appropriations of any public funds, Federal, State, or municipal, to any sectarian institutions. The following bodies have made or are making these petitions: Methodist General Conference, Springfield, Mass.; the presbytery of Genevese of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Clarion of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Columbus of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Florida of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Steuben of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of San Jose of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Central Washington of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Peoria of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Geneva of the Presbyterian Church; the Lexington conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Des Moines conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Tennessee conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the presbytery of Brooklyn-Nassau of the Presbyterian Church; the western Wisconsin conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Wisconsin conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the presbytery of Blairsville of the Presbyterian Church; the Michigan Baptist convention; the Indiana Baptist convention; the Kentucky Baptist general convention; Delaware Baptist State convention; the Connecticut Baptist convention; the Michigan Baptist convention; the Nevada Baptist convention; the Oklahoma Baptist convention; the Iowa Baptist convention; the western Washington Baptist convention; the Pennsylvania Baptist general convention; the Florida Baptist convention; the Georgia Baptist convention; the Baptist general convention of Texas; the southern Baptist convention; the Indiana conference Methodist Episcopal Church; south Georgia Conference; Episcopal Church South; the Missouri Baptist general association; the north Indiana conference; the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Wilmington conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; eastern Swedish conference Methodist Episcopal Church; the presbytery of Sacramento of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Detroit of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Zanesville of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Petoskey of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Kalamazoo of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Bot Butte of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Westchester of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Kittanning of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of New Brighton of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Hudson of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Brooklyn-Nassau of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Mankato of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Iowa of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of St. Joseph of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Iowa City of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Philadelphia of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Chillicothe of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Newcastle of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Washington City of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Sycamore of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Chester of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Bushville of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Boston of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Latrobe of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Ok brothers of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Win nebag of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Georgia of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Jackson of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Central West of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Freeport of the Presbyterian Church; the presbytery of Hannibal of the Presbyterian Church; the Texas conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Minnesota conference of the Episcopal Church South; the Pacific conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; the New York Baptist missionary conference; the Montana conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Tennessee conference, Methodist Episcopal Church South; the New Mexico conference, Methodist Episcopal Church South; the north Texas conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; north Georgia conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; Louisiana Baptist State convention; the Arkansas Baptist State convention; the Wyoming conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the northwest California conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the presbytery of Spokane of the Presbyterian Church; the North Dakota conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Erie conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the presbytery of Wisconsin of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Philadelphia conference Methodist Episcopal Church; Baptism convention of North Carolina; the presbytery of Allegheny of the Presbyterian Church; the conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and the New Jersey Baptist convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chafer, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1867) accepting certain tracts of land in the city of Missoula, Montana.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9661) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, to enable the heads of the several departments and independent establishments to adjust the rates of compensation of civilian employees in certain of the field services.

The message further announced that the House had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 26. An act to compensate the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for lands disposed of under the provisions of the free homestead act.

H.R. 646. An act to make valid and enforceable written provisions or agreements for arbitration of disputes arising out of contracts, maritime transactions, or commerce among the States or Territories or with foreign nations.

H.R. 8069. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved August 1, 1914; and

H.R. 2953. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States certain lands belonging to the United States and remaining in the hands of the estate of Christian Friedel, deceased, fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed enrolled bills of the following titles, and they were thereupon signed by the President of the Senate:


H.R. 4816. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to permit the city of Vicksburg, Miss., to construct and maintain water mains on and under the National Cemetery Road at Vicksburg, Miss.;

H.R. 4833. An act to pay tuition of Indian children in public schools.

H.R. 5223. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claim which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; and


REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY (S. DOC. NO. 152)

The PROPOSED REVIEW period to be held before the Senate a communication from the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Unnecessary Papers in the Executive De-
The President pro tempore appointed Mr. Morse and Mr. Fletcher members of the committee on the part of the Senate and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof. He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of documents and files of papers not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department or having no permanent value or historic interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The President pro tempore appointed Mr. Wadsworth and Mr. Fletcher members of the committee on the part of the Senate and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

DEPRESSION IN COTTON MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES (S. Doc. No. 159)

ThePresident pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a report of the Tariff Commission, in response to Senate Resolution 219, on the present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry and the effect of imports upon the cotton-cloth industry, which, without objection, will be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

Mr. WADSWORTH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the first part of the report which does not include tables be printed in the Congressional Record, and that the report be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will not object to having the tables printed also.

Mr. WADSWORTH of Massachusetts. They will be printed as a Senate document, but it would be too bulky to print them in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed as a Senate document, and to be printed in the Record in part, as follows:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION, Washington, D. C.,

On May 12, 1924, the United States Senate adopted the following resolution No. 219:

"Whereas a prolonged depression of exceptional magnitude has, is, and will continue to exist in the cotton textile industries of the United States, resulting in a condition of depression such as has rarely, if ever, existed before, and this condition is to a large extent the result of foreign competition in this country, and a condition which has resulted in the shutting down of cotton mills, in the closing of new establishments, in the transfer of labor to other industries, in a general decline of employment, and in a depression in wages and salaries;

"Therefore be it resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission be, and hereby is, directed to furnish to the Senate an expeditious and full report on the extent of the depression existing in the cotton textile industries of almost every country.

"The present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry is practically world-wide, although more severe in some countries than in others.

"The United States is the world's largest consumer of cotton. On the basis of number of spindles the cotton manufacturing countries rank as follows: The United Kingdom, the United States, France, Germany, India, Russia, Italy, Japan, Czechoslovakia, China, Spain, Brazil, Belgium, Switzerland, Canada, Poland, and America.

"A prompt answer to the inquiry of the Senate does not permit a detailed study of the relative extent of the depression in the various countries, and the following statements and quotations are given only as evidence that there is more or less depression existing in the cotton manufacturing industry of almost every country.

"The present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry of the United States is, no permanent value or historic interest, and asking for action produced in this country?

"Is the present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry confined to the United States or is it world-wide?"

"The present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry is practically world-wide, although more severe in some countries than in others."

"The United States is the world's largest consumer of cotton."

"(1) Is the present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry confined to the United States or is it world-wide?"

"(2) To what extent and for how long a period has the present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry of this country been apparent?"

"(3) What is the quantity and value of cotton cloth imported into and exported from the United States under the present tariff act as compared with those under the acts of 1880?"

"(4) What is the percentage of imports and exports, as compared to the domestic production, of cotton cloth in the census years 1909, 1914, 1919, 1921, and 1923?"

"(5) What types of cotton cloth constitute the bulk of the import trade, and are these cloths similar or different in character from those produced in this country?"

"(6) What are the main reasons for the importation of cotton cloths? In particular, are such imports due primarily to price or to quality?"

"(7) To what extent has the domestic industry been affected by the postwar increases in the importation of cotton cloths?"

"(8) What changes in the present use of cotton cloths be of material assistance in stimulating production and restoring prosperity to this industry?"

In response to the foregoing resolution, the United States Tariff Commission has the honor to submit the following:

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1923</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far East</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and South America</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-governing colonies</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (percentages)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (million yards)</td>
<td>7,973</td>
<td>4,772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above yardage totals show a wide decline in demand for British piece goods. Although, as shown by the above table, the percentage of total distribution of British piece goods exported to the United States increased from 0.8 of 1 per cent in 1913 to 4.2 per cent in 1923, the actual increase in sales of British piece goods to the United States was from 4,440,500 square yards in 1913 to 174,920 square yards in 1923, an increase of nearly 4 times.

At the present time many of the British cotton mills are shut down and a substantial proportion are working short time. The spinning mills that use American cotton are, by agreement, operating only 261 hours a week. Although the spinning mills that use Egyptian cotton in the manufacture of finer goods are more fully employed, it would appear that, all classes of goods considered, the industry as a whole, spinning and weaving, is not operating to more than two-thirds capacity.

One phase of the present depression in the British cotton industry, the fact that there has been not only a loss in production but also a diminution in productive machinery, is illustrated in a recent report (published May 1, 1924, as Special Bulletin No. 319) of the Department of Commerce. In part this is as follows:

"Since the armistice there has been a substantial reduction in the number of spindles and looms in place in Lancashire. Authorities disagree as to the exact figures, but there is no question as to the decline itself. The Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Directory,
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In its lists showed a decline between the years 1917 and 1923 of 3,431,000 and 17,120,252, according to the estimates published in the International Cotton Bulletin, to the effect that the reduced spindleage, 1920-1928, amounted to over 2,000,000 spindles.

"It was particularly commented upon in the cotton districts the great number of unemployed operatives, who were shipped unskilled to textile areas. However, 1920-22, the other textile machinists so remote, that high prices were paid for machinery which, in a number of years in Lancashire. Of course, the other factor—the actual wearing out of machinery—accounted for most of the net reduction in recent years. There is still a great need in Lancashire mills for the replacement of worn-out machinery and a stifling of the remaining increased in the last few days. On the whole, stocks are small. In the present condition of things it is not anticipated that any organized short time will take place in the whole of the cotton districts within the near future. However, owing to wild fluctuations in the prices of the raw material and the high tension of the world's economic situation, causing the general falling off in domestic consumption, there is no real demand in the textile industry at the present time.

In the bulletin for September, 1923, the French manufacturers reported:

"Prices continue to leave only very little, if any, profit at all. Notwithstanding the perceptible increase in the price of cotton, as a result of the war, the average prices obtaining have hardly increased since the publication of the last bulletin."

"France: The International Cotton Bulletin of March, 1924, states, "France, in direct contrast to the last census, is the only European country which has reduced her cotton consumption during the last year."

It contains the following report from French manufacturers:

"In contrast to the weaving industry, the spinning industry continues satisfactory. Until recently the spinning industry has lagged behind the weaving; however, in some cotton districts an appreciable improvement has been noted in this respect during the last few days. On the whole, stocks are small. In the present condition of things it is not anticipated that any organized short time will take place in the whole of the cotton districts within the near future. However, owing to wild fluctuations in the prices of the raw material and the high tension of the world's economic situation, causing the general falling off in domestic consumption, there is no real demand in the textile industry at the present time."

"In the bulletin for September, 1923, the French manufacturers reported:

"Prices continue to leave only very little, if any, profit at all. Notwithstanding the perceptible increase in the price of cotton, as a result of the war, the average prices obtaining have hardly increased since the publication of the last bulletin."

Germany : The Textile Mercury (published at Manchester, England), in its issue of May 10, states:

"According to a Teletype message from Berlin dated May 4, spring has brought in the German cotton industry generally has been satisfactory. Home demand, it is true, is not so eager as during the first months of the year, and retail business is somewhat quieter, but no great falling off in demand is yet felt. Most mills have work in hand up to the end of the year, and a considerable portion of the work will be done in the next few months. Employment, however, varies, 50 to 65 per cent of capacity being general, with 70 to 80 per cent at a large number of mills, and 100 per cent at a few. As regards expert, the German mills are placed at a disadvantage in the export trade, and many are to change their not having been able to purchase raw material before the rise in price and to the empty running at the mills. The further development of the industry will depend largely on the solution of the question of money and credit, and also on a mitigation of the policy of high prices and severe conditions followed by the combines in the textile industry."

The following extract is from the address of Mr. S. D. Salakawa, chairman of the Bombay Millowners' Association, at the annual meeting on February 26, 1924, as reported in the Indian Textile Journal for March:

"We are all aware that has just passed has clearly indicated to us that we are now drawing very close to the pre-war level of profits, and, perhaps, before normality has established itself our industry may pass through a still more critical time during the current year. Indeed, great difficulty are being felt by the effects of the after war. India can hardly hope to escape the gloom which seems to have enveloped countries with far greater staying powers than India. But the main reason for this continued depression are, in my opinion, the stagnation prevailing and the uncertainty prevailing may very naturally be tinged on the part of buyers to wait with a view to be able to make a better bargain in the future."

The International Cotton Bulletin of March, 1924, contains the following report from Italian manufacturers:

"Although the demand is scarce, spinners and weavers have sufficient work to keep the machinery going a few months. In particular, wages have been raised; prices goods and cloth containing artificial silk are sufficiently engaged, whilst those working on gray cloth, shirtings, and such like, are rather short of orders. No organized steppe is in force, but many mills are working short time, especially those weaving grey cloth. On the whole, the position is not so bad, and statistics show that stocks are small. It is hoped that a stronger demand will arise with the coming season, but with such an unsettled raw-cotton market it is impossible to estimate the prospects."

"Spain: The International Cotton Bulletin of March, 1924, contains the following report from Spanish manufacturers:

"The demand for goods is now at a standstill. Stagnation affects, at moment, about 40 per cent of the production, with a tendency to increase. Amongst the principal causes of the dullness of trade the following deserve mention:

1. The reduced consuming capacity of the country, owing to the general depression of business and to the losses suffered in and after the year 1921.

2. The disproportion existing between wages, especially agricultural wages, and the cost of living. In consequence of this the agricultural worker does not possess any margin for expenditure on clothing.

3. The depression in the world's economic situation, causing a suspension of Spain's foreign trade. The present industrial crisis has inevitably forced down sale prices in order to enable the sale of current production, leaving a profit which scarcely covers general costs and in some cases of sales from stock leaves no profit at all.

"As long as these conditions persist prosperity is impossible; but, at the same time, a general deterioration is not looked for unless new difficulties arise."

"Austria: The United States Textile Comforter at Rio de Janeiro reported May 24, 1924, as follows:

"The market for cotton goods in Rio de Janeiro has shown a general slackening, due to the course of the foreign exchange market and general business."

Belgium: The International Cotton Bulletin of March, 1924, contains the following report from Belgian manufacturers:

"The demand for cloth is very limited in this country owing to the high prices of the Belgian franc. The depreciation of our currency is, on the other hand, favorable to export business. In cotton-spinning mills orders are renewed regularly; and although the orders booked are not very important, there is no reason to consider the export business for the present year with any confidence. The rates of exchange enforce on certain days a stoppage of sales, buyers and sellers finding it impossible to cover themselves promptly when the price was lowered."

"Switzerland: The International Cotton Bulletin of March, 1924, contains the following report from Swiss manufacturers:

"Dealers are unable to collect outstanding bills nor to sell their stocks; on the contrary they receive few orders, instead of many which are received a few months ago. The foreign market is becoming extremely difficult, and the prospects are not very encouraging."

"Austria: The United States Textile Comforter at Vienna reported, May 9, 1924, as follows:

"The textile industry, with few exceptions, is suffering greatly from the shortage of money, which has become very acute. Dealers are unable to collect outstanding bills nor to sell their stocks; consequently the industry receives few orders, so that stagnation is much pronounced. The ever-decreasing price of American cotton also tends to prevent sound business operations. Print works are reported busy in some cases, with no orders for simple printed fabrics."

"To what extent and for how long a period has the present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry of this country been apparent?"

"The present depression in the cotton manufacturing industry of the United States has been apparent for about 11 months, from July, 1923, to May, 1924, inclusive."

