Hulson (Huelon) McField, Jackson, Miss.
217 Frank McKinney, Barfield, Ark.
3718 Dunk McKinnis, Nodena, Ark.
991 Sam McKissack (Samuel McKissack), Joiner, Ark.
1990 Albert McNeal, Joiner, Ark.
1639 Thomas O. Majors, Armorel, Ark.
4666 George Malone, Dell, Ark.
2459 Acy Manning (Maning), Butler, Ark.
4001 Mose Marrow (Mosie Morrow, Mose Morrow), Helena, Ark. (11 Natchez Street).
3478 Thomas A. Martin, Tyler, Mo.
2004 Will Martin, Wilson, Ark.
33 John Mathews, McFerren, Ark.
3940 Harry Houston Matthews (Huston Harry Matthews, Houston Henry Matthews), Pecan Point, Ark.
4990 James J. Mayberry (Manberry), Nodena, Ark.
2587 Robin Meador, Dell, Ark.
1355 George Miller, Wilson, Ark.
143 John Miller, Wilson, Ark.
3706 Tom Miller, Burdette, Ark.
3577 Doll Mitchell, Huffman, Ark.
1356 Parrie Montgomery, Barfield, Ark. (Lexington, Miss.).
1231 Will Montgomery, Wilson, Ark.
517 Jessie (Jesse) Moody, Huffman, Ark.
4220 Alex (Alec) Moore, Lepanto, Ark.
266 Clarence Moore, East Second Street, Blytheville, Ark.
2390 Ed Moore, Joiner, Ark.
1291 Johnnie Moore, Osceola, Ark.
2876 Will Moore, Burdette, Ark.
1261 Willie Moore, Wilson, Ark.
3764 Henry Morton, Topeka, Kans. (Barfield, Ark.).
4358 Joe Moseley (Mosely), Carson, Ark.
3615 Ed Mosely (Mosley), Osceola, Ark.
2708 Jerry Moseley (Mosley), Burdette, Ark.
3014 Robert Mosley (Robert Ferguson Mosley), Blytheville, Ark.
514 Walter Miller, Armorel, Ark.
4016 Edd Moran, Osceola, Ark.
4214 Ed Morgan, Wardell, Ark.
4426 Earnest (Ernest) Muet (Ernest Muel), Blytheville, Ark.
3304 Lige Murphy, Armorel, Ark.
976 Robert Murphy (Murphey), Wilson, Ark.
4322 Walter Lee Myer (Myers), Blytheville, Ark.
975 Will Myers, Blytheville, Ark.
103 Walter Myrick (Myricks), Osceola, Ark.
2854 Walter Nelson, Osceola, Ark.
2858 B. H. Newton (Ben Harrison Newton), Armorel, Ark.
4347 Sam Nichols (Nickols), Luxora, Ark.
3282 Napoleon Norman (Normon), Luxora, Ark.
4496 John Northern, Huffman, Ark.
2035 Jack B. O'Conner (Jack Burton O'Connor), Osceola, Ark.
1631 Percy Otterman (Otterson), Osceola, Ark.

2169 Bob Owens (Owen), Osceola, Ark.
2907 Frank Owens, Yarbro, Ark.
3860 Harrison Pagnett, Natchez, Miss. (Pagnette, Barfield, Ark.).
1347 John Parks, Blytheville, Ark.
2673 Jim Parnell, James (Joiner), Ark.
4797 James Payne (Paine, Paire), Butler, Ark.
1288 Walter Payne, Blytheville, Ark.
1386 Luther Pearson (Pearsons), Luxora, Ark.
1323 John Peoples, Whitton, Ark.
1466 Will Perkins, Frenchman Bayou, Ark.
582–583 Frank Pero, Blytheville, Ark. (Shaw, Miss.).
2467 Joe (Jim) Pervis, Osceola, Ark.
3107 Ashberry (Asbury, Ashberty) Petty, Wilson, Ark.
4478 Floyd Phipps, Joiner, Ark.
1301 Jesse Pickman (Pitman), Osceola, Ark.
2125 Jesse D. Pittman (Jessie D. Pitman), 206 College, Blytheville, Ark.
2178 Hill Pitts, Keiser, Ark.
3651 Simon Plunkett (Plunket), Luxora, Ark.
4891 Will Porter, Archillion, Ark.
4834 Ernest Posey, Roseland, Ark. (Rosedale, Miss.).
168 Jesse Powell, Dell, Ark.
3592 Willie Powell, Carson, Ark.
2669 Jim Pratt (Platt), Archillion, Ark.
5030 Herbert (Hurbert, Hubert) Price, Keiser, Ark.
3861 Jim Purse, Bolzill, Ala. (Barfield, Ark.).
712 Eldridge (Eldridge) Ray, R. F. D. 1, Osceola, Ark.
1601 Burney Reed, Osceola, Ark.
4197 Walter H. Reed (Reid), Blytheville, Ark.
263 Ernest (Earnest) Richards, Osceola, Ark. (3532 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.).
1839 Elsie Richardson, Wilson, Ark.
2682 Thad Richardson, Osceola, Ark.
4508 Harvey (Harvy) Richmond, Pecan Point, Ark.
4123 Thomas Robertson, Wilson, Ark.
1740 Alfred Robinson, Huffman, Ark.
3767 Arthur Robinson, Wardell, Ark.
2797 Willie (Will) Rogers, Wilson, Ark.
2857 James H. Rosa (James Henry Ross), 1219 South Second, Hamilton, Ohio.
4855 Samuel H. Rowe (Samuel Henry Rowe), Roseland, Ark.
3761 Wesley Royster, Osceola, Ark.
631 Henry Sanders, Joiner, Ark.
1070 Mose Sanders, Wilson, Ark.
766 Raymond Scales, Blytheville, Ark.
1417 Sam Scales, Wilson, Ark.
4553 John Scott, Wilson, Ark.
3665 Willis (Willie) Scott, Blytheville, Ark.
6 Elmer Sharp, Cottonwood, Mo. (Tyler, Mo.).
940 Dave Shaw, Videlia, La.
4444 Gus (G.) Shumpert, Joiner, Ark.
1443 John Simpson, R. F. D. 1, Osceola, Ark.
4769 Robert Simpson, Carson, Ark.
105 Alf Smith, McFerren, Ark. (McFeris, Ark.).
950 Charles (Charlie) Smith, Wardell, Ark.
4068 Claude C. Smith (Claude Cecil Smith, Claude Circle Smith), Manila, Ark.
4059 Edward Smith, Carson, Ark.
4256 Ernest (Earnest) Smith, Butler, Ark.
3062 Ernest Smith, Butler (Evadale), Ark.
2245 Harve E. Smith (Harve Elijah Smith), Manila, Ark.
1945, 1947 James Smith, Joiner, Ark.
3723 James (Jim) Smith, Burdette, Ark.
4912 John Smith, McFerrin, Ark.
4088 John H. Smith (John Henry Smith), Driver, Ark.
1819 or 1817 Sam Smith, Wilson, Ark.
3560 Will Smith, Hudson, Ala.
2967 William Spann, Keiser, Ark.
4353 Henry Spencer, Osceola, Ark.
2292 David C. Stephens (David Crocket Stevens), Marie, Ark.
3710 George Stevens, Armorel, Ark.
3600 Earl Stewart (Steward), Wilson, Ark.
4873 Fred M. Stewart, Blytheville, Ark.
4687 Wilson (William) Stiff, Dell, Ark.
420 James Stinson, Wilson, Ark.
4723 John Stokes, R. F. D. 1, Osceola, Ark.
3858 Tom Strickland, Blytheville, Ark.
706 Alonzo (Lonza) Strong, Blytheville, Ark.
314 John Sullivan, Butler, Ark.
347 Charlie (Charles) Taylor, Osceola, Ark.
1059 Colombus Taylor, Osceola, Ark.
880 Dudley Taylor (Duley Taylor), Joiner, Ark.
1717 George Taylor, Marie, Ark.
224 Henry Taylor, Dell, Ark.
3730 James Taylor (James Tayor), Marie, Ark.
1801 Junis (Junius) Taylor, Evadale, Ark.
3634 Otis Taylor, Wilson, Ark.
4464 Dan Thomas, Rosa, Ark.
1878 Jake Thomas, Nodena, Ark.
1484, 1485 John Thomas, Blytheville, Ark.
3380 John (James) Thomas, Wilson, Ark.
4821 Judge Thomas, Wilson, Ark.
3094 Henry Thompson, Huffman, Ark.
18 Jesse (Jessie) Thompson, Armorel, Ark.
3352 Jim Thompson, Memphis, Tenn. (Barfield, Ark.).
2381 Robert Thompson, Marie, Ark.
2814 John D. Todd, Archillion, Ark.
4091 Will Truman (Trurman), Blytheville, Ark.
13 Oscar Turner, Blytheville, Ark. (R. 2, Summit Co., Barberton, Ohio).
4567 Elijah Tyler, Natchez, Miss. (Barfield, Ark.).
3927 Arthur James Underwood (Arthur J. Underwood), Marie, Ark.
4186 Thomas Varerble (Venerble), Manila, Ark.
3030 John Wade, Osceola, Ark.
1716 Walter Wade, Carson, Ark.
4807 John Louis (Lewis) Walker, Blytheville, Ark.
4546 Leon Walker, Blytheville, Ark.
197 Walter Ward (W. L. Ward), Caruthersville, Ark.
519 Charles Warren, Nodena, Ark.
3063 Clarence Warren, Joiner, Ark.
1733 Lee Warren, Rosa, Ark.
1148 Albert Washington, Memphis, Tenn.
3688 Bob Washington, Barfield, Ark.
2933 George Washington, Blytheville, Ark.
2557 Emmett (Emmet) Washington, Huffman, Ark.
2338 James Washington, Hoffman, Ark.
4164 Walter Watkins, Armorel, Ark.
309 Louis E. Waters, Blytheville, Ark.
329 William Watson, Butler, Miss. (Butler, Ark.).
3822 Joe Weakley (Weakly), Hoffman, Ark.
1192 Ed Westherspoon, Vincer, Ark. (Weatherspoon, Vincent).
1721 Ernest Webb, Evadale, Ark.
2056 J. B. Wells, Blytheville, Ark.
3745 Curley Westbrook (Curly Westerbrook), Driver, Ark.
3729 George Wesley (Westley), R. F. D. 1, Osceola, Ark.
3116 Anthony White, Blytheville, Ark.
4126 James White, Basselt, Ark.
2532 Sam Widner, Modena, Ark. (Winder, Nodena, Ark.).
3972 George Wilkerson (George Wilkinson), Frenchmans Bayou, Ark.
163 Dave Wilkens, Nodena, Ark.
2966 Anthony Williams, Wilson, Ark.
3779 Arthur Williams, Dell, Ark.
49 Bob Williams, Evadale, Ark.
994 Charlie Williams, Satartio, Miss.
2911 Charles (Charley) Williams, St. Thomas, Ark.
3383 Charles (Charley) Williams, Wilson, Ark.
1841 Clarence Williams, Blytheville, Ark.
1513 David Williams, Wilson, Ark.
312 Ed. Williams (E. D. Williams), Blytheville, Ark.
2846 Ed. (Edi) Williams, Osceola, R. R. 1, Ark.
2357 Erwin (Irwin, Irvin) Williams, Joiner, Ark.
3227 Fred Willis, Blytheville, Ark.
80 Gaston Williams, Wilson, Ark.
3770 Henry Williams, Osceola, Ark.
2690 Howard Williams, Wilson, Ark.
3664 James (Jim) Williams, Osceola, Ark.
2221 J. E. Williams (J. A. Williams, James E. Williams), Barfield, Ark.
4232 John Williams, Wilson, Ark.
3189 Mose Williams, Huffman, Ark.
682 Will Williams, Carson, Ark.
2547 William Williams, Wilson, Ark.
4100 Phil Willis, Marie, Ark.
1961 Abe Wilson, Whitton, Ark.
1996 George Wilson, Dell, Ark.
3826 Inez Wilson, R. F. D. 2, Osceola, Ark.
2457 Mat (Matt, Mott) Wilson, Osceola, Ark.
1086 Willie Wilson, Barfield, Ark.
4144 John Womble (Wamble), Pecan Point, Ark.
4593 Zealous Woods, Joiner, Ark.
2959 James Woodson, Nodena, Ark.
74 Charles Wright, Blytheville, Ark.
4975 Jessie (Jesse) Wright, Blytheville, Ark.
4689 Joe Wright, R. F. D. 1, Osceola, Ark.
3731 Luther Wright, Blytheville, Ark.
2841 Ashley Young, Burdette, Ark.
2291 Henry Young, Barfield, Ark.
3276 Isador (Isadore) Young, Luxora, Ark.
1145 Pank Young, Burdette, Ark.
4 Richard (Rich) Young, Nodena, Ark.
4566 Taylor Young, Osceola, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PHILLIPS, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

789 Luther Adams, Old Town, Ark.
2840 Ike Adkins, Refuge Cotton Oil Co., Greenville, Miss. (Franklin, Helena, Ark.).
2061 Jeff Alexander, Elaine, Ark.
1205 Henry L. (Lee) Allen, 213 South Fourth, West Helena, Ark.
503 John Allen, Jonestown, Miss. (Millwood, Ark.).
2048 Albert Anderson, Buchanan's Quarters, West Helena, Ark.
1918 Hinds Anderson, Elaine, Ark.
4533 Mitchell Anderson, R. F. No. 1, Marvell, Ark.
2108 Robert Anderson, Lake View, Ark.
2820 Silas Anderson, F. Moore Place, Helena, Ark.
644 Tom Anderson, Smithville, Tex. (Lundell, Ark.).
485 Sterling (Starling) Arch, West Perry, Helena, Ark.
263 Mack Ashford, route No. 1, box 155, West Helena, Ark.
515 Earnest Askew (Eskew), Lundell, Ark.
220 Mose Badie, Helena, Ark.
589 Richard Bailey, Polk Place, Helena, Ark.
155 William Balnor, Elaine, Ark.
359 Jordan (Gordan) Baker, Holly Street, Helena, Ark.
2438 Percy Banks, Bailey Quarters, Helena, Ark.
1002 Sam Barley, Modoc, Ark.
992 Alex Bastine (Bastin, Memphis, Tenn.), 1101 College, Helena, Ark.
3987 Fred Bayless (Boylus), Helena, Ark.
3139 Sam Beasley, Stringtown, Helena, Ark.
1446 John Bell, John Bell Place (Helena?), Ark.
3988 Paul Bell, Marvell, Ark.
2986 Newton Berry, route No. 1, box 154, West Helena, Ark.
4502 Henry Betts, Marvell, Ark.
3748 John Biner, West Helena, Ark.
391 L. B. Bird (S. B. Bird), Wabash, Ark.
4641 Will Blackwell, Elaine, Ark.
1815 Ben Bliss, Lake View, Ark.
2635 John Blolock, 310 Arkansaw, Helena, Ark.
4307 Amos Body, Wabash, Ark.
814 Lloyd L. Bogan (Lawson J. Bogan), Balls Quarters, Helena, Ark.
1265 Richard Boins, Mobile, Helena, Ark.
3000 Will Boman, Plummerville, Ark.
4774 Steve Booker, 220 McDonough, Helena, Ark.
2109 Orange Booney, Caruthville, Mo.
2540 Will Brayier (Brazier), Seventh, Helena, Ark.
4795 Henry Brewer, 223 Elm, Helena, Ark.
56 Frank T. (Thomas) Brogan, Helena, Ark. (Monroe, La.).
1603 Charley Brookins, Mellwood, Ark.
747 Jimmie Brooks, Helena, Ark.
4662 Bud Brown, Ratio, Ark. (Lake Providence, La.).
1683 George Brown, West Helena, Ark.
155 Oscar Brown, Helena, Ark.
3825 Robert Brown, Mellwood, Ark.
1693 Jesse Burnside, 137 Hernando, West Helena, Ark. (Pillow Station, Ark.).

1508 Harrison Burris (Burrell, care of Lundell Lumber Co., Lundel, Ark.), Burrel, Rodney, Miss.
2923 Lee Bush (Bush 116), 1116 Perry, Helena, Ark.
2293 Willie Butler, Sam, West Helena, Ark.
2283 Ermon (Earmon) Bryant, West Helena, Ark.
2339 Will Campbell, 404 Walker, Helena, Ark.
2123 Willie Campbell, Hudsonville, Miss.
960 Joe Cannon, Helena, Ark.
541 Elbert Carr, West Helena, Ark.
2235 Jess (Jesse, Jessie) Carr, Barton, Ark.
4212 Houston Carr, York Street, Helena, Ark.
3336 Joe Carr, Southland Ark.
1749 Oscar Carr, Finks Alley, Helena, Ark.
2093 Robert Carter, Elaine, Ark.
4373 Henry Chandler, Mellwood, Ark.
1561 Claiborne (Claborne) Clarn, DuPark, La. (J. M. Countiss, Ratio, Ark.).
104 John F. Clark (John Fleming Clark), R. F. D., Poplar Grove, Ark.
1666 Peter Clark, S. St. Francis, Helena, Ark.
82 Percy Cochran, 414 York, Helena, Ark.
1728 Will Cole, Wabash, Ark.
3017 Alonzo (Alozo) Coleman, Elaine, Ark.
270a Oliver Coleman, 214 Beech, Helena, Ark.
801 Charlie Collins, Marvell, Ark.
4794 George Collins, Mellwood, Ark.
3318 Andrew Conningan, Wabash, Ark.
9 Charley Cook, Helena, Ark.
3693 Nick Crawford, Elaine, Ark.
2022 Glover (Grover) Crosby, Elaine, Ark.
1967 John Cummins (Cummings), Darling, Miss. (Mellwood, Ark.).
4107 Henry Curren (Curran, Kern), Helena, Ark.
133 John Currie, Countiss, Ark.
4726 Bob Curry, Helena, Ark.
1497 Edgar Curry, Pillow Place, Helena, Ark.
4440 Will Curtis, 220 McDonough, Helena, Ark.
3675 Alford Danford, 511 York, Helena, Ark.
1194 Read Daniels, Pontoloc, Helena, Ark.
4580 Sid Daniels (Daniel), Ropelight Quarters, Helena, Ark.
1067 Isaiah (Isiah) Darson (Daram), Marvell, Ark.
1298 Isaac Devenport, Straubs Lane, Helena, Ark.
3086 Charlie Davis, FitzHugh & Rabb Place, Helena, Ark.
4698 George Davis, Marvell, Ark.
366 Hense Davis, 8 Sam, W. Helena, Ark.
17 James F. Davis, Marvell, Ark.
4283 Johnnie Davis, Mortimerville, Ark.
795 Ora Davis, Jefferson, Tex. (Mellwood, Ark.).
888 Oscar Davis, Helena, Ark.
3004 Robert Davis, 120 W. Pecan, W. Helena, Ark.
2521 Sam Davis, R. F. D. 1, care of W. & B., Marvell, Ark.
773 Charley Dawson, Delhi, La. (Ratio, Ark.).
4481 Joe Delaureal (Delaurel), Lexa, Ark.
235 Willie Dickson, County Jail, Helena, Ark.
2879 George E. Dillon (Dillion), J. B. Pillow Place, Helena, Ark.
2211 Hezekiah Dixon (Dison), Clarksdale, Miss.
1814 Robert Dodd, Straub Lane, Helena, Ark.
2172 Fred E. Donald (Fred Ernest Donald), 234 S. 6th, W. Helena, Ark.
1479 Dozy Donahue (Dorsey Donahue, Dorsey Donohue), St. Francis Twp., Helena, Ark.
3238 Robert Dortch, Box 295, Helena, Ark.
3289 Tom Dorthis, R. F. D. 3, Marvell, Ark.
3735 Louis Dumis (Lewis Dennis, Louis Denis), Wabash, Ark.
170 Alex Dunbar, 420 Elm, Helena, Ark. (Ferguson, Ark.).
2553 Arthur Duncan, Cottonwood Falls, Kan. (Ratio, Ark.).
158 George Duncan, Popular Grove, Ark., Route 2.
4174 Willie (Willis) Dunn, Marvell, Ark.
1678 Ed Dunson (Denson), Elaine, Ark.
1747 Allen Edwards, P. O. Bx. 194, Helena, Ark.
3485 James Edwards, La Grange, Ark.
1115 John (Johnnie) Edwards, Oneida, Ark.
1015 John Edwards, Turner, Ark.
3809 Lloyd (Loyd) Edwards, Wabash, Ark.
1715 Willie Edwards, 111 Nachez, Helena, Ark.
1615 Arthur Ellis, Hanks, Helena, Ark.
3258 Albert Ervin, Garvin, W. Helena, Ark.
1016 Charlie Evans (Enos, Euas), R. F. D. 1, box 96, Marvell, Ark.
3441 William R. (Ruffices) Evans, 333 South Fifth, West Helena, Ark.
351 Connell (Councel) Everett, West Helena, Ark.
3523 David Fisher, R. 1, Box 136, West Helena, Ark.
293 Arthur Franklin, 202½ St. Francis, Helena, Ark.
3623 Willie Franklin, County Jail, Helena, Ark.
1857 George Furge (Furdge), Elaine, Ark.
903 Joe Gardner, West Helena, Ark.
3527 Solomon Gardner (Garner), Yazoo, Helena, Ark.
3116 Lindsey Garner, 124 Pecan, Helena, Ark.
832 Green Gates, Postelle, Ark.
3476 Overton Geter, Helena, Ark.
4421 Wesley Gillyard, 420 Missouri, Helena, Ark.
553 John Givens, West Helena, Ark.
3269 George Glasper, Pecan, Helena, Ark.
2102 Erman Godley, Elaine, Ark.
2130 Jessie Goins (Jesse Gaines, Goins), Solomon Quarters, Helena, Ark.
3117 Sam Goodman, Elaine, Ark.
39 William Grace, R. 1, box 121, Helena, Ark.
1023 Charlie Gracie, Mellwood, Ark.
1927 Gentle N. Graham (Gentle Newton Graham), 419 East Beech, Helena, Ark.
1210 Herman (Arman) Granberry, Turner, Ark.
1165 Dave Grant, Stewart Wornikin Place, Southland, Ark.
3923 Lucius Green, Elaine, Ark.
378 Richard Green, Elaine, Ark.
214 Sylvester Green, 420 Elm, Helena, Ark.
1538 William Green, Helena, Ark.
2167 Dave Greer, Helena, Ark.
4124 Randall (Randal) Greegs, Lexa, Ark.
3018 Archie (Archy) Griffin, Pepatite Quarters, Helena, Ark.
193a John H. Griffin, Marvell, Ark.
562 Lemon Griffin, Shelby, Miss., or Lundell, Ark.
4682 Leon (Leona) Griffin, Lexa, Ark.
331 Will Griffin, 1019 Walnut Street, Helena, Ark.
1387 Anderson Grons, Lexa, Ark.
4086 Tirey Gusby, Elaine, Ark.
2755 Stark Hair, Wabash, Ark.
4768 John Haley, Midland Heights, Helena, Ark.
3682 George Hall, Lation, Ark.
672 Paul Halliburton (Haliburton), Helena, Ark.
1149 Arthur Hardy, Ratio, Ark.
2933 Lex Harrell, Helena, Ark.
2228 Bennie Harris, Marvell, Ark.
12 Effie Harris, West Helena, Ark.
3075 Ike Harris, Arkansas, Helena, Ark., % E. E. Scarborough, Shelby, Miss.
3228 Jesse Harris, 1105 Poplar, Helena, Ark.
4149 Mat Harris, Postelle, Ark.
630 Will Harris, Barton, Ark.
1422 Willie Harris, Helena, Ark.
4420 Willie L. (B.) Harris, 206 St. Francis, Helena, Ark.
937 Wilson Harris, R. 1, box 7, Helena, Ark.
4170 Arthur Harrison, Lundell, Ark.
4111 Frank Haynes, R. No. 1, box 6, West Helena, Ark.
3739 Henry Hays, Helena, Ark.
643 Ozey Heard (Hurd), 111 Hanleys Alley, Helena, Ark.
4233 Willie Henderson, Phillips, Helena, Ark.
4411 Jim Henry, Casaisko, Miss. (Lundell, Ark.).
3550 John Hibbler, Gen. Del., Helena, Ark.
2456 James Hickey, Lexa, Ark.
3606 Jimmie Hicks, 501 Arkansas, Helena, Ark.
4508 Ben Hill, 15 York, Helena, Ark.
3695 John Hill, R. 1, box 152, Helena, Ark.
999 Pete Hill, Barton, Ark.
2793 Joe Hogan, Sommers Alley, Helena, Ark.
1780 Claude E. Holland, 216 Biscoe, Helena, Ark. (Dancy, Miss.).
176 Arthur Hollis (Hollins), West Helena, Ark.
2828 Ed Holmes, Trenton, Ark.
60 Jerry Homer, Box No. 27, R. F. D., Helena, Ark.
585 Ira (Jno.) Hopkins, West Helena, Ark.
1851 Julius Hopkins, Old Town, Ark.
1826 Smith Howard, Elaine, Ark.
1130 Lee Huey or Lee Hewey, Lake View, Ark.
4725 John Humphries, Preston Pl., Helena, Ark., or Helena, Huntsville, Ala.
1431 Johnnie M. Hughes (Johnie Hughes), DuBoch, La. (Raito, Ark.).
3509 Lee Hughey, Sam, West Helena, Ark.
329 Essie Hunter, Elaine, Ark.
3709 Otho (Othor) Hunter, West Helena, Ark.
4006 Latham (Latham) Hutchinson, 318 Pecan, Helena, Ark.
3697 Henry Hyman, Helena, Ark.
4474 Pink Ivon, Trenton, Ark.
4530 Ben Jackson, near Helena, Ark.
4718 Earl (Eone) Jackson, Catholic Hollow, Helena, Ark.
2183 George Jackson, Lexa, Ark.
494 King S. Jackson (King Solomon Jackson), 609 Franklin, Helena, Ark.
1746 Robert Jackson, 132 Pecan, Helena, Ark.
1253 Solomon Jackson, Henando, West Helena, Ark.
4582 Walter Jackson, Helena, Ark.
4386 Will Jackson, West Helena, Ark.
2186 Willie Jackson, Postelle, Ark.
1053 Scotland (Scottland) Jarrett, 220 Pecan, Helena, Ark.
3833 Jollie Jefferson, Wabash, Ark.
4747 Leroy Jenkins, Clemmons Hill, Helena, Ark.
2090 Edward Jobe, Mellwood, Ark.
1672 Allen Johnson, Trenton, Ark.
4754 Briscoe (Brisco) Johnson, Oneida, Ark.
4586 Henry Johnson, Helena, Ark.
1094 Jack Johnson, Water Street, Helena, Ark.
1759 Joe Johnson, 522 Pecan, Helena, Ark.
2600 Lawrence Johnson, Clarendon, Ark. (West Helena, Ark.).
304 Lawson Johnson, Elaine, Ark.
2901 Simon Johnson, Elaine, Ark.
1199 Will Johnson, 42 Elm, Helena, Ark.
2122 Will Johnson, Trenton, Ark.
1668 Willey (Wiley) Johnson, Mellwood, Ark.
2157 Calhoun Jones, Eline Ark.
554 Chas. (Charles) Jones, Macon, Ga.
616 Harrison Jones, Straubs Lane, Helena, Ark.
2484 Harry Jones, Elaine, Ark.
3471 John Jones, Lexa, Ark.
2861 M. Jones (Manual Jones), 134 Hernando, Helena, Ark.
3107 Robert Jones, jr., Greenwood, Miss. (Ratio, Ark.).
2963 Will Jones, 221 Beal, Natchez, Miss.
700 Will Jones, Helena, Ark.
761 Willie Jones, West Helena, Ark.
2815 Willie Jones, Helena, Ark.
4439 Eurgentine M. Jordan (Ergentine M. Jorden, J. Eurgentine M. Jorden), 164 Walnut, Helena, Ark.
1550 George C. King, Wessenborg Quarters, Helena, Ark.
1263 Chas. E. Kirkpatrick, Cherry, Helena, Ark.
1835 Norman Kirkwood, Cypert, Ark.
899 Thomas Lathan, Ratio, Ark.
3649 Judge Lee, Marvell, Ark.
1085 Ollie (Allie) Lee, Clayton, Miss. (Ratio, Ark.) (Theo. Fathmer & Co.).
2709 Sam Lee, Wellwood, Ark.
4021 Will Lee, Elaine, Ark.
3532 Willie Lee, 112 St. Francis, Helena, Ark.
1642 Efford (Efferd) Lester, 117 Hernando, West Helena, Ark.
2991 Arthur Lewis, Moores Place, near Helena, Ark.
2411 Charley Lewis, Rondo, Ark.
1743 James Lewis, Trenton, Ark.
1426 Thomas (Thomis) Lewis, 60 Elm, Helena, Ark. (78 Ponotoc Street, Helena, Ark.).
1124 Will H. Lewis (Lorne), Mellwood, Ark.
4116 Silas Light, Elaine, Ark.
232 Dan Lindsey (Lindsay), W. Helena, Ark.
339 Henry Little, Hernando, W. Helena, Ark.
4268 Elijah P. Littlefield (Elijah Parker Littlefield, Elija P. Litfield), 120 Poplar, Helena, Ark.
393 Chas. Loins (Charles Loin), 113 Chicksaw, Helena, Ark.
1153 Oscar Lott, R. 1, Box 116, W. Helena, Ark.
2432 Ben Lovelace (Loveless), 131 Elm, Helena, Ark.
65 James McCarrell (McCarral), Ohio Est., Helena, Ark.
3593 Arthur McCoy, Southland, Ark., % Tarkington & Swimmey, Cotton Plant, Ark.