"See Appendix B (see Appendix A) shows the rates of cotton consumption by American mills, and Table 2 shows activity in the cotton-spinning industry of the United States. These show that the rate of raw-cotton consumption and spindling activity were unusually high in the nine months from October, 1922, to June, 1923, inclusive, but that in July of 1923 there was a sharp drop in cotton consumption and in spindling activity and that both of these, although fluctuating from month to month, have since continued on generally lower levels."

II
As to the extent of the present depression, answer depends on what factor and what period is to be taken as a base. The total active spindle hours are reported each month by the Bureau of the Census (see Table 3) and can be taken, since there are no similar data as to home activity, as the best available standard for comparison. Data are available only to April, 1924. The total active spindle hours during the 10 months from July, 1923, the beginning of the depression, through April, 1924, averaged 7,931,775,255. If we compare these figures with the average active spindle hours during the 10 months from July, 1922, through April, 1923, which amounted to 8,410,090,997, we find that the percentage of decline in spindle hours is 10.45.

Sources, which will be found in their proper place in the Appendix, further illustrate this aspect of the subject.

Table 4: Production and sales of fine cotton goods reported by 24 New Bedford mills.

Table 5: Average wholesale prices of raw cotton, cotton yarn, and cotton cloths; also indexes based on 1913, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table 6: Wholesale prices of a standard print cloth and of bleached and printed cloths made therefrom; also cost of cotton used, as reported by a large mill each January 1 and July 1 since 1900, also wholesale prices of a standard gingham made of print cloth yarns. Table 6 is a record of the production and sales of fine cotton goods reported by 24 New Bedford mills. This table is pertinent to the inquiry, although, owing to the relatively small production of fine goods in this country, it cannot be taken as indicative of conditions in the industry as a whole. This table shows that there was a sharp decline in sales of fine goods by these mills in April, 1924, but that although volume of sales continued low in all but four of the subsequent months the production by these mills continued relatively high until April, 1924. The resulting accumulation of stock reflects clearly the falling off in demand.

In connection with the depression in the industry which began in July, 1923, as shown by tables 2 and 3, as well as by statements of the trade, it may be noted that in July, 1923, there was a sharp drop in the price of cotton, which was reflected in the prices obtainable for yarns and cloths. When cotton later increased in value the prices of the manufactured goods were not increased in the same proportion. This is shown in table 5, but inasmuch as the manufactures there shown are made of higher-priced cotton than the basic middling they quoted, table 6 is added to show the actual margin between the prices obtained for certain cloths and the costs of the cotton actually used therein as reported by a large manufacturer semiannually for a period of years.

As to the sharp fluctuations in cotton prices, the president of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, in a recent report to his association, remarked:

"Looking back over the last two years, spot cotton ranged from 17.75 cents in April, 1922, to 31.50 cents in March, 1923, down to 22.45 cents in July, 1923, up to 37.95 cents last December, and recently down to 27.05 cents. Future quotations on the New York Exchange have been even more erratic than the spot prices."

It may be noted that Fall River manufacturers mainly print cloth and that these goods are exported in large quantities; such competition as it experiences is from the southern mills, as there is no competition from imports. New Bedford, on the other hand, manufactures mainly fine goods and such competition as it experiences is mainly from abroad.

In view of these facts, it is interesting to know that Sanford & Kelley, New Bedford and Fall River stock brokers, in an annual review of the cotton-mill situation at these two places, have expressed the opinion that the Fall River coarse-goods mills had a very difficult time during the year 1923, as there was little or no manufacturing profit available in the industry as conducted at Fall River, whereas the cloth mills in New Bedfor had a very good year in 1923.

III

"What is the quantity and value of cotton cloth imported into and exported from the United States under the present tariff act as compared with those under the act of 1909?"

The total quantity and value of countable cotton cloths (which are the only kinds to which the resolution is understood to relate) imported and exported under the act of 1922 and under preceding acts have been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countable cotton cloths—Imports by tariff acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tariff acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1894 (1,422 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1909 (1,596 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1910 (1,394 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1911 (1,388 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1912 (1,375 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1922 (267 days)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For period from Sept. 22, 1922, to Mar. 31, 1924, inclusive, for which data are available.

Reduction of the above to a uniform basis, the year of 365 days, there is obtained the following contrast:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countable cotton cloths—Average per year of 365 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tariff acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of 1922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For period from Sept. 22, 1922, to Mar. 31, 1924, inclusive, for which data are available.

The figures for the five tariff acts prior to the act of 1922 show that the general tendency has been for the foreign trade, both export and import, of the United States in countable cotton cloths to increase. Under each of these successive tariff acts the rate of increase has been more marked in exports than in imports. Under the act of 1922 the increase in imports has been accentuated, whereas there has occurred a decrease in exports; this act, however, has been in operation not much over a year and a half. It is therefore too early to state that this marks a permanent reversal of the condition of a continually widening margin of exports over imports which is shown by the figures for the five preceding acts.

In amplification of the above there are attached tables 7 and 8. Table 7 shows imports for consumption for each year and fraction of a year under the tariff acts of 1890, 1896, 1897, 1900, 1913, and 1922, with details as to quantity, value, duty collected, value per unit, and the method of counting the ad valorem and the specific duties. Table 8 shows the quantity and value of domestic imports for each year and fraction of a year under the tariff acts above mentioned.

IV

"What is the percentage of imports and exports, as compared to the domestic production, of cotton cloth in the census years 1910, 1914, 1919, 1921, and 1923?"

The data are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countable cotton cloths—Relation of imports and exports to production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Production data not available.
The Bureau of Census states that the compilation of production data for 1923 has not been completed. For this reason production and import and export percentages are not given for 1923 in the foregoing tables. There is a basic difference in the figures for 1922 and 1923 as a tentative base for 1922, imports in 1922 were 3.33 per cent in quantity and 6.33 per cent in value, whereas exports were 7.61 per cent in quantity and 11.21 per cent in value. Since the consumption of cotton in the calendar year 1923 is over 25 per cent greater than in the calendar year 1922, it is probable that when all the figures become available the quantity and value of cotton-cloth production will be found to be greater, in which case the actual percentages for 1923 will prove to be smaller than those indicated.

Exports from the United States have exceeded imports in every year since 1875. The bulk of the exported cloths are woven of coarse or medium yarn goods, whereas the bulk of the imported cloths are woven of fine yarns. Table 9 shows domestic production and imports and exports by years, from 1899 to 1923, inclusive. Tables 10 and 11 show in detail the census records of production of the various cloths; these two tables show the derivation of the figures used above for the production of countable cotton cloths. Export data are given only for countable cotton cloths, and exports of special fabrics, such as pile fabrics, etc., are not included, and there are many items not included in the census, some being lumped with "manufactures of cotton n. a. p." For a correct comparison, cotton cloths provided for in the census, also articles such as towels and blankets, have been excluded from the production and export figures. The data as shown, therefore, relate solely to countable cotton cloths such as are now dutiable in paragraphs 903 and 906 of the tariff act of 1922.

V

What types of cotton cloth constitute the bulk of the import trade, and are these cloth similar or different in character from those produced in this country?

The types of cotton cloths predominating in the import trade vary from time to time. For a number of years prior to the World War, in fact until shortly after the war, the imported consigned consisted of dyed Venetians; these were eight-harness warp sateens, with a Silk-like finish imparted by secret processues. They were very popular as linings. The next largest import was of medium-fine and fine plain cloths, such as towels and blankets, and the great popularity of the fact that the imported fabrics are usually made of mule-spun Egyptian cotton and the domestic of ring-spun American cotton, the great bulk of the domestic production is of the lower grades, whereas in 1923 they constituted over two-thirds of the total. This increase has been due mainly to a better "cover" and a smoother feel than the domestic, although the latter will in many instances prove more durable. Swivel-woven cloths, including the genuine doped Swiss, are not yet used extensively in this country. There is practically no competition in the production of fabrics made of yarns above 120's except such as are woven with imported yarns. Japanese crepe, made of hard Indian and Chinese cottons, is also different in character from any domestic crepe, and has been made here in several other specialties, such as Penelope canvas, but the efforts have been given up because of the extra care and slow rate of production involved in their manufacture and consequent higher labor cost.

There is domestic production of cotton broadcloth shirtings, fine-combed warp satins, voiles, and fine plains (other than the extreme fine plains), the four types now constituting the bulk of the imports; also in the case of ginghams. In each of these instances, however, aside from the fact that the imported fabrics are usually made of mule-spun Egyptian cotton and the domestic of ring-spun American cotton, the great bulk of the domestic production is of the lower grades, whereas in 1923 they constituted over two-thirds of the total. This increase has been due mainly to a better "cover" and a smoother feel than the domestic, although the latter will in many instances prove more durable. Swivel-woven cloths, including the genuine doped Swiss, are not yet used extensively in this country. There is practically no competition in the production of fabrics made of yarns above 120's except such as are woven with imported yarns. Japanese crepe, made of hard Indian and Chinese cottons, is also different in character from any domestic crepe, and has been made here in several other specialties, such as Penelope canvas, but the efforts have been given up because of the extra care and slow rate of production involved in their manufacture and consequent higher labor cost.

In general, it may be said that on cloths that can be made of upland short-staple cotton, the spinning limit of which is about 40s, there is practically no competition from imported cloths. Japanese cloths can be made of upland cotton and are mostly of upland yarns not finer than 40s; and also certain finer goods, such as single voiles.

In general it may be said that on cloths that can be made of upland short-staple cotton, the spinning limit of which is about 40s, there is practically no competition from imported cloths. Japanese cloths can be made of upland cotton and are mostly of upland yarns not finer than 40s; and also certain finer goods, such as single voiles.

In general it may be said that on cloths that can be made of upland short-staple cotton, the spinning limit of which is about 40s, there is practically no competition from imported cloths. Japanese cloths can be made of upland cotton and are mostly of upland yarns not finer than 40s; and also certain finer goods, such as single voiles.

In general it may be said that on cloths that can be made of upland short-staple cotton, the spinning limit of which is about 40s, there is practically no competition from imported cloths. Japanese cloths can be made of upland cotton and are mostly of upland yarns not finer than 40s; and also certain finer goods, such as single voiles.

In general it may be said that on cloths that can be made of upland short-staple cotton, the spinning limit of which is about 40s, there is practically no competition from imported cloths. Japanese cloths can be made of upland cotton and are mostly of upland yarns not finer than 40s; and also certain finer goods, such as single voiles.
3. Lack of domestic production: The American cotton industry does not use swivel looms because of their slow rate of production and consequent higher labor cost. All swivel-woven cloths, including substantial amounts of swivel-decorated voiles and crepes, as well as the majority of the Egyptian cotton, are therefore imported at the present time. These goods are of Swiss or French origin and are produced mainly on hand looms in the homes. The American cotton industry spins but little warp yarn above 100s, and but little filling yarn above 12s, mainly because the demand is relatively small and it would hardly pay the domestic manufacturer to undertake to produce them. Fine lawns, organdies, muffles, etc., made of the higher range of fine yarns must therefore be purchased abroad. The American cotton industry has no dyewings, and therefore cloths of the fine-ply voiles and fine-ply broadcloths, in which smooth and well-rounded ply yarns of fine counts are essential, must be imported. One domestic firm makes fabrics of quality equal to the imported cloths, using imported yarns, but its plant is not sufficient to supply the domestic demand. Japanese crepe, the only cloth imported from Japan in appreciable quantities, is made of Indian or Chinese cotton, and therefore has a peculiarly rough, strong feel. This type of crepe is not produced in this country and is of a different character from the crepes made of the softer American cotton produced in great quantities by the domestic mills. Included in the imports are varied yarns and cloths made of Egyptian cotton production.

4. Specialty demand: Much of the importation of cotton cloth from France consists of specialties. Substantial amounts of such specialties come from Switzerland and Japan, and smaller amounts from other countries. The range, from voiles, gardens, etc., to fine shirting and broadcloths, ornamented with novelty yarns, to simple shirting fabrics which are of a confined pattern and which the consumer of exclusive taste buys because he has the guaranty that it will be different. The domestic manufacturer, working on a lessened scale of production, is hardly able to offer products that can compete favorably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts. In coutils for corsets, for instance, the American manufacturers supply the bulk demand, which is, in the main, of the lower grades, where the foreign mills are working on the bulk market. Domestic manufacturers are in this respect unable to enter profitably to the demand for fabrics of any one type or design required in small amounts.
INVESTIGATION OF NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that he has appointed the following members of the joint committee under House Joint Resolution No. 237:

Mr. SMITH, Mr. Pittman, and Mr. Cummins.

AGRICULTURE THE BASIC INDUSTRY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) declaring agriculture to be the basic industry of the country, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conference of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. SMITH, Mr. PITTMAN, and Mr. CUMMINS conference on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 646. An act to make valid and enforceable written provisions or agreements for arbitration of disputes arising out of contracts maritime transactions, or commerce among the States or Territories or with foreign nations; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 25. An act to compensate the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for lands disposed of under the provisions of the free homestead act; and

H. R. 5809. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved August 1, 1914; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. J. Res. 283. Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 283) to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 10, 1921; to the Committee on Immigration.

INSPECTION OF RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. S578) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and apparatus therefor," approved February 17, 1911, as amended. It is a question of providing adequate means for the proper inspection of railway locomotives. It is recommended by the President, the Budget, and by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and apparatus therefor," approved February 17, 1911, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"That when used in this act the terms 'carrier' and 'common carrier' mean a common carrier by railroad or partly by railroad and partly by water, in the continental United States, subject to the Interstate commerce act, as amended, excluding street, suburban, and interurban electric railways, unless operated as a part of a general railroad system of transportation."  

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"That it shall be unlawful for any carrier to use or permit to be used on its line any locomotive unless said locomotive, its boiler, tender, and all parts and appurtenances thereof are in proper condition and safe to operate in the service to which the same are put, that the same may be employed in the active service of such carrier without unnecessary peril to life or limb, and unless said locomotive, its boiler, tender, and all parts and appurtenances thereof have been inspected from time to time in accordance with the provisions of this act and are able to withstand such test or tests as may be prescribed in the rules and regulations hereinafter provided for."

Sec. 3. The last sentence of section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"The office of the chief inspector shall be in Washington, D. C., and the Interstate Commerce Commission shall provide such legal, technical, stenographic, and clerical help as the business of the office of the chief inspector and his said assistants may require."

Sec. 4. Section 4 of such act is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph to read as follows:

"Within the appropriations hereof and subject to the provisions of this act, the Interstate Commerce Commission may appoint, from time to time, not more than 15 inspectors in addition to the number authorized in the first paragraph of this section, as the needs of the service may require. Any inspector appointed under this paragraph shall be so named by the chief inspector that his service will be most effective."

Sec. 5. Section 10 of such act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. Hereafter the salary of the chief inspector shall be $8,000 per year; the salary of each assistant chief inspector shall be $5,000 per year; the salary of each inspector shall be $3,600 per year; and the annual allowance for each inspector for office rent, stationery, and travel, and said salary, as fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, shall not exceed $1,000.