938 Charley (Charlie) McCray, Oneida, Ark.
932 Ben McCullough (McCuller, Edenwold, Tenn.), Memphis, Tenn.
2749 James McDonald, Elaine, Ark.
4337 Claude McFarlans (McFarland), Straubs Lane, Helena, Ark.
2324 Will McFarlane (McFarland), 515 Belmer, Helena, Ark.
4758 Bolie McGruder, Wilmer, Ark. (Mellwood, Ark.).
4142 John McKaine (McKain), Mellwood, Ark.
1705 Oliver McKinney, Modoc, Ark.
2453 Willie Maberly, Marvell, Ark.
950 Norise (Noric) Man, West Helena, Ark.
2161 Charles (Chall) Marshall, 258 Pontiac, Helena, Ark.
2649 Henry Martin, Wabash, Ark.
1074 Scott Martin, Helena, Ark.
2433 Willie Mathews, Mellwood, Ark.
3313 Frank Mayham, Straub Lane, Helena, Ark.
1035 John Miles, 208 Walnut, Helena, Ark.
2799 Will Miles, Helena, Ark.
4370 Danlow (Douglas) Mills, Oneida, Ark.
2004 Willie Milton, 313 Mobile, Helena, Ark.
4619 Solomon Minoe (Menor, Minor), Old Town, Ark.
4074 F. Mitchell (Zebedie Mitchell), S. Pontiac, Helena, Ark.
1128 Jesse Mitchell, P. O. Helena, Ark.
2110 Jim Mitchell, Wabash, Ark.
919 Oscar Mitchell, Rutherford, Ala. (Rodgers Bros., Mellwood, Ark.).
1075 Tom Mooney, Oneida, Ark.
2064 Douglas (Douglass) Moore, Adams, Helena, Ark.
3917 Elbert Moore, Wabash, Ark.
2214 Henry Moore, Wabash, Ark.
4239 Peter Moore, W. Helena, Ark.
4091 Will Moore, Missouri, Helena, Ark.
1737 Will Moore, Wabash, Ark.
486 Ely (Eli) Morrison, Oak Ridge, La.
3821 Tom Moseby, Mellwood, Ark.
4541 Harrison Murphy, Oneida, Ark.
2638 Charley (Charlie) Murray, Elaine, Ark.
1939 Frank Myrick, Oneida, Ark.
1492 Dallas Nicholson, Trenton, Ark.
2684 James Nolan, Little Rock, Ark. (Ratio, Ark.).
4448 Lon Nunn, 517 Belmer, Helena, Ark.
3678 Toney (Tony) Oliver, Oneida, Ark.
4742 Willie Palmo, Mellwood, Ark.
3012 Henry Parker, Pecan, Helena, Ark.
1108 Joseph Parker, Elaine, Ark.
4590 William Parker, Helena, Ark.
260 William Parks, West Helena, Ark.
2647 Alexander Patterson, LaGrange, Ark.
4763 Dee Perkins, 130 Yazoo, Helena, Ark.
2473 Joseph Peterson, Marvell, Ark.
3757 Sonney (Sonny) Peterson, Poplar Grove, Ark.
3631 Rufus Petty, Lake View, Ark.
3333 Perry Phe, Helena, Ark.
880 George Phillips, 50 Simmons, Helena, Ark.
306 Hezekiah Phillips, Marvell, Ark.
880 M. B. Pigg (142 Third, W. Helen, Ark.; Monticello, Ark.). 142 Third, W. Hehelan, Ark.
2765 Henry Pinkston, Elaine, Ark.
1571 Fred Pollard, Marvell, Ark.
1 Leo Pollard, Poplar Grove, Ark.
1278 Chas. E. Porter, 1 Sam, W. Helena, Ark.
26 Ike Posey, 255 Phillips, Helena, Ark.
4152 Ed Powell, Wabash, Ark.
58 Henry Putman, W. Helena, Ark.
1837 Richard Puttman, Mellwood, Ark.
2173 Paul L. Ratcliffe (Paul Leslie Ratcliffe, Rotchiff), Cor. Walnut and Rightor, Helena, Ark.
1342 Dave Ray, E. Elaine, Ark.
1885 John Red, Clay Baker Place, Helena, Ark.
3505 John Reeves, Elaine, Ark.
1383 Johnnie (Johnie) Rhoades, So. Hotel, West Helena, Ark.
296 Golden Rice (G. Rice), LaGrange, Ark.
531 Robert Richard (Richards), Mellwood, Ark.
221a James Richardson, Helena, Ark.
315 Ed Roberson, W. Helena, Ark.
143 Robert Roberson, % Peter Deisch, Barton, Ark.
2262a Charlie Robertson, Mobile, Helena, Ark.
2308 Edward Robinson, Elaine, Ark.
1235 George Robinson, 115 Mobile, Helena, Ark.
2365 Isaac Robinson, Friars Point, Miss.
2174 John H. Robinson (John Henry Robinson), Solomon Moore Place, Helena, Ark.
265 Robert Robinson, Hanks Lane, Helena, Ark.
4557 John Rodgers, Lundell, Ark.
2023 Jack Rodgers (Jake Rogers), Boston, Ark.
1126 Joseph Rogers, Marvell, Ark.
3074 Wallace Rogers, general delivery, Helena, Ark.
3027 West Rogers (Rodgers), 119 Missouri, Helena, Ark.
371 Will Ross, Lexa, Ark.
3630 William Ross, North Helena, Ark.
4053 Jesse Rush, 1025 W. Ninth, Little Rock, Ark.
1215 Jonas (John) Sails, Wabash, Ark.
1043 Chas. Sanders, Poplar Grove, Ark.
3781 Frudon (Trudon) Sanders, Pontotoc, Helena, Ark.
2697 Jackson Sanders, Poplar Grove, Ark.
509 Munson (Newsome) Scott, Helena, Ark.
2382 Grant Shephard (Sheppard, Sherrard), 427 Mo., Helena, Ark.
1776 Robert Shepard, Oneida, Ark.
434 William C. Shephard (William Chas. Shepherd, N. Fourth, West Helena, Ark.; William C. Shepherd), Trenton, Tenn.
3906 Mat Shields, Postelle, Ark.
2079 Charles (Charlie) Shipp, Marvell, Ark.
914 A. D. Smith, 310 Arkansas, Helena, Ark.
4483 Archie Smith, 106 Biscoe, Helena, Ark.
958 B. Smith (Benoret Smith), 316 Arkansas, Helena, Ark.
1767 Edgar Smith (Ratio, Ark.), Cruger, Miss.
1144 Fonzey (Fonsey) Smith, Mellwood, Ark.
3339 George Smith, Memphis, Tenn., % G. E. Blackburn, Mellwood, Ark.
3203 Henry Smith, Lower Clopton Place, Helena, Ark.
604 Henry Smith (Henry N. Smith), W. Helena, Ark.
4031 Idsom (Idson) Smith, Old Town, Ark.
1486 James D. Smith, Lexa, Ark.
2419 Jesse Smith, 120 Yazoo, Helena, Ark.
3247 Jones (Jonas) Smith, 1105 Walker, Helena, Ark.
804 Nathan Smith, Elaine, Ark.
1964 Nelson Smith, 113 Mobile, Helena, Ark.
1827 Samuel Smith, 123 Pontiac, Helena, Ark.
3090 Tom Smith, Charleston, Miss.
565 Will Smith, Ferguson, Ark.
1033 Willie Smith, Elaine, Ark.
3373 Willie Spencer (Spinar), Ratio, Ark.
2082 Rufus Stenis (Steins), Postelle, Ark.
1360 Will Stephens, 817 Walnut, Helena, Ark.
1957 Charley Stevens (Stevenson), Wabash, Ark.
311 Frank Stevens (Starnes), Barton, Ark.
221 Willie Steveson, Helena, Ark.
1259 Lonnie Stoker (Louey Stokes), 28 Elm, Helena, Ark.
1760 Robert Stokes, 111 St. Francis, Helena, Ark.
4153 Roy Strong, 727 Franklin, Helena, Ark.
3887 Arthur Sullivan, 205 Pontiac, Helena, Ark.
835 John Sullivan, Biscoe, St. Helena, Ark.
853 Jeff Surgener, Clifton Place, Helena, Ark.
4444 Henry L. Sweeten, 825 Cherry, Helena, Ark. (Henry Law Sweeten, Warwick Hotel, St. Louis, Mo.).
3426 Jim Terry, Helena, Ark.
2871 Amos Thomas, Hernando, West Helena, Ark.
1246 Arthur Thomas, Elaine, Ark.
1357 Carl Thomas, Holly St., Helena, Ark.
2399 Dan Thomas, 316 Arkansas, Helena, Ark.
3414 Henry Thomas, Elaine, Ark.
4711 Hezekiah (Hezikiah, Hesikiah) Thomas, Elaine, Ark.
2903 Jerry Thomas, Trenton, Ark.
1529 John Thomas (John H. Thomas), West Helena, Ark.
1933 Sam Thomas, 113½ Yazoo, Helena, Ark.
3667 Jordan (Jordon) Thompson, 222 Simmons Alley, Helena, Ark.
1221 Robert Thompson, Walker Levee, Helena, Ark.
148 Sam Thompson (Sam), West Helena, Ark.
2455 Sherman Thompson, Holly Ridge, Miss. (Ratio, Ark.).
118 Frank Tillman, Lexa, Ark.
2938 Daniel Trenta (Treta), No. Cherry, Helena, Ark.
2633 Jesse Trimble, Wabash, Ark.
2912 George Tucker, S. Bisco, Helena, Ark.
1824 Zack (Zach) Tucker, 31 Ringo, West Helena, Ark.
4555 Ben Turner, Modoc, Ark.
3704 Leroy Tyler, Friars Point, Miss. (LeRoy Tylor, c/o G. S. Robinson, Westover, Ark.).
627 Jesse Vance, Pillow Addition, West Helena, Ark.
409 Will Vance, Pecan, Helena, Ark.
4559 Willis Vissel, Trenton, Ark.
135 Alfred Wakefield, Oneida, Ark.
92 Artemus (Artenius) Walker, R. 1, Bx. 142A, Helena, Ark.
249 Ed Walker, Marvell, Ark.
2098 James Walker, Marvell, Ark.
3141 Thomas Walker, 220 Walker, Helena, Ark.
188 Will Walker, Elaine, Ark.
873 John Wallace, 214 St. Francis, Helena, Ark.
206 Sam Wallace, Helena, Ark.
1521 Luke Walls, Cor. Phillips & Franklin, Helena, Ark.
2248 David Walton, Poplar Ext., Helena, Ark.
1006 Will Walton, Near Helena, Ark.
2556 Walter Ward, Southland, Ark.
1800 Bennie Washington, Lalour, Ark.
3097 Frank Washington, 142 Hammond, West Helena, Ark.
1400 James C. Washington (James Columbus Washington), Helena, Ark.
2892 Manuel Washington, 31 Hernando, West Helena, Ark.
2999 Paul Watkins, Helena, Ark.
292 Johnny (Johnie) Watson, Elaine, Ark.
1438 John Watts (Waits), Biscoe, Westover, Ark.
4764 Abraham Weathers, 418 Broad Alley, Helena, Ark.
1692 Ernest Webb, Natchez, Miss. (Brown Place, Ark.).
728 John Webb, Pine Bluff, Ark.
1233 Floyd (Cloyd, Lloyd) West, route 1, box 116, Lexa, Ark.
2945 Della Westor (Weston), Helena, Ark.
771 Alfred (Albert) Wheeler, Elaine, Ark.
482 Annias Whickins (Aninious Whickem, Ananias Whicken), Mellwood, Ark.
1949 Andrew White, Elaine, Ark.
2941 Bob White, route 1, box 153, West Helena, Ark.
3688 Grant White, Oneida, Ark.
3442 Hicks White, Elaine, Ark.
315a Osceola White, West Helena, Ark.
174 Shep White, route 1, box 146, West Helena, Ark.
156 Vowl White, Helena, Ark.
643a Walter White, Seventh, Helena, Ark.
4122 Will White, Helena Crossing, Helena, Ark.
4263 Willie G. Wiggins (Willie George Wiggins), Modoc, Ark.
4335 Jessie Wilford, 507 Ohio, Helena, Ark.
3366 Alexander Williams, Lexa, Ark.
1380 Bill Williams, State Levee, Miss. (Rogers Bros., Mellwood, Ark.).
3620 Charley Williams, Pon Pon, S. C.
2286 Cornelius Williams, 111 Hardy Alley, Helena, Ark.
2431 Dave Williams, Pillow Crossing, Ark.
1650 Earl Williams, 203 York, Helena, Ark.
3043 Edd O. Williams, Harberts Bend, Ark. (Ratio, Ark.).
1869 Eugene Williams, 310 St. Francis, Helena, Ark.
1435 Eugene Williams, Mellwood, Ark.
3961 Frank Williams, Wabash, Ark.
2217 Frank Williams, Pine Bluff, Ark.
38 Fred Williams, Helena, Ark.
1100 George Williams, 222 Simmons Alley, Helena, Ark.
3533 George Williams, Elaine, Ark.
2380 George Williams, R. F. D. 1, Lexa, Ark.
1212 George Williams, jr., Lexa, Ark.
3665 Harry Williams, Walker Levee, Helena, Ark.
287a Henry Williams, West Helena, Ark.
4115 Henry Williams, 420 Missouri, Helena, Ark.
767 Henry Williams, South of Westover Place, Helena, Ark. (Friars Point, Miss.).
3683 Isaac Williams, Galveston, Tex. (Lundell, Ark.).
2443 James Williams, Barton, Ark.
4523 James Williams, Elaine, Ark.
1370 James Williams, Mellwood, Ark.
766 Jim Williams, route 1, box No. 92, West Helena, Ark.
218a Marion Williams, Island 62, Modoc, Ark.
1045 Sam Williams, Carranza Street, West Helena, Ark.
2608 Tom Williams, Oneida, Ark.
780 Will Williams, Mellwood, Ark.

251 William Williams, James Pillow Place, Helena, Ark.
2503 William (Willie) Williams, Helena, Ark.
697 Floyd Willis, 4 Pontotoc, Helena, Ark.
303 Arthur Wilson (Wilsen), corner Cherry and McDonough, Helena, Ark.
2420 Charles (Charley) Wilson, Helena, Ark.
3360 Columbus Winfield, Elaine, Ark.
1640 Judge Wingard, Marvell, Ark.
283 Howard Wood, route 2, box 42, Poplar Grove, Ark.
298 Anthony Woods, 614 G. Broad Alley, Helena, Ark.
4724 Oscar Woods, Trenton, Ark.
879 Will Woods, Marvell, route 1, Marvell, Ark.
1103 Benson Wright, Pontiac, Helena, Ark.
2796 Chas. (Charlie) Wright, Elaine, Ark.
4623 Sullivan Wright, Marvell, Ark.
221 Jesse (Jessie) Wylie, Elaine, Ark.
1606 Blucher Yound (Young), Holden Ridge, near Helena, Ark.
228 Alfred Young, Helena, Ark.
438 Clarence S. Young, 706 Russell, West Helena, Ark.
2088 George Young, West Helena, Ark.
3763 James Young, route 1, box 58, West Helena, Ark.
1799 Willie Young, 114 Missouri, Helena, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF GADSDEN, STATE OF FLORIDA.

1542 Thomas J. Thomas, Quincy, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HAMILTON, STATE OF FLORIDA.

685 Robert Stewart (Robert Stewert), Jasper, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LAKE, STATE OF FLORIDA.

965 Eddie Lee (L.) Cunningham, Eustis, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LIBERTY, STATE OF FLORIDA.

67 Samuel E. (Samuel Eager, S. E.) Benson, Telogia, Fla.
398 Quincy Casey, Hasford, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, STATE OF FLORIDA.

568 Louis Walton (Lewis Walden) Conway, Yulee, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BIBB, STATE OF GEORGIA.

50a Joe McCallum, R. F. D. No. 1, Macon, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BROOKS, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1785 John Austin, Barney, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BULLOCH, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1881 Jordon Brisco (Jordan Briscoe), Statesboro, Ga.
1345 Mikell Gordon, Statesboro, Ga.
732 Tom Parrish, Statesboro, Ga. (26 Railroad Street, Statesboro, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BURKE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

2369 Bennie Smith, Waynesboro, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHARLTON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

67 Edward John Kennedy, St. George, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHATHAM, STATE OF GEORGIA.

313 Lather Baker, care Central of Georgia Railroad, Savannah, Ga. (Tybee, Ga.).
705 Martin Gaston, R. F. D. No. 2, Savannah, Ga.
377 Robert Lightburne (Robert Lightburn), Savannah, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF COBB, STATE OF GEORGIA.