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

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have a very important conference report for which I ask immediate consideration. Unless we can give early attention to the matter, the entire bill, carrying about $200,000,000, will fall, because we are in disagreement on quite a number of items.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the conference report must be received.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives to the bill (H. R. 5559) as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Resolved, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 57 and 30 to the bill (H. R. 5559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes and therein.

That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 58, and 59;

That the House agrees to a further conference requested by the Senate on the two disagreeing votes of the Senate thereon and

That Mr. MADSEN, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee are appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

Mr. WARRIN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to a compromise and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 20, 24, 41, 42, 49, and 37.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 11, 16, 17, 19, 22, 25, 26, 38, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1924, $50,000.

"For payment for services rendered the Senate or committees thereof, as follows: John G. Holland, Jr., $250; Ernest K. Hill,


Mr. WARREN. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GOODING. Well, Mr. President, I do not know whether the House would assent to that; but I am afraid the Senate would not.

Mr. WARREN. The President pro tempore, the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to. The President pro tempore declared the amendment to be agreed to, and asked for the call of the roll.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments in disagreement, ask the House for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conference on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two houses.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. HARRIS conferences on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birthday of George Washington, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2887) authorizing transfer of certain abandoned or unused lighthouse reservation lands by the United States to the State of New York for park purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed enrolled bills of the following titles, and they were then read by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 5513. An act to authorize an exchange of lands with the State of Washington;  


H. R. 7998. An act granting public lands to the city of Golden, Colo., to secure a supply of water for municipal and domestic purposes;  

H. R. 8839. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes;  

H. R. 977. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Kittitas and Grant, in the State of Washington, to construct a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Vanport Ferry, Wash.;  

H. R. 9245. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Vanderburgh County, Ind., and Henderson County, Ky.; and  

H. R. 9249. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—WAR FINANCE CORPORATION LOANS

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. Last evening, in the closing hour of the session, Mr. Robinson asked the Corporation of Wyoming what are the outstanding amendments upon which no agreement has been reached?

Mr. WARREN. The outstanding amendments include every item that pertains to reconstruction and farming interests. There are sundry others of which I can give the Senator a list.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was interrupted and did not hear the Senator's answer to the Senator from Arkansas. Will he kindly repeat it as far as he has gone?

Mr. WARREN. So far as the items in disagreement are concerned, they are all in disagreement as to the reconstruction and farming subjects. In addition to that are the items relating to the state investigations, United States marshals in United States courts, the matter of the Leavenworth bridge, and also a number of minor matters, but the main ones I have stated.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senate agree that the conference has reached with reference to the Veterans' Bureau hospital item?

Mr. WARREN. There has been no agreement reached with reference to that item.

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

The report was agreed to. 

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments in disagreement, ask the House for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conference on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two houses.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. HARRIS conferences on the part of the Senate.
The reading clerk read as follows:

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION,
THE TREASURY BUILDING,
Washington, June 7, 1924.

HON. FRANK R. GOODING,
United States Senate.

Mr. DEAR SENATOR GOODING: You have asked me to confirm in writing the opinions and explanations which I gave to you this morning as to the legality of certain loans made by the War Finance Corporation to a loan company, secured by the note of a corporation in which you are financially interested.

The loan in question was made to the Southern Idaho Loan Co., a livestock loan company, against its promissory note, secured by a number of notes of Livestock growers, among them being a corporation of which you own a substantial stock interest.

Section 114 of the Penal Code makes it unlawful for any Member of Congress to "undertake, execute, hold, or enjoy in whole or in part, any contract or agreement made or entered into in behalf of the United States by any officer or person authorized to make contracts on its behalf."

Section 115 makes it unlawful for an officer of the United States, on behalf of the United States, to enter into any contract with any Member of Congress.

Section 116 provides that "nothing contained in the two preceding sections shall extend, or be construed to extend, to any contract or agreement made or entered into, or accepted by any incorporated company, where such contract or agreement is made for the general benefit of such incorporated company or company."

Even if the sections above referred to are applicable to loans made by the War Finance Corporation, it is apparent that no violation has been nor is likely to be committed in the present case. The loan was made by the War Finance Corporation to a loan company which pledged as security a note of a corporation in which you hold stock. There was, therefore, no contract made between yourself and the War Finance Corporation and the provision of section 116 relating to contracts with a corporation in which a Member of Congress may be interested expressly covers the case.

Moreover, in the light of recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court, it is clear that a contract made by the War Finance Corporation is not a contract made on behalf of the United States with the meaning of penal provisions. The Supreme Court has so held in the case of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation (U. S. v. Strang, 254 U. S. 491), and the same reasoning is applicable to the War Finance Corporation, which is incorporated by special act of Congress. Indeed the War Finance Corporation act specifically provides that the United States is not liable for any obligation incurred by the corporation.

Of course, you understand that it is not a part of my official duties to give opinions upon the interpretations of the criminal laws of the United States. It is, however, my duty, as general counsel of the War Finance Corporation, to ascertain that loans made by the War Finance Corporation are made in accordance with law, and from this point of view I have examined the case with confidence that the transactions in question were not in violation of sections 114 to 116 of the Penal Code. The loans in question were made, as are all loans of the War Finance Corporation, in aid of the livestock industry as a whole of the security rendered and without regard to what individuals may be interested therein.

Yours very truly,

GERALD C. HENDRICKSON,
General Counsel.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, I felt last night that the Senator from Virginia did not intend, of course, to cast any reflection on my acts in this matter because I had not willfully violated the law and the law had not been violated. I am glad to have him make the statement which he has that, in his opinion, I am completely exonerated from violating a penal statute, and I get the reflection of any public service that I am going to know in my own conscience that I have never intentionally violated any law of my country.

Mr. President, I am entitled to have Senate Resolution 208, in which I have asked for an investigation of my acts in connection with this loan, disposed of in some way or other by the Senate, and I therefore ask for its immediate consideration.

I will say, Mr. President, that I should like to have a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate make a statement in regard to a letter which he received from the War Finance Corporation. It was charged that I had secured loans to the injury of the farmers of my State. No part of that is true. I spent more time in the early days of my service in the Senate in trying to secure relief for the farmers of my State through the War Finance Corporation than along any other line. There were some disappointments. The law did not go far enough to take care of the individual farmer, and in my State nearly 2,500 farmers were taken care of, and I know that it was more or less through my efforts that corporations were formed in Idaho that gave farmers an opportunity to secure loans, and in some communities the farmers were saved their homesteads.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 208, which I have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. The Secretary will read the resolution.

Resolved, That the President of the Senate pro tempore is authorized to appoint a special committee of three Members of the Senate to investigate and report to the Senate as soon as practicable the facts in respect of the activities of the War Finance Corporation in distributing loans and advances for agricultural and livestock purposes in the State of Idaho, and particularly any alleged favoritism shown in such distribution to FRANK R. GOODING, a Senator from the State of Idaho, or any member of his family, or any of his business associates.

The committee is authorized to hold hearings, to sit during the sessions and recesses of the Sixty-eighth Congress, and to employ such stenographic and other assistants as it may deem advisable. The committee is further authorized to send for persons and papers; to require by subpoena the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; and to take testimony.

All fees and expenses of witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. GOODING. I send to the desk a short letter from the War Finance Corporation, which I ask may be read, and then I shall have said my last word. I hope the Senate will take some action on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION,
April 22, 1922.

HON. F. R. GOODING,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your letter of April 22, would say that I do not find anywhere in our files any reference to an application made on behalf of the Canyon County Farm Bureau for a loan. If such an application was made, it would necessarily be made through one of the classes of financing organizations through which we are authorized under the law to make loans. Canyon County is within easy reaching distance of Boise, where the War Finance Corporation has its office. Any loan is made direct to the local agency. I do not, however, find any correspondence from or in regard to the organization in question.

I find that on April 24, 1922, you wrote Hon. Dwight F. Davis, Director of the War Finance Corporation, asking for information from various Idaho people with regard to War Finance Corporation loans,
asking that the situation referred to be looked into. Congressman Smith also wrote Mr. Meyer about the same time, and I find that Mr. Davis answered your letter the same day he received it. The matter referred to in that correspondence was all straightened out.

We do not, of course, know what inquiries may have been made of the bank, but I am satisfied that no one ever approached the agency with reasonable security for an agricultural loan was discouraged or turned down. Possibly more banks could have applied for loans than did, but that is a matter over which the corporation has no control. The livestock loan companies in your State have been doing particularly good work. The last day or two a very considerable portion of the work of the corporation has been in the renewal and extension of loans of from $100 to $1,500, and averaging about $500, on dairy cows through the Northside Live Stock Loan Co. at Jerome.

Yours very truly,

P. W. Mondaell.
and the officers of the Railway Mail Service $300 each, and in some instances more. It increases the salaries of clerks and carriers engaged on the rural mail routes for each carrier on a standard route. These increases apply alike to all classes of post offices. They ignore the fact that there is a wide difference in the cost of living in the larger cities and industrial centers as compared with the smaller cities and towns. If there is real need for revision of salaries in the Postal Service, it is to provide a wage differential for those employees serving in post offices located in the large cities and industrial centers. There is no justification for increasing salaries to apply to all offices when the need for such increases does not apply to a large number of the offices. Aside from this, no provision is made in this bill for raising the money which would be required to meet the additional expenditures which it proposes. Under its provisions we would be required to take an additional amount of approximately $88,000,000 per year from the moneys paid by the taxpayers and pass it on to the employees of the Postal Service. Certainly the interests of the people demand that any legislation increasing the cost of the Postal Service should give consideration to the raising of the moneys necessary to defray the additional cost.

For the fiscal year 1923 the postal revenues were $32,000,000 less than the cost of the service for that year. This deficit has been met from the moneys paid by the taxpayers. We should not add to the amount of the postal deficit, as is proposed by this bill, but should attempt as a sound business principle to have the users of the mails approximately pay the cost of the service. The law governs the Postmaster General in the power, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to increase parcel-post rates. Even if the proposed increase of $88,000,000 contemplated by this bill was justified, it would make it impossible for the users of the parcel post to recoup the whole amount in that manner, but it would be wholly impracticable to secure it from the parcel-post business without destroying that service. The farmers, who are the largest users of the parcel post, are not in a position to contribute a large sum to the postal employees.

The Post Office Department is now engaged by direction of Congress in the ascertainment of which amount of money was appropriated. This inquiry has been prosecuted with diligence and is nearing completion. When the results of this inquiry are available they will form the basis for an intelligent consideration by the Postmaster General and by Congress of all questions relating to the adequacy of postage rates. They will afford a proper basis for consideration of the relation of the cost of the Postal Service and the revenues derived therefrom. The time has arrived to consider putting the Postal Service on a sound business basis, so far as expenditures and revenues are concerned. It is apparent that the matter of increasing the salaries of postal employees should be considered in connection with the rates and methods by which the postal revenues may be correspondingly increased, not apart therefrom. This report will be available when the Congressional sessions in December, and this matter can then be considered.

If this provision stood alone, I should approve that part of the bill relating to campaign funds.

C. ALVIN CULHANE

The WHITE HOUSE, June 7, 1924.

REMISSION OF CUSTOMS DUTIES ON GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. KING obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to enable me to report a House bill?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is the least objection to it, I will withdraw it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if it is privileged, I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am reporting the House passed House bill 9111, a bill directing the remission of customs duties on certain property of the United States imported by the War Department. The War Department has imported $316,640 worth of material into the United States. In order to give the customs officials legal authority for free entry of all dutiable supplies so returned, I ask that this bill, passed by the House yesterday, be considered and passed here.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I do not lose the floor, I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was about to state the question when the Senator from Utah arose. The question is: Shall the bill pass the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the senior Senator from Utah? Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not yield for that purpose if it jeopardizes my right to hold the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will hold that the Senator from Utah retains the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have no objection, then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9111) directing the remission of customs duties on certain property of the United States imported by the War Department, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to remit all unpaid customs duties on material belonging to the United States and heretofore imported into the United States by the War Department.

Mr. WALSCH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what is the nature of the property that has been imported by the War Department, in a general way?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would refer the Senator from Utah to the report of the Committee on Appropriations, which was reported on November 11, 1918, and November 11, 1919, there were imported airplanes and spare parts, balloons and balloon supplies, aviators' clothing, hydrogenic and photographic material, to the extent of $28,967,239.

Mr. WALSCH of Massachusetts. Is it new material purchased abroad?

Mr. SMOOT. No, it is material of the Government.

Mr. WALSCH of Massachusetts. Is it material the Government has had in France and is bringing back?

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what it is.

Mr. WALSCH of Massachusetts. So there is new material involved?

Mr. SMOOT. Not a dollar's worth.

Mr. WALSCH of Massachusetts. I have no objection.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to say, without taking the Senator from Utah off the floor, that it is within the power of the Senate, if it so desires, to fix some other time for the consideration of the veto message.

Mr. KING. Mr. President. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. President, a few days ago, as I was proceeding to state, the Senate passed—

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I yield a question, if I do not jeopardize my standing.

Mr. BURSUM. Will the Senator yield to permit me to take up a conference report?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is that privileged?

Mr. BURSUM. Yes.

Mr. KING. Will the conference report have a privileged status?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report is privileged for the purpose of presenting it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator yields the floor for that purpose, it will take him off the floor.

Mr. KING. Then, if that is true, I should not care to yield for that purpose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is what it will do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BURSUM. Did I understand the Senator to yield or not to yield?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I do not yield, I would lose the right to the floor upon the conclusion of the consideration of that report, and in view of that fact I can not yield. I regret it, because I should be glad to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not hold that the Chair's pardon. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate from Tennessee held that the PRESIDENT pro tempore. May I inquire of the Chair, because I feel that conference reports are entitled to consideration, whether I would jeopardize my right to resume the floor if I yield for the consideration of a conference report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the veto message is the question before the Senate until
It is otherwise disposed of, and that the Senator would not lose his right to the floor by yielding for the purpose of considering the conference report, assuming it is done by unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it takes unanimous consent, I object. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not take unanimous consent to present the report. It requires the action of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. BURSUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas. Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senate from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] indicated a few moments ago that he desired to request consideration of unobjeeted bills upon the calendar under Rule VIII for a period of two hours. I am wondering if an arrangement of that kind can be effected. I am not submitting any request for unanimous consent. I understand he intends so to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. Mr. ROBINSON. Would the Senator from Utah object to an arrangement by which the Senate could proceed, after the considerat of the conference report, to the consideration of unobjeeted bills upon the calendar under Rule VIII for a period of two hours? I have no right to submit the request in the name of the Senator from Arkansas. I would be very happy to, with the consent of the Senator from Maine, but I feel under moral obligations to carry out a promise which I made, so I can not, without his consent.

Mr. NORRIS. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to ask the Senator if he would not be willing to yield so that we could have morning business? We adjourned last night, and there are a few reports of the Senate waiting for submittal. I know I am interested in one from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenditures of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest--

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON. That we can have morning business disposed of without regard to the desire of the Senator who has the floor?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to take the Senator off his feet.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator would not want to interfere with the morning business?

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. NORRIS. I would rather have an understanding to regard to it.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senate, in all candor, that a bill was passed the other day, the naval bill, authorizing the expenditure of a very large sum of money. It was passed at a time when, in my judgment, it should not have been passed. There was no opportunity given for several of us who desire to debate it to present our views. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has a good point of order. If I may use the expression—and I left the Chamber only for a moment, with the understanding that the Senator from Idaho would remain here—Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me at that juncture?

Mr. KING. I would be very glad to.

Mr. BORAH. The situation, as I understood it, was this, that the naval bill was to be the unfinished business, and that if we made the unfinished business, we were to take up executive business.

Mr. KING. I am glad to be corrected. At any rate, the Senator from Idaho received such assurances that he felt perfectly at ease, and left the Chamber. I returned to the Chamber within five or six minutes and discovered that the bill had been passed without a moment's consideration. Perhaps its time has passed.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I thereupon moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill had passed, and the motion for reconsideration is pending.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Maine, as he had a right, of course, to have the motion for reconsideration disposed of at an early date, that I would seek recognition this morning, and that if I should be recognized I would proceed to a discussion of that bill and such other business as I might feel disposed to indulge in. I have in good faith sought recognition—Mr. ROBINSON. I inquire of the Senator from Utah if he would just as leave proceed after morning business has been disposed of?

Mr. KING. I would be very glad to.

Mr. ROBINSON. I call for the regular order. Mr. KING. It would accommodate me very much, for the reason that a very important committee is now waiting for me; but I can not do it, under the promise I made to the Senator from Maine, unless he will release me from that promise, and if he will assent to an arrangement by which we may proceed to the consideration of unobjeeted bills during the morning hour, or look after the business of the morning hour, and that I can take the floor then, I shall be very glad to accede to the request of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think, in view of what has been said about the bill for the construction of new cruisers and for other purposes, to which the Senator has alluded, I will make some comments about the bill having been passed without debate. Early last week I secured a special order whereby that bill took its place upon the calendar—

Mr. KING. Does the Senator ask me to yield?

Mr. HALE. I ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. KING. I can not yield. The Senator can make his explanation in his own time.

Mr. NORRIS. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. I call for the regular order.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Senator from Arkansas has demanded the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order at the present moment is the consideration of the President's veto message—

Mr. NORRIS. The regular order is morning business, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is the disposition of the morning business. The Senate adjourned last evening, and the regular order is the morning business. I make a point of order that the regular order of business is the morning business of the Senate, under the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas remember the clause in the Constitution which makes it the duty of Congress to consider the disposition of the message—unless—while the Constitution does not so declare—the Senate or the House of Representatives shall otherwise dispose of the matter. The Chair recognizes that it is within the power of the Senate to refer the message, or to postpone its consideration to another time, but the Chair has no option in regard to what he must do if there is no other disposition of the matter.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I have the floor.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. For a question. May I say that I shall not yield if in any manner my right to maintain the floor is jeopardized. I am very happy to yield whenever I can do so, with that reservation.

Mr. STERLING. I do not believe it would take the floor from the Senator; at least, I would like to have an understanding that it does not take the floor from the Senator. Mr. President, I wanted to make a motion relative to the veto message of the President on the postal salaries bill. I make that motion. If the Senator from Utah will yield for that purpose—

Mr. KING. A parliamentary inquiry, in my own time. If I yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator from South Dakota to move to refer this message to the appropriate committee, with the consent of the Senate, I would not lose his right to retain the floor, but it would be subject to a demand for the regular order.
Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from South Dakota whether the motion which he would like to make, and which I have yielded for him to make, will lead to any debate?

Mr. STERLING. I think not. I do not think it will. At least, I shall not want to debate the motion, and I hardly think the Senator does want to do so. Mr. KING. I dislike to make these qualifications, but I feel compelled to. If there will be no debate, if the motion will go pro formas, and the message be referred to the appropriate committees and it do not lose my right to retain the floor, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Mr. LODGE. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not think any Senator can agree that there will be no debate on an important matter.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I am afraid I shall have to say no.

Mr. STERLING. The subject of the President's veto Mr. KING. I yield for a question.

Mr. STERLING. The postal salaries bill is before the Senate, as I understand it, the President of the Senate being about to submit to a vote of the Senate the question as to whether the bill shall pass or not, the President's veto to the contrary notwithstanding. My motion is—and I make it now—that the veto message of the President on the postal salary bill—

Mr. KING. I did not yield for that purpose.

Mr. STERLING. Be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The President pro tem. The Senate refuses to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. Before the Senator takes his seat—

The President pro tem. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the President pro tem. The Senator from Arkansas. Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I have demanded the regular order and suggested to the Chair that the regular order is the correct proceeding in the circumstances. There is nothing in the Constitution that prescribes the time or manner in which either House of Congress shall proceed to the consideration of a veto message.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment? I presume the Senator from Arkansas is rising to a parliamentary inquiry, and that, of course, would not take me from the floor, and I yield to that understanding.

Mr. ROBINSON. I make the point of order that the regular order is the transaction of morning business under the rules of the Senate. There is nothing in the Constitution that contradicts that proposition. The practice of the Senate of the House of Representatives is to proceed to the consideration of executive messages at the pleasure of the respective bodies. The Constitution does not require that upon the presentation of a veto message the bill shall be immediately considered, the practice has never been to do that. A veto message may be deferred, and under the rules of the Senate the proper procedure is the consideration of morning business, and in that contention the Senator from Massachusetts agrees with me absolutely.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on that point I would like to read.

Mr. KING. I yield—

Mr. NORRIS. An extract from the Constitution.

Mr. KING. For a parliamentary question.

Mr. NORRIS. It bears on the parliamentary situation.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The language I am about to read is in section 7, Article I, of the Constitution, and speaking of the duty of the President in signing a bill or returning it with his objections, this language is used:

If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, which shall enter the objections at large on their Journal and proceed to reconsider it.

It seems to me technically right to say, under the Constitution, that we have no right to consider it except by unanimous consent until those objections of the President have been entered on the Journal.

Mr. ROBINSON. Nearly that is true. Mr. NORRIS. That has not yet been done. Mr. ROBINSON. We could not even consider it now if the Senate desired to do so, upon objection. A motion to proceed to the consideration of the Executive message would be defeated upon a point of order that the objections have not been entered upon the Journal, because the Constitution itself requires that they be entered before the bill is considered until the objections shall have been entered on the Journal, and that has not been done. It could not have been done, because the message has just reached the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. It has not even been printed. The regular order of business is the morning business of the Senate, and I make the point of order and demand the regular order, which is that the Senate proceed to morning business. When the order is asked for, the Chair that the objections of the President have been entered in full on the Journal, then it will be in order for some Senator to move to consideration of the Executive veto message, but not until that has been done, under the express terms of the Constitution.

Mr. STERLING and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The President pro tem. The Chair is inclined to believe that the point of order now made is well taken and that the bill shall not be reconsidered until the objections of the President shall have been entered on the Journal.

Mr. KING and Mr. STERLING addressed the Chair.

The President pro tem. Will Senators allow the Chair to rule?

Mr. KING. With very great deference, of course.

The President pro tem. Therefore the veto message is not before the Senate at this time. On the demand for the regular order, the Chair holds that the regular order is the presentation of petitions and memorials.

Mr. KING and Mr. STERLING addressed the Chair.

The President pro tem. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. KING. I presume at the close of the morning hour I will be entitled to consideration at the hands of the distinguished President Officier.

The President pro tem. The Chair pledges nothing to the Senator from Utah upon that point. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw for the present the motion made a moment ago.

Mr. ROBINSON. I demand the regular order.

The President pro tem. The Chair has called for the regular order.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. I suggest that it be enforced.

The President pro tem. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order. There being none, reports of committees are in order.

DISTRICT COURT CLERKS' FEES

Mr. BRANDEGE. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably, without amendment, three House bills, and I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Firezla] to one of them. I desire to state that the committee has only reported the House bills that are now upon the Senate Calendar. These bills came over from the House as passed by the House, and the committee has been polled and authorized their report, because they have already reported the same bills. The Senator from Pennsylvania desires to make a motion.

Mr. PEPPER. After the bills have been reported—

The President pro tem. (Rapping for order.) The Senate must be in order. Proceedings can not go on until the Senate is in order. Will Senators who are on their feet take their seats and will the bystanders take the seats provided for them? The Senate must be in order.

Mr. PEPPER. After the bills have been reported I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate to make a very brief statement in explanation of them.

The President pro tem. Is there objection to a statement being made by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the request?

Mr. FLETCHER. Has there been unanimous consent granted for consideration of the report?

Mr. BRANDEGER. I reported the bill from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON. And now is it proposed to get unanimous consent to consider three at once?

Mr. BRANDEGER. No. If the Senator will allow me, they are very short bills that have been passed by the House and have been previously reported to the Senate by the Judiciary Committee, and it was agreed that the Senate should pass the House bills. It ought to take only a moment.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is a question of unanimous consent before either the Senate or the House bills can be considered?

Mr. BRANDEGER. Oh, certainly.
Mr. PEPPER. I merely did not wish to interrupt the process of reporting the bill. I am going to make a request for unanimous consent when it has been made in equity?

Mr. PEPPER. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the measure, and crave the indulgence of the Senator from Utah, if he has the floor, to make this brief statement respecting it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. A series of bills relating to practice in the offices of clerks of the United States courts throughout the country were introduced into both Houses at the request of the American Bar Association. The bills were referred in both Houses to the Judiciary Committee, in both Houses were reported out unanimously, and three of those bills have now passed the House, and are the three which have just been referred to by the Senator from Connecticut.

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

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Why were they embraced within three bills instead of one bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Each of the bills relate to a distinct and specific subject matter.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let us take them one at a time.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I am proposing to do. Only one of the bills has been reported, and it is to that one that I am addressing myself.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, is this the bill that proposes to give the Supreme Court power to make rules for legal proceedings, as it has now made them in equity?

Mr. PEPPER. Not at all, Mr. President. The bill relates merely to a matter affecting the convenience of practitioners in courts of the United States, substituting a different arrangement of fee bills for that which now exists, simplifying the accounting, and making certain what the charges are that the clerks are to make to suitors in United States courts.

Mr. SHIELDS. I object to the consideration of the bill.

Let the bill go over. There are several bills that have been reported on that subject from the American Bar Association, and I shall object to all of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate at this time is not permissible. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Tennessee objects to all the bills.

Mr. SHIELDS. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the regular order will be resumed. Are there further reports of the committees?

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BRANDEES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 5423) to amend section 2 of the act of August 1, 1888 (28 Stat. 1, p. 357); and

A bill (H. R. 5425) to provide for the disposition of moneys paid to or received by any official as a bribe, which may be used as evidence, in any case growing out of any such transaction.

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3384) to amend section 25 of the interstate commerce act, as amended, reported it with amendments.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 227) to authorize an adjustment of the city of New York for expenses incurred on behalf of the United States during the Civil War, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. KEYES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of Congress, to which were referred the following resolutions, reported them each without amendment:

A resolution (S. Res. 244) continuing until the end of the Sixty-eighth Congress the employment of an assistant clerk to the Clerk of the District of Columbia; and

A resolution (S. Res. 250) authorizing payment to Emma B. Woods, widow of the late Elliott Woods.

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported on June 8, that committee presented to the President of the United States an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 906. An act for the continuation of construction work on the San Carlos Federal Irrigation project in Arizona, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution providing for the United States Government to have representation at the celebration of the centennial of the first meeting of the Legislative Council of the Territory of Florida.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CONTINGENT EXPENSES

Mr. KEYES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably (S. J. Res. 216), as follows:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Reclamation be authorized to appoint a subcommittee to visit the Trinity project in Nebraska during the recess of Congress and report to the full committee on the practicability of said project and the advisability of instituting the same. There is hereby appropriated out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $500 for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said investigation."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Reclamation be authorized to appoint a subcommittee to visit the Trinity project in Nebraska during the recess of Congress and report to the full committee on the practicability of said project and the advisability of instituting the same. There is hereby appropriated out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $500 for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said investigation.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Reclamation be authorized to appoint a subcommittee to visit the Trinity project in Nebraska during the recess of Congress and report to the full committee on the practicability of said project and the advisability of instituting the same. There is hereby appropriated out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $500 for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Reclamation be authorized to appoint a subcommittee to visit the Trinity project in Nebraska during the recess of Congress and report to the full committee on the practicability of said project and the advisability of instituting the same. There is hereby appropriated out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $500 for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said investigation.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Reclamation be authorized to appoint a subcommittee to visit the Trinity project in Nebraska during the recess of Congress and report to the full committee on the practicability of said project and the advisability of instituting the same. There is hereby appropriated out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $500 for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Reclamation be authorized to appoint a subcommittee to visit the Trinity project in Nebraska during the recess of Congress and report to the full committee on the practicability of said project and the advisability of instituting the same. There is hereby appropriated out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $500 for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said investigation.
The distinctive feature of this project is that it lies well within the area where the rainfall is almost, but not quite, sufficient for the satisfactory production of crops. There is needed a supplemental supply of water to insure more certain and profitable production. The early contemplation of this project was to meet the situation entirely different from the storage of water in the subsurface. This project is, therefore, a departure from the usual custom of establishing irrigation projects under recognized arid conditions and it comes into consideration the possibilities of subsurface storage of water. Certain questions concerning the feasibility of the project have arisen. These questions are: first, The average deficiency of rainfall during the growing season; second, whether or not the supplemental water to be supplied will increase the rainfall deficiency; third, what increase in crop production may be expected from supplemental irrigation. This brief report will be an answer to these questions. More detailed information concerning soils, climate, crop yields, and the value of supplemental water is furnished in the report written by Mr. A. Lincoln Fellows, of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Location of Project: This project is located in south-central Nebraska, comprising portions of Adams, Knox, Phelps, and Gosper Counties. It lies between north latitudes 40° 20' and 40° 40', and west longitudes 98° 10' and 98° 35'. It is bounded on the north by the breaks of the Platte River which are irregular, more or less savage and unirrigated. On the south and west it is bounded by highly dissected and eroded portions of the plain, locally known as Canyon Lands. On the east it expands into a comparatively level plain, to which rather heavy textured soil. It is approximately 63 miles in length, or from 10,500 miles in width and comprises some 500,000 acres of irrigable land.

Topography: The project lies on an extensive upland prairie table, that according to the agricultural agents of the various counties, is slightly undulating; natural drainage is fairly well established in the eastern portion of the area but in the western portion the drainage is into depressional areas or basins which are yet have not established complete drainage outlet to the rivers.

Elevation: The elevation is from 1,900 feet above sea level in the eastern portion of the area to 2,000 feet above sea level in the western portion of the area, the slope to the east being approximately 8 feet per mile. This is a abrupt slope southeast toward the Republican River valley.