2185 Claude Patman (Cloud, Claud Patmon), Smyrna, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF COFFEE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

695 Willie Green (Greene), Douglas, Ga.
1430 Charlie Williams, Douglas, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF COLQUITT, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1041 Butler H. Hudson (Button Harry Hudson, Butten H. Hudson), Doerun, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF COLUMBIA, STATE OF GEORGIA.

780 Robert (Robt.) Hawthorne, Evans, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CRISP, STATE OF GEORGIA.

798 John Henry Carthen, route B, Cordele, Ga. (route B, care Crisp Naval Stores, Cordele, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DOOLY, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1913 Sam Mathis, R. F. D. No. 4, Vienna, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ELBERT, STATE OF GEORGIA.

415 Joe Hunnicutt, R. F. D. No. 1, Bowman, Ga.
623 Will Johnson, R. F. D. No. 4, Elberton, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HALL, STATE OF GEORGIA.

216 Earl Simpson, R. F. D. No. 8, Gainesville, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HENRY, STATE OF GEORGIA.

69 Oscar Sims, route No. 1, McDonough, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF JASPER, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1185 Willie (Will) Walker, Monticello, Ga. (R. F. D. No. 6, Monticello, Ga.; R. 6, Juliette, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF JENKINS, STATE OF GEORGIA.

933 Benjamin Harrison (H., Benj. H.) Gadd, Millen, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF JONES, STATE OF GEORGIA.

184 Willie Goolsby, care Lovelace Lumber Co., Lovelace, Ga. (Bradley, Ga.).
1059 Willie (Cooter) Lester, (Willie Lester), Haddock, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LIBERTY, STATE OF GEORGIA.

573 Thomas Baggs, Ludowici, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LOWNDES, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1434 Johnnir Jinks (Johnny Jinks), Albany, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF M'DUFFIE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

901 Henry Hall, Thomson, Ga. (Thompson, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF MACON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1331 Harold B. Geiger (Harrold Bernard Gieger, Harrold Bernard Geiger), 558 Second Street, Macon, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MILTON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

834 Jesse James McCollum, route 1, Woodstock, Ga. (Woodstock, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MUSKOGEE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

2129 Ike Davis, route no. 1, box 14, Columbus, Ga.
3428 Wade M. (Mitchell) Featherstone, 3245 Third Avenue, Columbus, Ga.
3590 John Smith, R. F. D. 1, box 8, Columbus, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF NEWTON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1124 Charlie Foster, R. F. D., Covington, Ga. (Covington, Ga.).
839 Jim Smith, care Bob T. Ballard, Covington, Ga. (June Smith, Covington, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF OGLETHORPE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

745 Flipper Howard (Flipper Howan (Flipper Howon), Lexington, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF RANDOLPH, STATE OF GEORGIA.

421 Willie Sims, Springvale, Ga. (Springdale, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF SAVANNAH, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1179 Ben Frazier, boat, Cleveland Bay and Abecorn Street, Savannah, Ga.
987 Benjamin (Benj.) Gray, 537 East Hull Street, Savannah, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF SAVANNAH, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1901 George Davis, 317 West Wayne Street, Savannah, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TATNALL, STATE OF GEORGIA.

468 Neal L. (Neil L.) Morris, Mendes, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TELFAIR, STATE OF GEORGIA.

717 Willie Parks, Jacksonville, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TERRELL, STATE OF GEORGIA.

192 Charley (Charlie) Jackson, R. F. D., Bronwood, Ga.
1345 Hollis Lewis, R. F. D. No. 7, Dawson, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF THOMAS, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1306 Will Johnson, Pear Orchard, Thomasville, Ga.
1923 Willard (Williard) Ponder, Thomasville, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TURNER, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1212 George Grace Farmer, Ashburn, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIGGS, STATE OF GEORGIA.

198 Willie Hill, Dry Branch, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WARE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1587 J. B. Pelham, Hebardville, Ga.
1731 Clinton Sapp, Waycross, Ga. (74½ Reynolds Street, Waycross, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1079 Julian Berry, Sandersville, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WORTH, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1823 John Warrens (John Warren, Sylvester, Ga.), Route No. 1, care W. G. Brantly, Sylvester, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ALCORN, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

942 Willie Adams, Corinth, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF BOLIVAR, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

20 Henry Lawson Beeman (Swiftwater, Miss.), Rosedale, Miss.
579 Ed Jones, Dohomey, Miss.
693 James Williams, Lovdell, Miss.
925 William (Will) Henry Davis, Shelby, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF BOLIVAR, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

201 Johnnie (Johnny, Johny), Jones, Shaw, Miss.
274 Joseph Thompson, Merigold, Miss.
606 Willie Williams, Aligator, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHICKASAW, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

776 Glen (Glenn) Pulliam, Hoyston, Mississippi.
1114 Willie Magbee (Magby), (Egypt, Miss.), Buena Vista, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CLAY, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1019 Edward F. Murphey (E. F. Murphy), West Point, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DE SOTO, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1934 Zera Williams, Horn Lake, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HINDS, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1310 James (Jonnie, Johnnie) Martin, Terry, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HUMPHREYS, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1396 Walter Claiborn Thomastown, La. (Swiftwater, Miss.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ISAQUENA, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

297 Jonnie Robinson (Johnie Roberson), Magna Vista, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LAMAR, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

542 Jim Nixon, Lumberton, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF LAUDERDALE, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1388 Willie Brown, Drinkwater Quares, Meridian, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF LAUDERDALE, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1604 Robert Monroe Jackson, Twenty-third Street and Thirty-first Avenue, Meridian, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MARION, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

591 John I. Abram, Columbia, Miss.
899 Joe Sidney Craft, Foxworth, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD, COUNTY OF MARSHALL, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1792 Lucius Bowen, Holly Springs, Miss.
418 Robert Boyce, Byhalia, Miss.
625 Frank Buffington, Potts Camp, Miss.
1929 Charmie Caruthers, Holly Springs, Miss.
1358 Geo. Conner (Geo. Connor), Holly Springs, Miss. (route 6).
1711 John James Crawford, route 1, Holly Springs, Miss.
1143 Willie Dean, Byhalia, Miss.
1182 Royston, Dillard (Royster Dilliard), route 7, Holly Springs, Miss.
1699 Houston Duke, Malone, Miss. (Duke Houston, route 5, Holly Springs, Miss.).
1338 Joseph Ellis, 956 S. Fourth Street, Memphis, Tenn. (R. F. D., Byhalia, Miss., Collierville, Tenn.).

745 George Falkner, 4, Byhalia, Marshall County, Miss.
1707 Jeff Faulkner (Jeff Falkner), Holly Springs, Miss.
730 Van Gatewood, Cayce, Miss. (R. F. D., Collierville, Tenn.).
130 Elzy Gorman (Elgie Gormon), route 3, Collierville, Tenn.
1884 Golden Guinn, Byhalia, Miss. (Hallow Springs, Miss.).
1615 Will Hamilton, Waterford, Miss. (route 5, Holly Springs, Miss.).
1141 Walter Harris, Potts Camp, Miss. (Meadville, Penn.).
590 Leon Hollowell, route 4, Coldwater, Miss. (Lenon Hollowell, Wyatte, Miss.).
1168 James Lee Houston, route 4, Holly Springs, Miss. (Mount Pleasant, Miss.).
2015 Ben Ingram, Malone, Miss.
179 Will Jenkins, Hudsonville, Miss.
259 Alcuin Jones (Alcin Jones) (care of T. M. Best), Byhalia, Miss.
590 Erskine Jones, R. F. D. 3, Collierville, Tenn.
1278 Jesse Jones, Holly Springs, Miss.
301 Baxter R. Leach (Baxter Richard Leach, Holly Springs, Miss.).
1052 Spencer McDonald, Holly Springs, Miss.
615– Clay Miller, Holly Springs, Miss. (route 2, Waterford, Miss.).
421 Henry Muse, route 6, Holly Springs, Miss.
1397 Wm. Miller Nelson, jr., route 2, box 28, Holly Springs, Miss.
340 Willie Teel Norfleet, Cayce, Miss.
1538 Pickens Norris, Mount Pleasant, Miss.
1378 Allen Parker, Holly Springs, Miss.
1490 John Pettie, route 4, Holly Springs, Miss. (Como, Miss.).
1716 Adam Prentiss (Prentis Adams, Malone, Miss.).
727 Herbert Rayford, Holly Springs, Miss.
1290 Mel Robinson, route 4, Holly Springs, Miss. (Red Banks, Miss.).
1497 Cyrus Rook (Cyrus Rooks), route 3, Collierville, Tenn., Hudsonville, Miss.
431 Clifton Sanderson, R. F. D. 6, box 43, Holly Springs, Miss.
552 Andrew Jackson Simms (Andrew Jackson Sims), 6, Holly Springs, Miss.).
405 Golden Stewart, R. F. D. 6, Holly Springs, Miss.
1745 Ben Taylor, Holly Springs, Miss.
1658 Ernest Terry, Holly Springs, Miss. (Ernest Terry, Hudsonville, Miss.).
767 John Tharp, Mount Pleasant, Miss.
538 Ulecious Toles, Rt. 3, Collierville, Tenn. (R. F. D. 4, Collierville, Tenn.).
55 Murdock Tunstall (Brown) (Murdock Bronson Tunstall, Murdock Tunstall), R. Byhalia, Miss.
1833 Lee Walker, Waterford, Miss.
773 Chas. Ware, Flats, Miss. (Charlie Ware, Byhalia, Miss.).
113 Andrew Wilkins, Potts Camp, Miss. (R. F. D. 2, Potts Camp, Miss.).
535 David Williams, Byhalia, Miss.
1456 John Williams, Rt. 5, Collierville, Tenn. (Hudsonville, Miss.).
219 Tom Williams, R. F. D. 5, Collierville, Tenn.
1361 Walter Williams, Route 6, Holly Springs, Miss.
1161 Chester Withers, Route 2, Byhalia, Miss. 244 Caldwell, Memphis, Tenn.).
1559 Will Tunstall, Byhalia, Miss. (Route 3, Byhalia, Miss.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MONROE, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

215 Will Meadows, Amory, Miss. (Will Meaders, Amery, Miss.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PANOLA, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

248. Willie Collins, Crenshaw, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PEARL RIVER, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

737 Joseph Wilson Copps, Picayune, Miss.
69 Hiram G. Stewart, Poplarville, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PONTOTOC, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1020 Jessie (Jesse) Ward, R. F. D. No. 4, Houlka, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF RANKIN, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1391 Jno. (John) Monroe Magee, Route 3, Florence, Miss. (Jackson, Miss.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TALLAHATCHIE, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

2623 Ernest Winters, Tutwiler, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TUNICA, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

409 Willie Woods, Dubbs, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WALTHALL, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

878 Otto Lunday (Otho Lundy), Tylertown, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BRUNSWICK, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

94 John Gore (Goerge), Phoenix, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF BUNCOMBE, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

215 Robert Johnston (Johnson), Route 4, Asheville, N. C.
1849½ Herman Embler, Swannaroa, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF BUNCOMBE, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

930 Will Allen, Buttrick Street (Butrice Street), Asheville, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BURKE, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

975 Willie (William) McDowell, Morganton, N. C.
1298 Otis (Odes, Oldes) Phinazee, Construction, N. C.
1689 James Steel, Construction, N. C.
303 James Rasperry Corpening (James R. Corpening, James Raspberry Fopening), Construction, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHATHAM, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