Climate

The project lies in what is known as the subhumid area between the humid and the arid districts. Of the several climatic factors that influence crop production the rainfall affects throughout this area makes crop production hazardous. Drought, resulting either from an insufficient total supply of rainfall or from a very unfavorable distribution of the rainfall that does come is of frequent occurrence. These periods of drought, coupled with the loss of a considerable portion of the virgin fertility of the soil, combine to give quite generally low yields of crops. The crop record for the past 20 years shows that in not more than one year out of five are profitable crops produced.

The temperature ranges from a mean of 41° F. for January to a mean of 75° F. for July, with rare extremes as low as 40° below and 111° above. The storms, which occur in the winter, make the production of all crops common to the general territory. The relative humidity is a little lower than in eastern Nebraska, which tends to decrease somewhat the efficiency of a given amount of rain. It is only during periods of drought and high winds that the temperature, wind velocity, and relative humidity become injurious to crop production. During such periods they combine to greatly increase the rate of transpiration and the consequent demand of the crop for water. If the soil is lacking in moisture injury results. The amount of damage depends upon the dryness of the soil and length of time such unfavorable conditions obtain.

Precaution: Rainfall is the one great limiting factor of crop production within the area. Not only is the total amount generally insufficient for good crop yields, but the distribution is uncertain and frequently very unfavorable. Droughts of greater or lesser severity are frequent, occurring almost every year, and in the mean, during the past 20 years, have resulted in unprofitably low yields. While the rainfall is probably as favorable as formerly, there has been a gradual loss of organic matter from the cultivated soil, which has made it less efficient and has necessitated the use of more manure in crop yields. The difficulty of putting the land to grass or legumes under a limited rainfall makes the maintenance of the organic content of the soil almost impossible.

INADQUACY OF PRESENT RAINFALL

The mean annual rainfall at Holdrege, Minata, and Hastings Government weather stations are 23.35, 24.05, and 25.42 inches, respectively, and average 24.27 inches for the three stations. The average annual precipitation of the three stations has varied in the 20 years, 1904 to 1923, from a minimum of 18.27 in 1921 to a maximum of 40.46 inches in 1915. In 20 years 14 years have been below average, averaging inches. The 6 years above normal have averaged 9 inches. The variation in average annual rainfall at the three stations is shown in Figure I.

The rainfall in the area is of the continental type, the periods of the maximum and minimum rain being in winter and summer, respectively. Figure II shows the distribution of the average rainfall at the three stations by months, — inches of rainfall during the six summer months, April 1 to September 30. May and June are, on the average, the wettest months of the year, while Periods of the months following the summer months are almost rainless or are relatively so.

In order to show the adequacy or inadequacy of a 24-inch annual rainfall, more than two-thirds of which falls during the growing season, it is necessary to take a number of things into consideration, such as the nature of the rainfall and the frequency and severity of rainless periods.

NATURE OF THE RAINFALL

To determine the nature of the rainfall rains have been divided into four classes, viz.: (1) 0—24 inches, light showers, invariably valueless; (2) 25—49 inches, medium showers, generally valueless, reduced yields of wheat, even when falling as an isolated rain, between April 1 and October 31; (3) 50—99 inches, light rains; (4) 1 inch and over. The two latter classes of rains have more or less value, depending upon their frequency, and together make up the effective precipitation for the irrigation of crops.

Chart 6 [omitted in RECORD] shows the distribution of the four classes of rains in winter and summer at Holdrege, based on 20 years' records. The months included in the winter period are October to March, inclusive, and the months included in the summer period are April to September, inclusive. At Holdrege 78.6% of the total precipitation comes during the six summer months; 18.60% of the total 23.35 inches falls during the winter. About half the average rainfall for the years above the average shown in Chart 6 comes during long stretches of rainless periods.

FREQUENCY OF THE DROUGHT PERIODS

One of the peculiarities of the section of the Great Plains in which this project is located is the frequent occurrence of prolonged dry periods, during which little or no rain falls. These periods are usually terminated by a succession of heavy rains, which make an average of the rainfall by months over a period of years appear favorable for the country, whereas many a single season may have been disastrous in one way or another.

Periods during which crops are most affected by shortage of moisture may be described as follows:

1. April 1 to May 15. High winds which drift the loose, dry soil and uproot small grains occur frequently and often are responsible for reduced yields of wheat, even when succeeding moisture conditions are highly favorable. The germination and early growth of oats is more or less seriously affected by shortage of rain during this period. Unless the soil be well filled with moisture, a period of 30 days at this season may have little or no rain, and if sudden moist precipitation occurs as a result of this period, it may do serious damage to corn. Occasionally such periods are made more serious by the winter being unusually open and dry.

2. May 15 to July 1. Intense winds which increase the evaporating power of the air are frequently experienced, occasionally with heavy rains. About 10 days during this period are free, during which little or no rain falls, in 1915. In this period corn is transpiring water often at the rate of a quarter inch during July, and herein consists its importance as a grazing crop. The dryness of the surface soil at this period is unfavorable for germination and early growth of corn. Unless a soil be filled with moisture to a depth of 4 feet or more, a period of 30 days with little or no rainfall coming at this season may be disastrous for the wheat and oat crop.

3. July 1 to August 21. High temperatures reaching 100° to 108° can be expected during this period. Hot winds blowing around August 1 may do serious damage to corn when it is tasseling or silking. During this period corn is transpiring water at the rate of a quarter inch of rainfall daily. A period of 30 days during which little or no rain falls coming at this season may ruin a corn crop, unless the soil be well filled with water to the full depth of root penetration.

4. August 21 to October 31. During the first half of the season the land is being prepared for winter wheat. A rainless period at this time seriously interferes with tillage operations and leads to delayed work, which may prove an unsatisfactory condition. Seeding, which should normally be over by October 1, must be accomplished during the last week of September. In order to insure its germination and growth. It is highly important that the soil be filled with water to a depth of 3 feet or more if wheat is to germinate and early growth of good prospects as severe droughts and intense winds in early April. A period of 30 days either in the first or the last part of this season during which little or no rain falls is often a serious handicap in the succeeding year's wheat crop.

The drought periods of 30 or more days between April 1 and October 31, and during which no rain at all is commonly in this section, but periods of 30 days or more during which no effective rainfall occurs in about one year in two. Periods of 30 days or more during
which less than 1 inch of effective rain falls are very common. There has not been a single year in the last 20 years at either Hastings, Minden, or Holdrege in which such dry periods have not occurred from one to four times between the dates of April 1 and October 31.

Table 1, 2, and 3 show the frequency of dry periods at Hastings, Minden, and Holdrege. A dry period is considered as being a period of 30 days or longer during which less than 1 inch of effective rain has fallen. By effective rain is meant any rain of over 0.50 inch or rains of over 0.50 inch falling on consecutive days. The experience in the Great Plains has been that daily precipitation of less than 0.50 inch is generally values less than the standpoint of a drought. At Hastings in the last 20 years 42 dry periods have occurred, averaging 46.1 inch daily and during which only 0.60 inch effective precipitation occurred. At Minden 44 such periods have occurred, averaging 44 days each, with 0.41 inch effective rains. At Holdrege 48 dry periods have occurred, averaging 48 days each, with 0.47 inch of effective rainfall.

The distribution of dry periods is shown in Charts 4 and 5 (mounted in Record). These charts also show graphically the yield of corn and wheat during the same years. The seriousness of the dry period of over 40 days will depend upon conditions of moisture preceding the drought and when the dry period begins and ends. However, when such dry periods come as frequently as they do in central Nebraska it is probable that damage results almost every year.

Table No. 1.—Frequency of dry periods at Hastings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Length (Days)</th>
<th>Total rainfall (Inches)</th>
<th>Effective rainfall</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Apr. 26-May 31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>May 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Apr. 27-May 31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>May 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>May 1-July 11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>July 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>May 19-Aug. 29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>Aug. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>May 22-Aug. 11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Aug. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>May 22-Aug. 10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>May 30-Aug. 9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>May 31-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>May 30-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>May 31-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>May 30-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>May 31-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>May 30-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>May 31-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>May 30-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>May 31-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>May 30-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>May 31-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>May 30-Aug. 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average dry periods in 25 years: 46.18 inches.

Table No. 2.—Frequency of dry periods at Minden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Length (Days)</th>
<th>Total rainfall (Inches)</th>
<th>Effective rainfall</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average dry periods in 25 years: 33.18 inches.

Table No. 3.—Frequency of dry periods at Holdrege

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Length (Days)</th>
<th>Total rainfall (Inches)</th>
<th>Effective rainfall</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Apr. 1-May 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average dry periods in 25 years: 33.18 inches.

Indecisive Rainfall for Corn Production

That a period of drought coming between July 1 and August 25 may ruin a corn crop is well known to all farmers in central Nebraska. That such a disaster can be averted or at least mitigated to a considerable extent by adequate moisture up to July 1 is not well understood.

If the soil is well filled with water on July 1, as would be the case if rainfall during the preceding spring and fall had been heavy, a good crop of corn can usually be expected. Only the most extreme conditions at the most critical stage in the corn's development can bring about serious damage. Table No. 4 shows the correlation of
the effective rainfall which has gone to produce the corn crops with yield in Adams and Phelps Counties since 1905, the data being arranged in descending order of yields, not chronologically. The same data are shown graphically in chart. It is obvious that the effective rainfall during fall and spring up to July 1 is what determines the yield of corn. The only exceptions have been the years 1907, 1913, and 1918, when with adequate moisture on the soil for a good crop, a seriously reduced yield was caused by extremely dry and hot weather in July and August.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Adams County</th>
<th>Phelps County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yield per ac</td>
<td>Effective rain up to July 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>19.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>17.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>18.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>18.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>18.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>15.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>13.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALUE OF SUPPLEMENTAL WATER

Supplemental irrigation contemplates the application to the soil of sufficient water to make up the difference between the crop requirements and the rainfall. The water may be applied either before the crop is seeded and held in storage in the subsoil, or as a direct application to the growing crop. The fact that a deficiency of rainfall can in a large measure be met by water stored in the soil is generally recognized. The experience of farmers in the Great Plains has been that in those years when they had a considerable amount of water in the soil at seeding time, either as carry over from the previous year or from early spring rains, they were much more certain of satisfactory yields. In years when they were found the entire soil dry. In the latter case the crop is entirely dependent upon opportunie rains, while a reserve supply of water tends to ensure the crop through the dry period. For several years, farmers near Lexington, Nebr., have been practicing supplemental irrigation and report greatly increased yields of crops from the practice.

The value of water stored in the soil has also been demonstrated by many experiment stations. At North Platte Experiment Station it has been found that an abundance of water in the subsoil is a great protection to the crop against drought, the protection being in almost exact proportion to the total available soil water within reach of the crop. This was found particularly true for the small grains. Of the 1915 and 1917 years, during the 10 years that the station has been under operation, the water stored by spring rains was greater than doubled the yield of winter wheat, as compared to winter wheat following small grain. Several years during this time only 2 or 3 inches of water had been applied. It has been claimed that water in storage in the soil will completely produce a crop, but with considerable water in the subsoil there are very few years when there is not sufficient rainfall to produce quite satisfactory crops. Mr. Zook, in Nebraska Experiment Station Bulletin 192, says: "Average yields per acre of all crops were higher on fallow than under any system of continuous cropping. Yields of grain on fallow were frequently more than double those of grain after grain. Of crops grown on fallow the largest gains were made by winter wheat and the smallest by corn."

In Circular No. 72, of the Kansas State Agricultural College, Mr. George P. Knapp reports: "Experiments at the Garden City Branch Experiment Station, covering a period of five years, have shown that sufficient water can be stored in the soil by winter irrigation alone to produce good crops of corn, kafir, milo, and certain other row crops. The soil on which these experiments were made is a deep silt loam, representative of most of the upland in the western part of the State. Good yields have been obtained each year by all crops grown on the winter irrigated land. At the same time, with the exception of the year of 1915, rainfall during the growing season has been almost generally recognized that water is the limiting factor in crop production in the area known as the Great Plains."

In an exhaustive study along this line Mr. Fellows concludes that sufficient water stored in the subsoil will probably almost double the yield of crops now obtained throughout this project. There will be years, as there has been in the past, when rainfall will be largely sufficient, but those years are of infrequent occurrence. It is entirely probable that the above estimate is quite correct. Mr. Fellows concludes further that even greater yields might be obtained if, in addition to the stored water, there might be water available to put on the land at any time when it is needed. At any rate, experience has shown that a deficiency of rainfall can, in a large measure, be made up by water in storage.

SOILS OF THE AREA

The questions now come: (1) Are the soils of the area suitable for irrigation? (2) Do they have sufficient water capacity to hold the water needed to supplement the rainfall? (3) Do they have sufficient fertility that warrants an irrigation project to supply additional water?

Character of the soils: The soils of the proposed irrigation area are all of loessial formation. The lossy material below the line of soil development is of general uniform composition and consists of loess extending to a depth of 100 feet or more without any fault such as rock strata, hardpan, or gravel seams. There is nothing in the soil profile to interfere with the water percolating with the water percolating with its recovery through the development of plant roots. The soils in the virgin state are fertile prairie soils, rich in both organic and inorganic elements of plant food. During the period that they have been under cultivation the organic and nitrogen content have been materially reduced. There is no evidence and little probability that alkar will ever become a problem in this area even under irrigation.

The rate at which a soil will absorb water is of practical importance under irrigation. It has a direct bearing on the possibility of spreading water over the land. Determinations on this point throughout the project showed that all the soils were able to take water at a rate entirely satisfactory for irrigation purposes. The surface soils are permeable and easily penetrated. Experience has shown in their present state of fertility they are capable of producing satisfactory crops when they have sufficient moisture available and climate conditions are not too unfavorable. Considering all the various factors the soils of the area are apparently entirely suitable for irrigation farming.

Water capacity: The soils of the area have a uniformly high-water holding capacity. Field experiments show that they will hold on the average 12 inches of water in the upper 2 feet of soil. This amount is more than half—in fact, 12.28 inches—would be available for use of the crops. This is a high available water capacity.

Supplemental irrigation has greatly increased yields of crops from the practice. The value of water stored in the soil has also been demonstrated by many experiment stations. At North Platte Experiment Station it has been found that an abundance of water in the subsoil is a great protection to the crop against drought, the protection being in almost exact proportion to the total available soil water within reach of the crop. This was found particularly true for the small grains. During the 10 years that the station has been under operation, the water stored by spring rains was greater than doubled the yield of winter wheat, as compared to winter wheat following small grain. Several years during this time only 2 or 3 inches of water had been applied. It has been claimed that water in storage in the soil will completely produce a crop, but with considerable water in the subsoil there are very few years when there is not sufficient rainfall to produce quite satisfactory crops. Mr. Zook, in Nebraska Experiment Station Bulletin 192, says: "Average yields per acre of all crops were higher on fallow than under any system of continuous cropping. Yields of grain on fallow were frequently more than double those of grain after grain. Of crops grown on fallow the largest gains were made by winter wheat and the smallest by corn."
The feeding depth of crop plants: It will be noted that the water-carrying capacity of the soil is determined for a 6-foot column of soil. This was done in order to include the root zone for the normal farm crops. Water stored below the root zone is not available to the crops, as capillarity is negligible except when there is free water. Most of the farm crops feed deeper than is ordinarily supposed, and are able to recover any available water within the limit of their root zone providing it is needed. Where sufficient water is not obtained by the plant next the surface most agricultural plants will root more deeply, providing they can find available water within the 6-foot subssoil. Investigations by Miller, Weaver, Burr, and others show that the 6-foot depth represents the practical feeding zone of most of the farm crops in this section and on this type of soil with the exception of alfalufs, which feeds more deeply. If the lower subssoil is dry, so that the plants can obtain no water from that region, the roots will not be extended into it. As an average for five years' observations at North Platte of the crops grown on summer tilled land which had moisture stored in the lower subssoil spring wheat, oats, barley, and corn developed their root system to a depth of from 5 to 6 feet, while winter wheat fed approximately 1 foot deeper into the soil.