915 George Alston, Pittsboro, N. C. (route No. 2, Pittsboro, N. C.).
1723 James Watson Clark, Pittsboro, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHOWAN, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

530 George Green, R. F. D., Tyner, N. C. (R. F. D. No. 1, Edenton, N. C.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF COLUMBUS, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

0473 James Oscar Baldwin (Boldwin), Whiteville, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CUMBERLAND, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

2124 Jasper McKay (McKoy), R. F. D. No. 3, Fayetteville, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DAVIDSON, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

953 Clarence Barnes, Lexington, N. C.
406¼ Rubin Crissom (Ruben Cresson), Thomasville, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DURHAM, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

3491 Benjamin F. Hester, 2109 Warnick Avenue, Newport News, Va. (Benjamin Franklin Hester, 901 Pickett Street, Durham, N. C.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF EDGECOMBE, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

298 John Lee, Atlantic Avenue, Rocky Mount, N. C.
1143 Charlie Mercer, care Ricks Hotel, Rocky Mount, N. C. (Albemarle Avenue, Rocky Mount, N. C.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF GASTON, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

2225 John Henry Craig, Gastonia, N. C. (Mount Holly, N. C.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

3336 Johnnie Davis, Weldon, N. C.
3534 Ray Elmore Hudson, Roanoke Rapids, N. C.
474 Dock Lattimore, Roanoke Rapids, N. C.
1915 John M. McLain, Enfield, N. C.
3143 Ed Moore, Winston-Salem, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HARNETT, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

1040 Arthur Lee Byrd, route 3, Lillington, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF JOHNSTON, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

434 Andrew Sanders, Smithfield, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LENOIR, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

813 John Williams, route 1, Kinston, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MARTIN, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

359 Lester (Chester) Williams, Palmyra, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF NASH, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

228a Arthur Davis, 210 Holly Street (210 Hally Street), Rocky Mount, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PITT, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

375 Willie Fleming, Greenville, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

327 James A. Covington, Hamlet, N. C.
1554 James De Berry, Hamlet, N. C.
2220 Walter Dockery, Hamlet, N. C.
894 James Smith, Hamlet, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF STANLY, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

2172 James Green (Greene), Badin, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF STOKES, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

37 Samuel Hairston, Walnut Cove, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF WAKE, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

1172 John Hill, Raleigh, N. C.
1677 James Cozart, 216 North West Street, Raleigh, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

74 Willie Barnes, Plymouth, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WILKES, STATE OF NORTH CAORLINA.

133 Eddie Harris, Wilkesboro, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

333 John Brown, 840 Tenth and Woodland Avenue, Winston-Salem, N. C.
1313 Fronzie Cozart, 607 Depot Street, Winston-Salem, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF AIKEN, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

3025 Joseph (Jacob) Bland, care W. H. Johnson, Augusta, Ga. (2109 Abbeville Street, Aiken, S. C.).
1274 George Garden (Gardner), care Augusta Arsenal, North Augusta, S. C. (R. F. D. North Augusta, S. C.).
3115 James A. (Elexander) Green, Montmorenci, S. C. (R. F. D. No. 1, Montmorenci, S. C.).
2755 Joe Green, Route No. 3, Augusta, S. C. (R. F. D. No. 3, Augusta, Ga.)
3244 Fred Griffin, Langley, S. C.
47 Sam Robinson, Hamburg, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, COUNTY OF ANDERSON, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

134 Otto McAlister (McAllister), Iva, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BARNWELL, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1547 Norman Cave Baldock (Baldocks), S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BERKELEY, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

580 Henry Gamble, Huger, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF CHARLESTON, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1453 Prince Small (Smalls), 75 Anson Street, Charleston, S. C.
1740 Henry Small (Smalls), 7 Kirkland Lane (42 Archdale Street), Charleston, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHESTER, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1791 Will Caldwell, route 2, Chester, S. C.
2007 John Stewart, Clairton, Pa. (Chester, S. C.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE CITY OF COLUMBIA, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

59 James Allen, 5 College Street, Columbia, S. C.
1838 John Henry (John H.) Allen, 4824 Palasa (1824 Pulaski Street), Columbia, S. C.
1931 Aaron Anderson, R. F. D. No. 4, Columbia, S. C.
2871
2817(?) Joel Anderson, rear 2017 Assembly Street, Cola, S. C.
2540 William Robert Atkinson (William Atkinson), 1615 Gadsden Street, Columbia, S. C.
1352 William Bird, Columbia, S. C. (Care Eckert & Eckert, Coatesville, Pa.)
2366 Stanley Bird (Sidney) (S. B.) Blackwell, 1444 Main Street, Columbia, S. C.
1273a Isaac Burke (Broode), 605 Taylor Street, Columbia, S. C.
2171 Cecil Brown, 1325 Gregg Street, Columbia, S. C.
1523 Harrison Brown, 1001 College Street, Columbia, S. C.

2630 Henry Brown, 1011 Pendleton Street, Columbia, S. C.
2929 Jack Bryant, 829 Lincoln Street, Columbia, S. C.
2946 Clarence Buggs, 1214 Wayne Street, Columbia, S. C.
2757 Edward Butler (Butler (rear) 1315 Barnwell Street), 1315 Marion Street (rear), Columbia, S. C.
3114 James Cannon, 1323 Lincoln Street, Columbia, S. C.
3466 John Carr, 25 (215) Maryland Street, Columbia, S. C.
2532 Randolph Carswell, 604 Lady Street, Columbia, S. C.
3122 David Cass, 1029 Lady Street, Columbia, S. C.
543 David Cayruth (Cagruth), Tree Street, Columbia, S. C.
562 LeRoy Cease, 1022 Church Street, Columbia, S. C.
3915 Thomas De Witt (T. D.) (Thomas D.) Clark, 822 Laurel Street, Columbia, S. C.
727 Willie Coad, 1930 Bull Street, Columbia, S. C.
2492 Dennis Coles, 1728 Rice Street, Columbia, S. C. (1108 S Street, NW., Washington, D. C.).
1660 Will Conn, Columbia, S. C. (care Sou. Rwy. Co., Greenville, S. C.).
3810 Press (Pres) Crapton (Pres. Crapton (Crafton), 1614 Gregg St.), 1814 Harder St., Columbia, S. C.
3399 Ada Crim, Columbia, S. C. (care N. & W. R. R., War Eagle, W. Va.).
699 Goliath Cunningham, 1528 Taylor Street, Columbia, S. C.
3690 Tommy Dausby (Dansby), 550 Huger Street, Columbia, S. C.
2734 Walter Davis, Columbia, S. C. (care A. & C. Wright (Contractors) Gaffney, S. C.).
2696 Willie Davis, Columbia, S. C. (care Hardaway Const. Co., Lugoff, S. C.).
3233 Nick Debbles (Dibbles), 1221 Bonville Street (Barnwell Street), Columbia, S. C.
2973 Leon Luther (Arthur) (L. L.), Dickerson, 326 Whaley Street, Columbia, S. C.
1039 Ernest Duncan, 1012 Gervais Street, Columbia, S. C.
2967 Robert Entzminger, 1920 Hampton Avenue (1921 Henderson Street), Columbia, S. C.
1001 Manton Evans, 1806 Huger Street, Columbia, S. C.
1104 Angelo Faschi (Faschi Angola (Angelo), 1620 Pulaski Street, Columbia, S. C.
762 John Darwin (D), Feaster, 1907 Washington Street, Columbia, S. C.
1187 James Ernest (E.) Fowler, 409 Hampton Street, Columbia, S. C.
3905 Perry Franklin, 21 Sumter Street, Columbia, S. C.
3128 Charlie Gaillard (Gillyard), 1306 Greeg (Gregg) Street, Columbia, S. C.
2865 Elliott Gaillard, 1108 College Street, Columbia, S. C.
3915 George Gardner, Columbia, S. C. (care R. L. Jackson, Erhardt, S. C.).
2690 Clarence (C. J.) James (J.) Gary, 1305 Assembly Street, Columbia, S. C.
60 Stafford (Strafford) Gibson, 1010 Wheat Street, Columbia, S. C.
3403 Walter Gibson, Columbia, S. C.
2093 Willie Giles, 908 Pendleton Street, Columbia, S. C.
2125 Gus Glover, Columbia, S. C. (care City Jail, Columbia, S. C.).
13 Norman Glymph (Glymph), 1233 Gregg Street, Columbia, S. C.
2668 Leroy Bristol Goodwin, 2223 Gevars Street, Columbia, S. C.
415 John Gradick (Graddick), Columbia, S. C. (care Southern Railway, Marion, N. C.).
2947 Earl Gray, 922 Green Street, Columbia, S. C.
3246 Ira Green, 529 Main Street, Columbia, S. C.
2787 Edward Hall, 1606 Gregg Street, Columbia, S. C.
2688 Nick Harmon, 1614 Gervais Street, Columbia, S. C. (1924½), Pulaski Street, Columbia, S. C.
2911 Paul Harris, 1404 Wayne Street, Columbia, S. C.
2784 Jackson Hatcher (Hatchen), 912 Taylor Street, Columbia, S. C.
3739 John Henry, 907 Washington Street, Columbia, S. C.
3707 Samuel (Sam) Hicks (Hick), Columbia, S. C. (Midvale Steele & Ordnance Co.; Worth Brothers Co., Coatesville,, Va.(Pa.).
836 Braddy (Bradley) Hipp, 1731 William Street, Columbia, S. C.
1606 Arthur Edward (E.) Hoeninghausen (Hoeinghasen), 1202 Main Street, Columbia, S. C.
1793 John Huff, 1 Sumter Alley, Columbia, S. C.
2518 Jack Hollios (Hollis), Assembly Street, Columbia, S. C.
2809 Thomas Holloway, 908 Washington Street, Columbia, S. C.
2775 William Howard, 326 Lincoln Street, Columbia, S. C.
2308 Samuel J. (John) Howell, 2214 Bull Street, Columbia, S. C.
3207 Leroy Hudson, 1011 Sumter Street (1011 Senate Street), Columbia, S. C.
1771 Isaiah Hutchinson (Isiah Huchinson), 1909 Pine Street, Columbia, S. C.
419 George Jackson, 25 Pendleton Street, Columbia, S. C.
341 James Jackson, 916 Green Street, Columbia, S. C.
1901 Daniel Declanis (Declaris), James, 516 Pulaski Street, Columbia, S. C.
2353 James Jenkins, Alley 1900 Block Main Street, Columbia, S. C.
2463 John Jenkins, jr., 412 Pickens Street, Columbia, S. C.
2966 Clarence Johnson, Hampton Avenue, Columbia, S. C.
757 George Johnson (Johnston), 1607 Two Notch Road, Columbia, S. C.
1161 Henry Lee Johnson, 515 Hampton Street, Columbia, S. C.
1364 Herbert Johnson, 1506 Richland, S. C.—Columbia.
1253 Willie Johnson, 1228 Elwood Street, Columbia, S. C.
345 George Jones, 516 Gervais Street, Columbia, S. C.
2174 James Kelly, Columbia, S. C. (care C. W. Lane & Co. (Inc.), Tocson, Ga.).
2330 Haskell Kennedy, 2121 Main Street, Columbia, S. C.
821 Isaiah Abraham (A.) Leaphart, 1909 Pulaski Street, Columbia, S. C.
3545 Henry Lee, 1235 Barnwell Street, Columbia, S. C.
1138 Robert Edward (E.) Lee, 1410 Tobacco Street, Columbia, S. C.
622 George Lewis, 1017 Vine Street, W. Columbia, S. C.
1471 Isaac (I.) Lewis, 1430 Divine Street, Columbia, S. C.
1273b Eugene Littles, 1413 Blossom Street, Columbia, S. C.
1196 Calop Loman (Lowman), 708 Plane Street, Columbia, S. C.
2481 Lloyd (Loyd) McClain, 6 Millers Alley, N. Side 1200 Block, Blossom Street, Columbia, S. C.
1348 Albert McGraw, Columbia, S. C. (care Hot Springs Co., Hot Springs, Va.).
3315 Harry McMillan (McMillian), Garners Ferry Road, Columbia, S. C., R. F. D.
3568a Sam McMillen (McMullen, Sam M. McMullen, Sam McMillan), Columbia, S. C. (care Whitacre Greer F. P. Co., Waynesburg, Ohio.)
3927 Willie McMillan, 8 Sumter Avenue, Columbia, S. C.
170 John Mack, 1314 Whaley Street, Columbia, S. C.
2199 Owen (Owens) Mack, North Columbia, Columbia, S. C. (care Lige Ballentine, North Columbia, S. C.).
1018 William Richard (R.) Madson, 130 State Hospital, Columbia, S. C.
3285 Eckley (Ekley) Lewis Marshall, 607 Blanding Street, Columbia, S. C.
985 David Moody, 852 Robin Street, Columbia, S. C.
2275a Cleveland Moore, 1322 Park Street, Columbia, S. C.
1343 Julius More (Moore), 726 Lincoln Street, Columbia, S. C.
272 Henry Morris, 708 Lumber Street, Columbia, S. C.
1205 Ed Muldrow, 2218 Washington Street, Columbia, S. C.
2755 Hazel Murdock, 2116 Elmwood Street, Columbia, S. C.
2031 Robert Ernest (Robert E., R. E.) Oates, 910½ Main Street, Columbia, S. C.
1524 Willie Outling, Columbia, S. C. (Norfolk Southern R. R. Co., Carolina Junction, Va.)
1562 Enrico Pagnani, 1027 Washington Street, Columbia, S. C. (723 South Sheridan Street, on rear, Philadelphia, Pa.).
3857 George Penn, jr., 910 Washington Street, Columbia, S. C.
1561 Robert Perry, 724 Plain Street, Columbia, S. C. (724 (Plain) Hampton, Columbia, S. C.).
3674 Robert Ponds, 2 Graham Alley, Columbia, S. C.
2232 Joseph Portee, 1713 Highland Alley, Columbia, S. C. (Joe Porter, 1120 Laurens Street, Columbia, S. C.).
3048 John Albert (A.) Price, 500 Gervais Street, Columbia, S. C.
1190 Ben Hans Reardon (Ben Hard Rearden, B. H. Reardon), 1022 Church Street, Columbia, S. C.
886 Willie James Rice, 1326 Henderson, Columbia, S. C.
2029 James Riley, Columbia, S. C. (Lukens Steel Co., Coatesville, Pa.).
371 Berley Rizer, 1017 College Street, Columbia, S. C.
1437 John Robinson, 1314 Oak Street, Columbia, S. C.
3469 Willie Rooks, 720 College Street, Columbia, S. C.
2422 Tom Roschell, 1400 Divine Street, Columbia, S. C.
2137 Henry Quincy (Q.) Rucker, 1222 Heidt Street, Columbia, S. C.
3507 Arthur Sarton (Sartor), 1102 Cuba Street, Columbia, S. C.
1122 Arthur Roland (A. R.) Sharpe, 1527½ Hampton Street, Columbia, S. C.
951 Will Shurell (Sherrill), 7 Sumter Street, Columbia, S. C.
2593 John Smith, 822 Assembly Street, Columbia, S. C.
96 Lee Smith, 1629 Oate Street (1629 Gates Street), Columbia, S. C.
3508 Will Steadman, 2 Grahams Alley, Columbia, S. C.
1037 Holice Lester (H. L.) Stinson, Imperial Hotel, Columbia, S. C.
2932 Jesse Fello (Fella) Stukes, 2011 Wilson Street, Columbia, S. C.
23 Suhoun (Suliorn) Thompson, R. F. D. No. 4, Columbia, S. C.
178 Edward Tucker, 916 Gates Street, Columbia, S. C.
2868 Charlie Walker, 1913 Tobacco Street, Columbia, S. C.
2538 Ed Waters, Camp near Columbia S. C. (care Powell Fuel Co., Columbia, S. C.).
2244 J. C. Weekley, Columbia, S. C. (care Armour & Co., Chicago, Ill.).
3780 Henry Weston, 604 Gate (604 Gates Street), Columbia, S. C.
3541 Samuel Tyler (S. L.) Willard, 2011 Wilson Street, Columbia, S. C.
2693 A. W. Williams, 431 Hampton Street, Columbia, S. C.
2102 Charles (Charls) Williams, 710 Lady Street, Columbia, S. C.
744 Frank Williams, 1416½ Richland Street, Columbia, S. C.
2376 George Williams (William), 828 Sumpter Street, Columbia, S. C.
3688 Hansel William, 1022 Lincoln Street, Columbia, S. C. (146 Third Avenue, plan No. 11, Woodlawn, Pa.).
362 John Williams, 180 West Gervais Street (180 Gervais), Columbia, S. C.
3439 Julius Williams, 513 Sumter Street, Columbia, S. C.
1264 Sidney Williams, 1305 Assembly Street, Columbia, S. C.
2921 Willie Williams, 1912 Blanding Street, Columbia, S. C.
586 Willie Robert Wesley (Wesly) Williams, 1008 College Street, Columbia, S. C.
1452 Willie Quinton (W. Q., Willie Quitton) Williams, 1515 Gist Street, Columbia, S. C.
3108 Stephen Williamson, 1833 Gregg Street, Columbia, S. C.
2906 Frank Wright, Columbia, S. C. (care Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Columbia, S. C.).
2650 John Wright, 428 Lincoln Street, Columbia, S. C.
1066 George Young, 1109 Divine Street, Columbia, S. C.
2791 Perry Franklin, 2021 Sumpter Street, Columbia, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DILLON, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1801 Arthur Lane, Latta, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF GEORGETOWN, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1130 Bill Keith, R. F. D. Georgetown, S. C. (Black River Road, Georgetown, S. C.).
1014 Sam Mouzon (Monzon), Andrews, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF GREENVILLE, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

3338 Sam Frank Smith, 14 North Street, Greenville, S. C.
774 Nathan Benson, Greer, S. C.
3420 James Miller, 530 Gewer Street, Greenville, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HAMPTON, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

101 Timothy Williams, Estill, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HORRY, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1806 John G. (J.) Floyd, Conway, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LAURENS, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

558 Henry Campbell, jr., Cross Hill, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MARLBORO, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

813 Sam Small, Bennettsville, S. C. (Brownsville, S. C.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF NEWBERRY, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

585 Willie Suber, route 2, Newberry, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF ORANGEBURG, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

139 Willie Davis, Orangeburg, S. C. (Seaboard Avenue, Orangeburg, S. C.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF ORANGEBURG, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

398 George Starks, Elloree, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF RICHLAND, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1140 Thermon (Thurmon) Aaron, Olympia, S. C.
236 Gilbert Adams, R. F. D. No. 2, Lykesland, S. C.
2483 Henry Anderson, Congaree, S. C.
1915 David Blacker (Blocker), Eastover, S. C.
2445 Ernest Blocker, route No. 1, Columbia, S. C.
1405 Henry (Harry) Boulder, R. F. D. No. 3, Columbia, S. C.
2476 Preston Brown, Eastover, S. C.
960 Hosey Chavis, English, S. C.
966
1221 Will Cook, Eau Clare, Columbia, S. C.
336 William Morris (M.) Crawley, 3905 Park Street, Eau Claire, S. C.
2294 James Arthur (Jas. A.) Drake, R. F. D., Columbia, S. C.
981 David Lawrence (David L.) Entminger (Entininger, Entzminger), Richland County, Pleasant, S. C.
2330 Leslie Gaines (Gains), R. F. D. No. 7, box 68, Columbia, S. C.
105 David Gary, R. F. D. No. 1, Columbia, S. C.
787 Ben Goodwin, Eastover, S. C.
1129 Isaac Goodwin, Lykesland, S. C.
1890 Eddie Grant, Eastover, S. C.
1379 Marsh (March), Gunter, Eastover, S. C.
1183 Millaye (Millege, Millage) Hall, Eastover, S. C.
2418 Henry Bert (H. B., Henry B.) Hambree, R. F. D., Columbia, S. C.
1152 Elizoe Harris (Elijah Harrin), Blythewood, R. F. D. No. 3, S. C.
744 John Justice (J.) Harris, Olympia, S. C.
936 Raford (Ralford) Hinton, Eastover, S. C.
71 Julius Hodge, Eastover (618 Gate Street, Columbia), S. C.
85 Joseph (Joe) Hopkins, R. F. D. No. 1, Lykesland, S. C.
1948 Ben Isaac, route 4, box 36, Columbia, S. C.
1418 Robert James, Gadsden, S. C.
1984 William Henry (H.) Johnson, R. R. No. 5, Cameron Road, Columbia, S. C.
2034 Willie Johnson, Bookman, S. C.
18 Allen Jones, R. F. D. No. 2, Hopkins, S. C.
1756 Teague Kinard, 1912 Lady Street, Columbia, S. C.
799 Will Laudman (William Laudman), R. F. D. No. 4, Columbia, S. C.
1000 Jerome Blumridge (P., J. P.) Lemley, R. F. D. No. 4, Columbia, S. C.
1522 John McDanield (McDaniel), route No. 3, box 404, Columbia, S. C.
47 Thomas Moore, Gadsden, S. C.
2098 Josh Matthews, Hopkins, S. C.
1918 Joseph Morris, Eastover, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF RICHLAND, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1277 Wilson Moye, R. F. D. No. 4, box 39, Columbia, S. C.
89 Thomas Nesbit, 1001 Lady Street, Columbia, S. C.
1970 Thomas Richardson, R. F. D. No. 2, Hopkins, S. C.
1640 Dan Webster Rogers (W., Dan Rogers, Dan W. Rodgers), Olympia, S. C.
2481 Willie Simpson, R. F. D. No. 1, Bookman, S. C.
1497 Earnest (Ernest) Sims, Lykesland, S. C.
1629 Willie Singleton, R. F. D. No. 1, College Place, S. C.
103 Scipio Salams (Salons, Scipio Solons), 222–24 Jeraivis (Gervais), Columbia, S. C.
1001 Charles (Charlie, Chas.) J. Thomas, R. F. D. No. 1, box 41, Columbia, S. C.
2156 Ely Washington, Ridgewood, Eau Clair, S. C.
2166 Hammond Wethersby (Weathersby), Olympia, Columbia, S. C.
1252 Adam Williams, Bluff Road, Columbia, S. C.
1759 Ernest Wright, Congaree, S. C.
1055 John Young, Kingville, S. C.
724 Andrew Brown, Colonial Heights, Columbia, S. C.
1486 Willis Hamplet (Hamblet), route 2, Columbia, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1325 Edd (Ed) Alexander, route 1, Welford, S. C. (Inman, S. C.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF SUMTER, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

2162 John James, Mayesville, S. C.
2075 Henry Jones, Sumter, S. C. (R. F. D. No. 5, Sumter, S. C.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BLOUNT, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

62 Frank Clifton, Maryville, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF CHATTANOOGA, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

2283 James Bailey, Chattanooga, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF DAVIDSON, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

659 Will (Willie) Williams, Kirkland Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HENRY, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

907 Claud Cole, Puryear, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF KNOX, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

1444 Thomas (Tom) Pratt, R. F. D. No. 3, Straw Plains, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF KNOX, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

536 Harry Edward Hall, 101 West Main Street, Knoxville, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LAUDERDALE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