**Table No. 5.—Field carrying capacity and available water capacity of upper 6 feet of soil at various points in area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Measured equivalent</th>
<th>Field carrying capacity</th>
<th>Hydroscopic coefficient</th>
<th>Field available water capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per cent Per cent</td>
<td>Inches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5 24.4 12.0</td>
<td>21.8 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.2 24.8 11.7</td>
<td>22.2 11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.2 24.8 11.7</td>
<td>22.2 11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4 24.7 11.7</td>
<td>22.1 11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdrege</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.9 26.4 11.5</td>
<td>22.6 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5 26.4 11.8</td>
<td>22.6 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.8 26.4 11.7</td>
<td>22.6 11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.4 22.2 9.2</td>
<td>21.5 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.5 22.3 9.3</td>
<td>21.6 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.5 22.3 9.3</td>
<td>21.6 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5 23.1 10.5</td>
<td>21.6 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5 23.1 10.5</td>
<td>21.6 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5 23.1 10.5</td>
<td>21.6 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.4 22.4 11.1</td>
<td>21.8 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking the last sampling in the fall as showing the maximum accumulation of water by summer rainfall, out of these five years, three show a loss of 2 to 4 per cent in the first foot and two show a small loss in the second foot. In two of the five years spring rains before the sampling date completely covered up the loss. The answer to the question of the effect of irrigation during the winter, the greatest loss being in the first foot section. Water can be applied to the land and carried through the winter if desirable. When we consider the large amount of available water that these soils could hold, the company of water in carrying stored water through the winter, and the possibility of the plants to recover water to a considerable depth in this region it can be safely said that the soils of this area do have sufficient water capacity to hold the water and prevent it from escaping. It is the best practice to apply it all at once and carry it as storage water, except perhaps for the small grains, but if 12 inches of water represents the water required to supplement the rainfall it can in a large measure be carried in the soil.

**Fertility:** In the virgin state the soils of this area were very fertile, rich in both organic and inorganic elements of fertility, and capable of producing high yields. Under cultivation there has been a gradual decrease in the organic content of the soil. Many farmers with long experience in this section report a steady decrease from the maximum yields obtained when the land was new, and also that it requires more manure than formerly. The decreased yield and the fact that the land is harder to handle in the fall in the organic content of the soil. The soils still contain sufficient phosphoric acid and potash for many years to come. The lime content, except in the subssoil, is comparatively high, and liming is not necessary for the successful operation of this region. If the yields can hardly be expected without building up the organic content of the soils, the soil is still sufficiently fertile to produce good yields of all crops grown when there is sufficient water available. The inherent fertility of the soil is high, but proper rotation of crops and the growing of legumes are very difficult to obtain under a limited rainfall. With a supplemental supply of water satisfactory yields can be maintained.

**Supplemental Evidence**

The land under the proposed project is now and has been for many years under private ownership. The farmers are already on the land, which is held in units mainly ranging from 160 acres up. Probably 90 per cent of the land is under cultivation, and is generally quite well improved as to buildings, fences, etc. The farmers have the horses and machinery necessary for farming the land under the present system. There is already invested in this area a tremendous amount of capital, largely resting with the farm owners. The area has splendid transportation facilities both as to railroads and highways. There is a highway on almost every section line, generally kept in fairly satisfactory condition. Shipping points are not far away, farm having more than a few miles to deliver its products to a loading point. The area lies relatively close to some important primary markets. It is within 200 miles of Omaha; within 700 miles of Chicago; and within less than 400 miles of St. Joe and Kansas City. These primary markets afford a ready outlet for all agricultural products. The question may arise as to what will be the effect of irrigation on the permanency of the agriculture of this area. The effect, of course, is problematic, depending largely upon the degree of intensity of the agriculture that would follow irrigation. It is safe to assume, however, that a more permanent and profitable form of diversified agriculture would follow irrigation than is possible without it.

It was mentioned above that the organic content of the soil is being depleted and that there is a consequent decline in yields. Organic matter, while not itself a plant food, is essential to proper soil conditions. A sufficient supply of organic matter makes the soil a more receptive of water from rains and makes all tillage operations easier. It is the greatest factor in the fertility and management of the soil. The lower yields and increased labor coincide with the depletion of the organic content of the soils. It is possible that for a time small, less profitable but are having a discouraging effect upon the farmers. Under present conditions the situation will grow worse. Soil管理工作 under limited rainfall is more difficult than in humid or irrigated conditions. Getting stands of grass or legumes is frequently impossible because of drought. The keeping of more livestock is curtailed by the problems of dependable pastures and adequate feed supplies. While there is no question as to the permanency of some of the present conditions, the situation will grow worse. Soil management can be brought about with additional water.

**Order of Business**

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report upon House bill 941, and I move that the conference report be agreed to.
Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The President pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. McKellar. Is that motion in order at this time? If not, I demand the regular order.

The President pro tempore. The Chair is of opinion that after 1 o'clock a motion of that kind can be made. That is the understanding of the Chair with regard to the rule.

Mr. Robinson. We were proceeding with the disposition of morning business.

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator withdraw the motion?

Mr. Robinson. If not, let us vote it down.

Mr. Bursum. I would like to get a chance to hear what is being said.

Mr. Robinson. I suggest that the Senator withdraw his motion until morning business has been completed.

Mr. Bursum. I will withdraw the motion for the present.

The President pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from New Mexico must be disposed of.

Mr. La Follette. He has withdrawn it. The Chair did not hear the withdrawal of the motion.

The President pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico withdraw his motion?

Mr. Bursum. On request, I will withdraw the motion until after morning business has been declared finished.

ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES

The President pro tempore. Are there further reports of committees?

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. From the Committee on Immigration. I report back favorably with an amendment. House Joint Resolution 233, to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. Bursum. I object.

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. Bursum. The understanding was that we were to proceed with morning business.

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. That is what we are doing. This will not take more than two minutes of explanation.

Mr. Bursum. What is the joint resolution?

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. It is a joint resolution permitting the retention in the United States of those aliens who came in under the ruling of the department.

Mr. Bursum. I have no objection to that. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. It applies to approximately 8,000 aliens who are now here and about 500 who are on the ocean. The committee were unanimously in favor of it.

The President pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. Bursum. No objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert:

That the following aliens arriving in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921, as amended and extended, may, if otherwise admissible and if not subject to deportation for other causes, be permitted to enter and remain in the United States without regard to the provisions of such act of May 19, 1921, as amended and extended:

(1) Aliens heretofore admitted in excess of quota and charged to the quota of a later month;

(2) Aliens heretofore admitted under a construction of such act of May 19, 1921, required by court decision;

(3) Aliens arriving in the United States after May 26, and before July 1, 1924, who departed from the United States from the last port outside the United States or outside foreign contiguous territory on or before May 26, 1924, believing in good faith that they would be admitted and that the construction of such act of May 19, 1921, required by court decision; and

(4) Aliens heretofore temporarily admitted under bond to relieve congestion of entrants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. George. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I favor the resolution as amended, but I desire to ask if this amendment will change the number of those coming over under the nisii pruis court's decision to future quotas and understand that to be the case.

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. The Senate amendment makes the joint resolution much stricter than it was when it passed the other House.

Mr. George. But does it add to the quota?

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. It does not charge these immigrants against the quota of next year, and all of the quotas for the present year are exhausted now; there are no remaining quotas for this year except for one or two.

Mr. George. It will not reduce the quota for next year?

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. No. The admission of these persons this year will not affect the quota for next year in any way.

Mr. Robinson. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. Robinson. I have heard a statement to the effect that the legal result of the passage of this joint resolution will be to confirm the right to remain in the United States of all immigrants who are here, even including those who came in violation of the law; I mean through fraudulent arrangements.

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. No, Mr. President; that is not true, especially in view of the manner in which the committee has proceeded to amend the joint resolution. We have taken care of the cases to which the Senator from Arkansas refers. We were afraid of that.

Mr. Robinson. So that only those who come within the ruling in the Gottlieb case will be permitted?

Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania. Those who came in good faith, believing that under the court decisions they were entitled to enter the United States, will be permitted to remain.

Mr. Robinson. Very well. Under that statement of facts I make no objection to the joint resolution.

The President pro tempore. The joint resolution is in the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. Herrell. Mr. President, for many years I have been an ardent advocate of restricted immigration. I hold that the manner in which immigrants have been illegally slipped into the United States during the last three years is a disgrace to this country. Immigration agents have made money; they have grown rich selling passports into the United States. Some of the newspapers of the country have bitterly assailed those crooked agents. We passed a law here not long ago cutting down the number of immigrants that might come into our country. You were filling this land with Bolsheviks, with anarchists, with kidnappers, and with people who are the deadly enemies of the American form of government. The sentiment of Congress of the American people is against lawless immigration laws and strongly in favor of restricted immigration.

Mr. President, where the wives of men who are already American citizens and their minor children have come to our land, I know it makes a sympathetic appeal to us; but I believe that this is a fixed-up job on the American Nation. I think that the immigrant agents held those immigrants back only from their in their fruitful object of sympathy and big-heartedness of our people to let these 14,000 additional immigrants come in. Is this law to be enforced or is it not to be enforced? That is the question which now confronts us.

Mr. President, it must be that the immigration agents have been apprehended by somebody who has been watching or we never would have heard of these 14,000 persons; they would have been slipped in as hundreds of thousands of others have been, with the agents holding their hands behind them, growing fat and rich upon bartering the birthright of the American boy and girl. Here these come in the closing hours of the session, a pitiful appeal to our generosity and our big-heartedness to open the door and let 14,000 immigrants come in, with the story that they are the wives and children of citizens who are already here. What are these citizens doing here, leaving their homes and children behind? Are they not bringing them in when their quotas were not exhausted?

Mr. President, it looks to me as though a trick had been played upon us. The agents go over there and bring in 10,000 more to come in and to be placed by those coming in. It is said, "Well, these men's wives and children ought to come in." We are all touched by such an appeal. I want those wives to be with their husbands and this appeal to be with them, too; but I am calling the attention of the Congress and of the country to the fact that we are confronted by a situation which we have got to watch.
Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I should like to inquire whether
the present number of aliens admitted under the present
quota and those who would be admitted under the
new quota. I ask unanimous consent to place his reply in the
Record. His report shows an unusually large number admitted
from Canada and Mexico. The Senate voted down my amendment
placing Canada and Mexico under the new quota so as to limit the
number coming from those countries.

Mr. PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the letter
of the Secretary of Labor will be printed in the Record.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 6, 1924.

Hon. Wiliam J. Harris,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr DEAR Senator: This will acknowledge your letter of the 6th,
requesting information concerning aliens admitted to the United States
during certain periods, and asking my views on the effect
of the immigration act of 1924. In my reply, for your convenience I am
reprinting the questions and following each with the answer in
the order presented.

"1. How many aliens were admitted to the United States
during the first year prior to the enactment of the first quota
law on May 19, 1921?"

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1921, 675,163 were admitted
to the United States.

"2. How many were admitted in each of the years following the
enactment of the quota law?"

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, the first full year of
operation of the 1921 act, there were admitted 432,905. During the
fiscal year ended June 30, 1923, there were admitted 673,406, while
during the first nine months of the present year the total had reached
719,162.

"3. Except for a few restrictions the quota acts have not applied
to the Dominion of Canada and Mexico. How many aliens charged to a quota were admitted from the Dominion of Canada under
that act?"

Nonquota immigrants from Canada, admitted during the fiscal year
ended June 30, 1922, numbered 112,651. During the fiscal year ended
June 30, 1923, 11,425 of this class were admitted.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, to 77,231. During the first nine months of the present fiscal year, 1924, 141,135 have been admitted. To show the character
of this Canadian immigration, I analyze below the figures for 1922.
The admissions are divided into 39,295 English, 30,438 French, 17,045
Scotch, 12,000 Irish, 4,486 Hebrews, and smaller numbers of other
peoples, chiefly of European origin.

"4. How many nonquota aliens were admitted from the Republic
of Mexico during the same periods?"

Nonquota aliens admitted from Mexico during the fiscal year ended
June 30, 1922, numbered 32,916. This number was increased during
the fiscal year ended June 30, 1923, to 77,251. During the first nine months of the present fiscal year, 1924, this number had increased to
77,981.

"5. How many 'quota' aliens have been admitted each year from
Canada since the passage of the quota act?"

The admissions are divided into 39,295 English, 30,438 French, 17,045
Scotch, 12,000 Irish, 4,486 Hebrews, and smaller numbers of other
peoples, chiefly of European origin.

"6. How many 'quota' aliens have been admitted each year from
Mexico since the passage of the quota act?"

The totals of quota and nonquota immigrants admitted from Canada
and Mexico for the same periods are therefore—
Mr. SHIELDS: The immigration act of 1924 in no manner changes the status of seamen. It leaves the door wide open for their entrance, and the bureau and the department are left without any means of combating the traffic.

15. Do you consider the immigration act of 1924 an improvement over the quota act of May 19, 1921?

While the immigration act of 1924 is not all that I would like to see under a permanent restrictive immigration law, it is a decided improvement over the old quota act because it provides for a partial examination of immigrants abroad, eliminates a great deal of uncertainty as to the condition of quotas because of assignment at foreign ports, reduces the long and often inadequate time allowed for the cases of separated families. The increased penalty placed upon steamship companies for bringing indelible aliens will also aid in the enforcement of the law.

Mr. SHIELDS, do I detect defects you have noted in the immigration act of 1924 which should be remedied by additional legislation?

My principal criticism of the immigration act of 1924 is its inelasticity to meet the varying needs of American industry, and while restricting the importation of labor from Europe, places no ban upon competition from Mexican labor, which may be admitted in unlimited number. If, within the quota given to European countries, some provisions were provided to select the types and classes meeting the certain industrial and agricultural needs arising from time to time, it seems to me that we would have a much better law. For instance, under this act 50 per cent or more of the quota could be street peddlers and small tradesmen, of which we have an ample supply, while an acute shortage might be registered in the steel industry, slate quarries, or tin mills. Obviously, a confirmed street salesman will not make a section hand. In my recommendations for legislation I suggested the method of imposing an ad valorem and an unlimited labor for any industry when labor of like kind could not be found unemployed in the United States. If some such system were devised and kept within the limits prescribed by Congress, I think we would have a policy more in line with our needs. I also believe that it is a decided mistake to discriminate against European labor in favor of Mexican, and for that reason I am in hearty accord with the amendment to bring the Western Hemisphere as well as the Eastern under the provisions of the quota law.