100 John Scott, route 2, Henning, Tenn.
194 James Henning, Henning, route 3, Tenn. (route 2, Henning, Tenn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF MEMPHIS, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

9 Mose Brace, Memphis, Tenn. (Trezevant Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.).
578 William A. (Arthur) White, 1304 South Wellington Street, Memphis, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 4, CITY OF MEMPHIS, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

2659 Bates Holts, 318 Adams Street, Memphis, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 5, CITY OF MEMPHIS, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

2073 Henry Manning (Henery Maning), 864 Annie Street, Memphis, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MORGAN, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

87 Bunyon (Bunyan) Crisp, Sunbright, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF NASHVILLE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

1431 James Henry Majors, 510 McEwan Avenue, Nashville, Tenn. (110 Hermitage Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF NASHVILLE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

582 Mose Abernathy, 1108 Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
761 Robert Alderson, 617 Clinton Street, Nashville, Tenn.
874 Haywood Allen, Nashville, Tenn. (Gordensburg, Tenn., care Charleston Mining Co.).
935 Felix Alsup, 1015 Fourteenth Avenue south, Nashville, Tenn.
691 Arthur Bailey, 506 Fourth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
51 Frank Ballentine, 1108 Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1255 Wm. (William) Battle, 702 Third Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1694 Walter Beech (Beach), 322 Eighth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
706 Robert Booker, Sixteenth and Cedar Streets, Nashville, Tenn.
1778 Arthur Breen, 126 Fourteenth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
1012 Jas. Louis Bright, jr., 407 Eighth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
2625 William Bromfield, (William Broomfield, Willie Bromfield), Gay and x Ninth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
1884 Robert O. (Robert Opheniah, R. O.) Brooks, 817 Chenevert Street, Houston, Tex. (Nashville, Tenn.).
102 Tom Buchanan (Buchannan), Nashville, Tenn.
252 Jim Henry Bulls, 1810 Church Street, Nashville, Tenn.
162 Alonzo Burns, 138 Twelfth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
1426 Chas. D. (Chas. D. or J.). Charles Dewey Cannon, 701 Eighteenth Avenue south, Nashville, Tenn. (811 Telfair Street, Augusta, Ga.).
956 Thos. Campbell, 143 Fifth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
118 Wm. Belfield (William Belfield) Claxton, 125 Ninth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
568 Henry (Henie) Costello, 226 Nashville, Tenn.
2602 Samuel Le Roy (Leroy) Cretsinger, Nashville, Tenn.
2643 Henry Lee Crittenden, Fishings Dredge, U. S. A. (Nashville, Tenn., Fishmingo Dredge).
1929 Bud Daniel, 306 Sixth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
2423 John Davis, 125 Twelfth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
385 Will Davis, 506 Third Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
1498 James A. DeMoss (James Anderson De Moss), 321 Thirteenth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
1971 Perry DeMoss (Demoss), 216 Tenth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
2374 Sterling Wilbur (Wilber) Dixon, 744 Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
265 John Donald, Eighteenth and Cedar Streets, Nashville, Tenn.
1687 Hyder (Hider) Drew, 523 Jo Johnston Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1104 Jesse James Durrett, 318 Sixth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
91 Jas. A. (James A.) Eaton, 931 Second Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
1865 Charlie Edmondson, 917 Pearl Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2209 Hiram Edwards, 1109 Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2586 Garfield Ellison, 314 Twelfth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
739 Oscar H. Ewing, 924 Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1007 Willie Finley (Finney), 909 Gay Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1055 Frank Ford, 138 Fifth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2568 Thos. (Thomas) Ford, 1712 State Street, Nashville, Tenn.
240 Don Foster, 1020 Cole Street, Nashville, Tenn. (2345 East Thirty-third Street, Cleveland, Ohio).
1265 Alfred (Alf.) Frazier, 321 Twelfth Avenue north, Nashville, Tenn.
1854 Lee Gentry, 616 Eighth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2469 Levis G. Glenn, 149 Seventh Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
2094 Julius Goldstein, 432 Fifth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn. (1424 Beinville Street, New Orleans, La.).
206 Richard Gordon, 204½ Ninth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
204 George Greer, 1404 Fourteenth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2167 John Henry Hardison, 727 Tenth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1307 Porter Harris, 1029 Eighth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
620 John Harrison, 314 Polk Alley, Nashville, Tenn.
2117 Robt. (Robert) Alexander Harrison, Belmont Apartments, Sixteenth Avenue, South, Nashville, Tenn.
781 Edward Hays, 433 Ninth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
1733 Willie Henning (Willis Heming, Willie Fleming), 1023 Gay Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2650 Eugene Hight, 116 Twelfth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
141 George Hill, Jo Johnston Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
994 George Holliway, 428 Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
195 Homer Holt, 940 Jo Johnston Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1228 John House, Peabody and Seventh Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2302 Lucky (Luckie) House, 1610 Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1944 Chas. Hutchison (Hutcherson), 131 Sixth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
2520 Howard Jackson, 322 Eighth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
1599 John Henry Jackson, 416 Twelfth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
1607 Willie Jenkins, 211 Eleventh Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
331 Charlie (Charles, Chas.) Johns, 2 Third Avenue, North (Rear), Nashville, Tenn. (501 Third Avenue, North, No. 2 Rear, Nashville, Tenn.).
740 Dennis Johnson, 1013 Jo Johnston Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1880 James Johnson, 910 North Joe Johnston Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1127 Leonard (Lenord) Johnson, Nashville, Tenn. (care Walsh Construction Co., Bellefontaine, Ohio).
772 Samuel Carl (Carlie, S. C.) Johnson, 1618½ State Street, Nashville, Tenn.
590 Jonas (James, Jonus) Jones, 1213 Pearl Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1903 Alfred Bernards (Bernard) Kamins, Nashville, Tenn.
2270 Chas. Augustus (Charles Agustus) King, 1924 Hayes Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2767 Eddie Lee King, 931 Gay Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1193 Wm. McKinley (William McKinley, Willie Mackinley), 109 Eighth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2354 O'Dell Kirby (Odell Kirby), 1013 Fourth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.

2050 Robt. F. (Robert F., R. F.) Looney, 528 Third Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1976 Fred Lytton (Lyttan), 144 Fourth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
876 John Mathews, 718 Gay Street, Nashville, Tenn.
324 Chas. Meyers (Charles Myers, Charlie Myers), 323 Eighth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
517 Robert Miles (Robert Wilds), Fourteenth Avenue and Church Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2783 Willie Mimms, 602 Jo Johnston Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1787 Will W. (W. W.) Monroe, 421 Fourth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
1019 Sam Myers, 531 Tetia Avenue, Nashville, Tenn. (Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Shops, Bridgeport, Ohio).
1382 General (Gentle) Grant Nuby, Nashville, Tenn.
1214 Wm. (William) Nunnelly, 303 Gay Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1268 John Henry Oden, Patterson and Penn Alley, West Nashville, Tenn.
2663 Ollie (Oly) Patton, 302 Capitol Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2216 John Ralph Pierson, 1905 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn. (602 North Los Angelus, Anaheim, Tenn.; 735 Scarritt Building, Kansas City, Mo.).
1710 Eugene Powers, 209 Eleventh Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
1110 James Poynter (Pointer), 1 Stone Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1343 Wm. Monroe (William M.) Potter, 508 Tenth Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn.
2203 Will Primm, 326 Eighth Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
2169 Henry Reese, 510 Fourth Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
1232 Perry Robertson, 1501 15th Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
1728 John Scott, 1129 First Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
205 Isom Smalling, 109 Keys Alley, Nashville, Tenn.
2649 Felix Smith, 1805 State Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1753 Fred Snellings, 504 Ninth, North Nashville, Tenn.
692 Earl (Earle) Rogers Thomas, 510 Hudson Street, Nashville, Tenn. (cantonment, Louisville, Ky.).
184 Edie Fletcher Thomas, 907 Eleventh Avenue North, Nashville, Tenn.
1713 Richard Thomas, 1315 Twelfth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1455 Mayhew (Mayhue) Thompson, Nashville, Tenn.
1246 James Tyler, 518 Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
611 Willie Volarb, 1039 Gundery Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1673 Arrelus Von Leggett, 328 Fifth Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn., or Anelus Von Leggett, 318 Fifth Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.).
605 Herman Wm. (Herman William) Waldron, 307 Sixth Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn.
2737 John Walker, 424 Twelfth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2506 Wm. (William) Hover Wallace, Y. M. C. A., Fourth Avenue and Cedar Street, Nashville, Tenn.
693 Dyer Lee Walton (Dyar Lee Walton), 1910 West End Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2696 Milton B. Watkins, steamboat, Nashville, Tenn. (lives in steamboat).
545 Doc Webb, 1116 (or 1166) Jo Johnston Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1756 John Whitson, rear 130 Sixth Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
1570 John Williams, 528 Fifth Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
161 John Williams, 1015 Eighth Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
2501 Johnson Williams, 918 Haslam Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1021 Jos. (Joseph) Cleveland Wilson, 429 Ninth Avenue, North Nashville, Tenn.
2122 Tom Woolens, 1121 Gay Street, Nashville, Tenn.
627 John Wright, 616 Seventh Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn.
178 Will Davis Morris, Nashville, Tenn. (Athens, Ala.).
2618 Richie James Wilson, 2211 Murphy Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
297a Wm. Jones (James) Crittenden, Nashville, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ROANE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

1736 George Leonard (Lenard) Phifer, Erie, Tenn. (R. F. D. No. 1, Erie, Tenn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF SULLIVAN, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

389 Thomas Jefferson, Kingsport, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TIPTON, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

736 Willie Stevens, Leland, Miss.
1164 Charley Smith, Covington, Tenn.
1565 Robert Cotten, route 3, Covington, Tenn.
2189a Tom Marlin (Maclin), Mason, Tenn.
1922 Charlie (Charley) Smith, 930 Jefferson Street, Memphis, Tenn.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1029. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a statement of the documents and publications received and distributed by the Navy Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

1030. A letter from the general secretary of the Near East Relief, transmitting report of the Near East Relief for the year ending December 31, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1031. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of the disposition of useless papers in the files of navy yards, naval stations, etc.; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. H. Rept. No. 1758. A report on the disposition of useless papers in Treasury Department. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 14471) to provide for the erection of a monument or memorial to the memory of Grover Cleveland; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14472) for the acquirement of land in the District of Columbia as sites for public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14473) for the enlargement of the grounds surrounding the United States Capitol Building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 14474) to provide for the protection and development of lower Colorado River Basin, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. KINDRED: A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 88) providing for the appointment of a committee of five Senators and five Representatives to call on the President and urge him to call a conference of the leading powers of the world to consider and work out a specific plan for world stabilization and prosperity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: A resolution (H. Res. 573) authorizing the printing as a document, for distribution through the folding room, the prayers offered by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, petitioning Congress to make such provisions as will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell Indian inheritance lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging Congress to set aside the Bad Lands of South Dakota as a national park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging the Federal Trade Commission to take such steps as will be necessary to abolish the Pittsburgh plus practice; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KISSEL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, protesting against inefficient control and direction of their occupational training and progress and emphasizing the necessity for enforcement of all rules and regulations in the Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, recommending that Congress set aside the Bad Lands as a national park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota favoring provisions being made whereby the Secretary of the Interior has authority to sell Indian inheritance lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona favoring Senate bill 4187 to extend the time for the payment of charges now due on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, petitioning the Congress of the United States to assist the silver-mining industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota opposing the practice of Pittsburgh plus; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota urging Congress to set aside the Bad Lands as a national park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota favoring the Secretary of the Interior being authorized to sell Indian inheritance lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. HADLEY introduced a bill (H. R. 14475) granting a pension to Melissa Ticknor, which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.