Cordially yours,

JAMES J. DAVIE.
The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators be elected forthwith to investigate and report to the Senate on December 8, 1924, the campaign expenditures made by or on behalf of, or in support of, or in opposition to, any and all candidates for President and Vice President and presidential electors; the names of the persons, firms, or corporations contributing to the said candidate or candidates or their party committee or committees, or any other agency, the amounts contributed, pledged, loaned, or otherwise made available for the campaign expenses; the names of the recipients of any such funds, and the amount thereof; in relation thereto, not only as to the subscriptions of money and the expenditures thereof but as to the use of any other means of influence, including the promise of patronage, and all other facts in relation thereto that would to the public interest and would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

That said committee is hereby empowered to sit and act during the adjournment of Congress at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents; to employ stenographers at a cost of not exceeding 25 cents per hour; to allow such expenses as the committee deems advisable.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let it be read, Mr. President.

The resolution as amended was read, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 241, submitted by Mr. HAARELD May 28, 1924, as follows:

Resolved, Senate Resolution 241, agreed to January 7, 1924, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs or any subcommittee thereof to hold and render hearings upon any subject which may have been before said committee, and hereby is, amended to enable said committee or any subcommittee thereof to hold such hearings at such times and places as may be considered necessary by the committee or its subcommittees, the expenses incident thereto to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let it be read.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.
and insert "a," and at the end of line 6 to strike out "to" and to insert "consisting of not more than three members to." The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 112, agreed to January 7, 1924, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs or any subcommittee thereof, during the Sixty-eighth Congress to hold and report hearings upon any subject which may come before said committee, be, and hereby is, amended to enable a subcommittee thereof consisting of not more than three members to hold hearings at such times and places as may be considered necessary by the committee or its subcommittee; the expenses incident thereto to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. Reports of committees are in order.

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has just reported on Senate Resolution 249. That permits an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the recess as to the losses to the farmers in the price of wheat on account of Government interference through price fixing. It permits the committee to hold hearings in Washington or elsewhere.

If any member of the Senate likes to get together a little money, he is agreed that there would be no expensive investigation; that there might be a few hearings prior to the convening of Congress, but a great deal of the information would be secured from the department here later.

The resolution provides for a report on the 1st of January, or before.

This is the only thing along the line of looking after the wheat situation, except the so-called Bursum bill, which is pending here. That is a measure really providing for reimbursing the farmers $50,000,000, which the Government took away from them in prices. It provides for a bonus of 35 cents a bushel on the export of wheat, in the belief that it will put the domestic price up some 25 to 35 cents per bushel. It is too late to get that bill through. The parliamentary situation does not permit that. Therefore, I just want to give notice that when some House members come up North at the spring session, they may feel that we will offer that proposition as a rider or an amendment to that bill. It is estimated that the cost for one year would be approximately $50,000,000. A suggestion has been made that it should also include corn, and the export on corn being very small, and the bonus proposed being 15 cents a bushel, it is estimated that it will cost something like $4,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 249 be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution entered yesterday by the Senator from Montana and now called up.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I very much regret this action. I merely desire to say in this connection that it seems quite unnecessary to review the facts recited in the report as they are substantially the same as they were given by me to the Senate some two months ago, save for the facts developed in regard to the cotton business. Those are of no great importance.

The committee has informed the Senate generally concerning these disclosures, and I feel entirely justified in saying that the report is substantially as the facts have been given to the Senate heretofore.

I feel that before the session expires the Senate ought to express either its approval or disapproval of the work of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the motion entered yesterday by the Senator from Montana and now called up.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I regret that no action has been taken on the resolution which requires action. The motion is for the Senate to adopt a report which, of course, the Senate has not read, for it was filed only yesterday, to adopt a report from a committee five members of which have begged for an opportunity to investigate the facts of the report.

If any action were required now, I should make no opposition to the motion. If there were any recommendation that required any action, it would be another question. We are called upon to pass upon the report and adopt it when the five members of the committee which had the matter under investigation are not sufficiently familiar with the report to pass upon it, and of course no Member of the Senate has an opportunity to read it.

I can not let that report be adopted without some fair expression of the reasons which even upon a casual examination lead me to think it ought to be further considered, and I beg the Senate to believe me when I say that I regret the situation exceedingly, for in the necessity of the case it will take much more to go over the facts which I must present to the Senate.

I begged that it might be deferred. I am met with a condition which I deplore, and which I could not prevent, and therefore I may take up the report with the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In view of the statement of the Senator from Missouri, I want to ask if the report could not go over? This is the last day of the session, and there are a good many people coming up, and I wanted to get an answer, if I could, for the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.
Mr. WASHING of Montana. Mr. President, I have a number of bills on the calendar in which I am very deeply interested, but this comes up in its regular order. I can see no reason why it should not be disposed of. I do not think there is any occasion for any protracted discussion. The Senator from Missouri is at perfect liberty at any time to submit a report of his own. He might at any time have prepared a report of his own. The hearings were discontinued quite a while ago. The report has been in his hands for three days. It seems to me by this time that he ought to have been in shape to submit to the Senate any observations he may care to make in respect to it.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will recognize the fairness of the statement when I say that three days, in the present condition of business in the Senate, is no time for consideration. If I stood alone—because I have not been long upon that committee, and because I recognize the ability of the Senator from Montana on that committee—I should not be here taking this position, but when five members of that committee, including the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who was formerly the chairman, begged the Senator from Montana to defer the report, which requires no immediate action, I do not let it go in without a fair statement of the reasons why I do not agree to that report.

PAYMENT OF TAXES TO STEVENS AND FERRY COUNTIES, WASH.

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

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Before the Senator takes up that matter, would he yield to me for a moment to have a little bill to pay taxes on my property in my State printed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DILL. If it will lead to any debate, I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPENCER. I yield with pleasure, if I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot guarantee that.

Mr. SPENCER. Then I must go on. I would yield to the Senator in a moment. Or, I will say now, I ask for unanimous consent to allow me to yield to the Senator to have his measure acted upon, to resume the floor at the conclusion of the consideration of his bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. DILL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 1434, to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Stevens and Ferry Counties, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the Information of the Senate.

The reading clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Stevens and Ferry Counties, in the State of Washington, as taxes collected by said counties under sections 2 of the act of July 1, 1892, relating to the payment of local taxes on allotted Colville Indian lands, the following sums, to wit: To Stevens County, $41,509.67; to Ferry County, $71,465; Provided, That there may be deducted from said amounts by the Secretary of the Interior such sum or sums as he may find have been paid to said counties for Indian tuition; also the excess, if any, where the rate based on the value of Indian allotments may be found to be in excess of the rate on taxable land.

Sec. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $115,767.67, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of said sums to said counties as provided in the foregoing section.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. DILL. This bill has passed the Senate twice. It came over from the House. These counties have been waiting many years for this money, and I hope the Senator will not object. Mr. WALSH of Montana, if I go in with respect to this, I would not object to it, but I notice other Senators standing here with bills in their hands ready to make similar requests.

Mr. DILL. I think the Senator might give notice that he will not yield to any others.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not object.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF BIRTH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. FESS. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after I have yielded to the Senator from Ohio I may resume the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. SPENCER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate Senate Joint Resolution 85, authorizing an appropriation for the preparation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birthday of George Washington, which were:

To strike out the preamble.

On page 2, lines 8 and 9, to strike out "the President pro tempore" and insert "PRESIDING OFFICER."

On page 3, to strike out all after "to" where it appears the first time in line 15, down to and including "participation" in line 16, and to insert "communicate with governments of such nations."

On page 4, line 8, after the word "datia," insert a comma and "out of the amount appropriated."

On page 4, strike out all after "enacted" in line 11 down to and including "approved." in line 12.

Mr. FESS. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Senator from Missouri if he does not wish me a moment to talk to him from the floor.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that when I shall have yielded to the Senator from Wyoming I may resume the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

MRS. EMMA B. WOODS

Mr. WARREN. I ask for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 236, reported this morning from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $6,000 to Mrs. Emma B. Woods, widow of the late Elliott Woods, Architect of the Capitol, said sum being the amount of one year's salary received by him at the time of his death.

REARRANGEMENT OF SENATE CHAMBERS

Mr. COPELAND and others addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that after I have yielded to the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] I may resume the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I shall have to object after the present request to any more unanimous-consent requests, because the Senator from Missouri will in that way be able to keep the floor all afternoon.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia withhold his objection until I have made a statement. I have a resolution which, unless it is passed to-day, will be of no value.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield the floor?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I said after this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from West Virginia will not make that statement too positive until he may know the circumstances involved with reference to other cases.

Mr. NEELY. We will cross that bridge when we come to it. Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought the Senator was closing the bridge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 291, relating to the ventilation of the Senate Chamber.

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

Mr. BORAH. I understand the resolution is to bring the Senate in touch with the outside world.

Mr. COPELAND. That is included as a possibility.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol be authorized and directed, under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules, to consult with architects of repute and expert in ventilation and acoustics with a view to improving the living conditions of the Senate Chamber, and giving attention to rearrangement and reconstruction, including a plan to place the Chamber in direct contact with the outer wall or walls of the building, and to report with plans to the President pro tempore of the Senate on the first Monday of December, 1924. The expenses hereunder, not to exceed the sum of $10,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

IMPORTATION OF CRUDE OPIUM

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield the floor?

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that when I have yielded the floor to the Senator from Utah I may be allowed to resume the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill (H. R. 7070) prohibiting the importation of crude opium for the purpose of manufacturing heroin is the bill which I ask unanimous consent to have considered at this time. There is a convention to be held in Europe within a very short time, and it is necessary that we pass the bill before that convention if we are going to have any effect in the convention as a Nation.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature, both legal and equitable, which the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians, residing in the State of Washington, have against the United States, may be submitted to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal by either party to the Supreme Court of the United States for determination; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine any and all such claims and report to Congress thereon.

The Court of Claims shall have authority to determine and adjudge the rights, both legal and equitable, of the said Cowlitz Tribe of Indians in the said claims, and all such claims shall be allowed credit for all sums, and such fee as may be allowed as the court may order. The suit or suits shall be tried by the court, and no other verification shall be necessary:

Provided, That upon the final determination of such suit or suits the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to fix and determine a reasonable sum not to exceed $10 per cent of the recovery; and such sum is to be paid out of any sum or sums found due said tribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was passed and sent to the House.
Mr. Fletcher. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that when I shall have yielded to the Senator from Florida I may be allowed to resume the floor.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. Reserving the right to object, my curiosity at last has been aroused. We are calling the calendar? Is that the whole reason for which the Senator from Missouri asks to yield to me for the consideration of the bill on the calendar?

Mr. Fletcher. We are not calling the calendar.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We ought to give an hour or two of the time of the Senate to the consideration of the bills on the calendar instead of proceeding in this way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from New York that under the present procedure, if continued, the calendar will be completed in a short time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection. I merely want to understand the situation.

Mr. Fletcher. The bill could have been passed while we have been having this discussion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We had better understand how we are doing this, because I expect to participate if it is continued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has proposed a unanimous consent request that after yielding to the Senator from Florida he be permitted to continue his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 527 (H. R. 3537) for the relief of I. A. Scott; a similar bill has passed the Senate twice or three times, and this bill has now passed the House.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay the sum of $3,575.62 out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to L. A. Scott as compensation for loss and in full satisfaction of any claim for damages as a result of a collision between the mine planter Maj. Albert C. Jenkins and the American schooner Golden State at Pensacola, Fl.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will continue his remarks.

NORTHWEST TERRITORY GRANTS

Mr. Neely and Mr. Simmons addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. Neely. I ask unanimous consent that after I shall have yielded to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Neely] I may be allowed to resume the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Why do not the Chair hear objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. Neely. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article appearing in the West Virginia Bar, relating to the claims of West Virginia against the Federal Government growing out of the northwest territory grants.

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

AN IMPORTANT MESSAGE TO THE BAR OF WEST VIRGINIA—SENATOR CHILTON PRESENTS AN ILLUMINATING EXPOSITION OF THE CLAIM OF WEST VIRGINIA AGAINST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GROWING OUT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY

To the Bar:

For the purpose of bringing an important legal and public matter to the attention of the lawyers, as well as the people of West Virginia, I have published an article appearing in the West Virginia Bar, relating to the claims of West Virginia against the Federal Government growing out of the northwest territory grants.

The article was printed in the Record, and was accepted by the Senate on March 1, 1874. This bill was approved by the Senate and the House, and went to the President, who signed it into law.

The Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported favorably on the bill, and it was passed by the Senate and House of Representatives, and was signed by the President.

The essential facts upon which this claim is based are set forth in the passage which I had the honor to make in the Senate of the United States, on April 10, 1912. There are two barriers of a general nature to overcome before this claim can be brought out into the light of day and decided upon its merits. The first is that, so far as the States are concerned, the statute of limitations has been held up by our own people and the people of the country as a great benefactor for having made the sacrifices of giving to the Nation the vast territory northwest of the Ohio River, comprising the States of Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, and a part of Minnesota, to the National Government. Thus it is written down in history. And since it is now proposed to show to the country that such is not the exact truth, we must surmount, not only the plea of long acquiescence, but also hundreds of historical enunciations on the nullification of the mather State, extending from 1784 until a few years ago. None of the praise given Virginia for her munificence, in the hour of national peril and necessity, need be withdrawn. She gave with a bountiful hand, and history has, in many instances, perverted, as usually is the case. I venture to say that if the bar of the West Virginia, and the reading people of the State, will give but a few hours time to a study of the facts as they are set forth, they will see that the case of the bar of the present case is clearly decided, and clearly that it will survive both the inaccuracies of history and everything that can possibly be construed into acquiescence, on our part, in the assumed attitude of the Government.

I present this claim, as I have done on more than one occasion in the Senate, before the Committee on the Judiciary, and before its subcommittees, to which this measure was referred. I have been confronted with the query: "Why do not the people of West Virginia take more interest in the claim and press it?" I was relieved somewhat by the resolution of the legislature of 1913, calling upon Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State to urge upon the President and the Senate and House of Representatives the passage of a bill to settle our claim.

The Legislature of Virginia has also passed resolutions of the same purport. However, it is plain that, as yet, there is not behind the movement that earnestness of conviction which is necessary to success. This is not said in a sense of complaining, because it is quite natural. It is not to be expected that many of our people have given that study and thought to the subject necessary to overcome impressions of accepted history; and it is to the credit of the people that they demand more than mere assertion before pressing a claim against the Government. I have an abiding conviction that when the whole State of West Virginia shall understand this case as it is, they will see to it that it be pressed upon the Senate, House, the press, and the people may study this question, and be convinced of the justice of our claim, as I am, that we want to present, in your columns, the facts, and some of the arguments, in favor of the claim.

We must bear in mind always that the present Constitution of the United States was not ratified by sufficient States to make it effective until 1788. Before that we had a Confederation of the States, which was a very weak organization in which the Federal authority could not compel the States to pay taxes, nor do anything else. Up to 1781 Maryland had not joined the Confederation, so that instead of it being a federation of 13 States, it was a federation of only 12 States. In 1795 Maryland passed resolutions laying before the Continental Congress the reasons why she did not join the federation. These reasons were, speaking generally, that some of the States, including Virginia, had claims to western lands, and, Maryland argued, that in case the Colonies of the United States should gain their independence by the Revolutionary War, then being fought, those States could sell their lands in the West, thereby lessening their taxes, and thereby attracting population from the States not favorably disposed.

The Continental Congress then passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That copies of the several papers referred to the committee be transmitted, with a copy of the report, to the legislatures of the several States, and that it be earnestly recommended to those who have claims to the western country to pass such laws as they may deem necessary to secure such claims. And be it further resolved, that the Congress shall not, in any case, grant any authority by the Constitution of the Articles of Confederation; and that the Legislature of Maryland be earnestly requested to authorize the Delegates in Congress to subscribe the said article."

Note, in passing, that the western land situation was "the only obstacle to the final ratification of the Articles of Confederation." And the delegates of a Continental Congress urged Maryland to ratify the articles, and thus complete the Confederation.
After this, to wit, in January, 1781, Virginia passed a resolution of her legislature, setting forth the terms upon which she would convey to the United States the remaining claim of lands in that province. In that resolution it was provided that the territory should be laid out and formed into States not less than 100, nor more than 150 miles square, and that the States should be distinct republics having a government and admittance into the Union. If provided, further, that the expenses incurred by Virginia in surveying the British posts and maintaining forts and garrisons and acquiring the territory, should be reimbursed by the United States. The French and Canadian inhabitants, who professed themselves citizens of Virginia, should be protected in their holdings, and that a quantity of land, not exceeding 150,000 acres, should be allowed to Gen. George Rogers Clark, and to his officers and soldiers. And the members of the American Army, who, in their professions as citizens of Virginia, should be considered as a common fund for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become or shall become members of the Confederation, or Federal Alliance, of the said States, Virginia inclusive, according to their usual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditure, and shall be faithfully and bona fide disposed of for that purpose and for no other use or purpose whatsoever.

Immediately after this resolution of the Legislature of Virginia was passed—that is, in March, 1781—Maryland ratified the Federal compact, and from that time there was a Confederation of the thirteen original States. The bounty of Virginia seemed insufficient, and the Confederation, in March, 1781, asked for the deed of cession to the Congress, present of the history of the grant and its acceptance, which almost completely incorporated the compact, and from that time the ratification of the Constitution and the adoption of the Federal convention made it a trust, the new United States became likewise a trustee. Note the words again, “all debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of this Constitution shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the former.”

There are many other material facts and details of this momentous transaction, all of which, so far as I have been able to construe them, speak for the contention of Virginia and West Virginia rather than against it, and I do not take the space to quote them here. If this movement shall ever develop into a litigation, no doubt the industrious lawyers will bring them out and analyse and mass them upon the one side or the other of the controversy. But no one will ever find any release or waiver by Virginia of the trust contained in the original grant and in the resolutions of 1781.

The reason why this is necessary to call attention to the terms of that trust, first, let us inquire what land was ceded to Virginia by the Articles of Confederation. The Continental Congress had asked her to do was “to remove the only obstacle to a final ratification of the Union.” All of the said States, Virginia inclusive, were given power to remove the only obstacle to a final ratification of the Union. Virginia did it, and upon the presentation of the series and conditions and details of the grant and its acceptance, the trust was a contract on the part of Virginia to do certain things, and upon this basis of valuation each State was paid for the trust. The Confederation had the trust, and not the entity, the United States, as afterwards organized; and that for the following reasons: First, the States were to participate “according to their usual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditure.” The only States which could have paid, or did, in fact, pay anything into the general charge and expenditure, were the thirteen original States by which the Constitution, which contained the grant until the new Constitution was adopted, carried on the Revolutionary War, and brought it to a successful conclusion. There is nothing uncertain about this description, because by Article VIII of the Articles of Confederation, it was stated that the trust fund “should be inserted in the section dealing with the purchase of lands. It was among the States which had no political claim to any of the States or of any particular State.” The deed of cession gave the power to the Continental Congress to dispose of the land. It says that the property “should be disposed of by general power of disposing of the public domain as to make it clear that the claim “of any particular State” should not be predicated by that general grant of power. What claim of any particular State could be excepted from the grants or grants of western lands? Why should this clause guard against the “claim of any particular State” be included in the section dealing with the public domain except to protect the States under the western land claim? Again, by accepting the grant, the old Confederation was made a trustee under the terms of the trust set out in the grant. Therefore, Article IV, section 3, of the Constitution, makes it a trust, the new United States became likewise a trustee. Note the words again, “all debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of this Constitution shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the former.”

"All debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of this Constitution shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the former."
that Virginia would have failed or refused to do so, and that then the
9 adopting it would have formed the present United States Govern-
ment. In that event, those who may claim that the adoption of the
Constitution wiped out all that happened before, or that the condi-
tion of the grant embraced the States which were afterwards admitted
into the present United States, would put Virginia in the strange
state of being a beneficiary to a trust, in which the trustee would have the
right to ignore, and that the beneficiaries would also leave out Virginia as a beneficiary. By the words, "Virginia inclusive", the intent to make the beneficiaries separate States and not the general entity of the United States, is quite clear, and therefore the problem
also comes clear. It so happened that Virginia did ratify the Constitution, but we must look upon this trust and construe it so as to make it
consistent with the ratification or failure of ratification by Virginia. If
Virginia had not ratified the Constitution, certainly she could not have dissolved the old confederation, converting a trust intended for the 13 States to a trust for the benefit of the 9 States, leaving Virginia entirely out. It is clear to me that this trust, or what is the same thing, "the use and benefit of this land," was intended for the 13 States which had ratified the old confederation, and for Maryland, if she did thereafter come in, which she did, and that Virginia and the old confederation thoroughly un-
derstood that the bounty of Virginia extended to the 13 colonies or States with whom she had been associated during the Revolutionary War, and each was to participate in the "use and benefits" in the proportion that might be necessary for its expenses. Thus the trust created a trust wherein the property is described, the trustee is named, the beneficiaries designated with accuracy, so that a clerk with a proper deed of cession, or trust, necessary from public records the exact interest which each beneficiary should have in the trust. With that intention, Virginia provided that this trust fund or property "shall be faithfully
and bona fide disposed of for that purpose, and for no other purpose whatsoever." What defense could the defaulting or delinquent trustees make under such an instrument in a court of equity were the beneficiaries and trustee individuals instead of sovereign States?

West Virginia claims that the United States has not been faithful
or consistent with its obligation, or faithful to the trust, during the period from the separation in 1863. It can hardly be possible that the considerations which have been presented to the Virginia debt suit could fail to lead to the conclusion that West Virginia is entitled to a just and equitable proportion of all of the land purchased from Spain and France, and from territory acquired
by war or treaty, and that these lands would be sold at such price as to
yield the proceeds to the beneficiaries the same as those it had so specifically described as its "use and benefit" in the organic act of the United States, and were not in contemplation when the original deed was made, and which could not, and did not, pay anything into the "general charge and expenditure" of the United States, and that the states which were afterwards admitted, would be the beneficiaries the same as those it had so specifically described in the original deed. It is not right, legally or morally, for the present National Government to take any position which will do violence to the evident intention of the parties to this instrument in 1784.

One word regarding Virginia's title. It is sufficient to state that under the deed the United States acquired possession and has con-
veyed title to the land embraced in the deed. It is not now in the
mouth of the United States to say that the grantor in the deed of
trust did not have title to the land, as an excuse or defense for not paying over the money in her hands as trustees derived from its sale.

No claim is being made by any grantee. The United States has never
been called upon to repay a dollar which she received for the sale of
any of those lands. Her title, derived from Virginia, has been anac-
ronized, rejected, and set aside by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1832, Chief Justice
Marshall recognized that the deed from Virginia to the confedera-
tion was made upon "certain stipulations and conditions," and that the United States acquired title to these lands as acreages, for the
price of a dollar for the 34,511,360 acres, the United States has not been faithful
in paying over the money in her hands as trustees derived from its sale. It would hardly be possible that the considerations which have been presented to the Virginia debt suit could fail to lead to the conclusion that West Virginia is entitled to a just and equitable proportion of all of the
land purchased from Spain and France, and from territory acquired
by war or treaty, and that these lands would be sold at such price as to
yield the proceeds to the beneficiaries the same as those it had so specifically described as its "use and benefit" in the original deed. It is not right, legally or morally, for the present National Government to take any position which will do violence to the evident intention of the parties to this instrument in 1784.

One word regarding Virginia's title. It is sufficient to state that under the deed the United States acquired possession and has con-
veyed title to the land embraced in the deed. It is not now in the
mouth of the United States to say that the grantor in the deed of
trust did not have title to the land, as an excuse or defense for not paying over the money in her hands as trustees derived from its sale.

No claim is being made by any grantee. The United States has never
been called upon to repay a dollar which she received for the sale of
any of those lands. Her title, derived from Virginia, has been anac-
ronized, rejected, and set aside by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1832, Chief Justice
Marshall recognized that the deed from Virginia to the confedera-
tion was made upon "certain stipulations and conditions," and that the United States acquired title to these lands as acreages, for the
price of a dollar for the 34,511,360 acres, the United States has not been faithful
in paying over the money in her hands as trustees derived from its sale. It would hardly be possible that the considerations which have been presented to the Virginia debt suit could fail to lead to the conclusion that West Virginia is entitled to a just and equitable proportion of all of the
land purchased from Spain and France, and from territory acquired
by war or treaty, and that these lands would be sold at such price as to
yield the proceeds to the beneficiaries the same as those it had so specifically described as its "use and benefit" in the original deed. It is not right, legally or morally, for the present National Government to take any position which will do violence to the evident intention of the parties to this instrument in 1784.

One word regarding Virginia's title. It is sufficient to state that under the deed the United States acquired possession and has con-
veyed title to the land embraced in the deed. It is not now in the
mouth of the United States to say that the grantor in the deed of
trust did not have title to the land, as an excuse or defense for not paying over the money in her hands as trustees derived from its sale.

No claim is being made by any grantee. The United States has never
been called upon to repay a dollar which she received for the sale of
any of those lands. Her title, derived from Virginia, has been anac-
ronized, rejected, and set aside by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1832, Chief Justice
Marshall recognized that the deed from Virginia to the confedera-
tion was made upon "certain stipulations and conditions," and that the United States acquired title to these lands as acreages, for the
price of a dollar for the 34,511,360 acres, the United States has not been faithful
in paying over the money in her hands as trustees derived from its sale. It would hardly be possible that the considerations which have been presented to the Virginia debt suit could fail to lead to the conclusion that West Virginia is entitled to a just and equitable proportion of all of the
land purchased from Spain and France, and from territory acquired
by war or treaty, and that these lands would be sold at such price as to
yield the proceeds to the beneficiaries the same as those it had so specifically described as its "use and benefit" in the original deed. It is not right, legally or morally, for the present National Government to take any position which will do violence to the evident intention of the parties to this instrument in 1784.
The purpose of the bill which I have introduced is to give the consent of the Federal Government to a suit. It does not ask for any money settlement; it does not ask for power to commit itself to anything, except to the proposition that the Federal Government cannot afford to afford the relation of a defaulting or delinquent trustee, especially where the beneficiaries are sovereign in their own right. That Virginia can be made a beneficiary is for the good of the country. It does not ask that Virginia will second her every move in this direction, that the United States can not afford to deny to a sovereign State the right to litigate so important a matter. Indeed, it would seem to me that the Federal Government ought not to take sides in such a case, and I feel confident that Virginia will second her every move in this direction, that the United States can not afford to deny to a sovereign State the right to litigate so important a matter. But when it comes to a case wherein it is claimed that the Federal Government is a defaulting, delinquent, or negligent trustee, and that she is taking the benefit of a defect in the Constitution from States money or property which was placed in her hands for a purpose as sacred as the commutation of the original Federal compact and the successful prosecution of the Revolutionary War, the citizens of the country should hang their heads in shame till a settlement be made. The right to sue in the Court of Claims has already been given to Indians, Indian tribes, corporations, and individuals. Liberal with all private interests, why should the Government be a hard taskmaster with the sovereign States which gave it birth? Some court, some tribunal, must sooner or later do justice in this important matter, and it has seemed to me that now is the time for the legal profession to do its duty, and to set the country a good example. It has been done, and is being done in the United States, and it will be done in the Supreme Court of the United States, and in the Federal courts.

We have been forced to submit to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in a case wherein a judgment for over $25,000,000 was rendered against us. Whenever we do so, however much we may believe that no such judgment should have been rendered, it is on record as to the judgment of the highest court in the land, and to us that means the highest court on earth. We have paid the debt. We have paid it on interest, and discharged every part of the judgment against us.

It has been found that this has been a case of the delegacies who presented the debt. Shall we give it up? Shall we ignore a claim which is so just and the evidence of which is so clear? Shall we sit by and do nothing? Or shall we grasp this opportunity like young, vigorous Western Virginians are accustomed to do in everything, and by compelling power of a united, determined effort make the halls of Congress ring with the demand for justice. With such a cause we can not and will not fail.

CHARLESTON, W. Va., July 23, 1887.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. BRUCE addressed the Chair.

HE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that when I shall have yielded to the Senator from North Carolina I may be allowed to dispose of the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON THE LATE HON. CLAude Kitchin.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a brief statement by myself with reference to the life and public services of the Hon. CLAude Kitchin, late minority leader of the House of Representatives. Memorial services were held in Washington and in his home, and the volume embracing the speeches of Mr. Kitchin's colleagues on that occasion will shortly be printed. I wish my brief statement to appear in that volume. Mr. KITCHIN was one of the greatest parliamentary leaders and debaters of the present day.

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

Mr. WOODWARD, Mr. President, I cannot permit this session of Congress to close without paying a personal tribute to the great party and parliamentary leader of the body at the other end of the Capitol who has lately passed to the Great Beyond. The House has already held memorial services in honor of Mr. KITCHIN and his colleagues in that body have spoken in just and deserved eulogy of his life and his high public service.

The old practice of holding memorial services for Senator for Members of the House, however distinguished, has fallen into disuse. The position which CLAude KITCHIN attained and occupied in the Republic was so eminent and unusual, however, that it would not be fitting for the Senate to adjourn without further notice of his death than the resolutions of sorrow and condolence that have already been unanimously adopted in this Chamber.

CLAude KITCHIN was twelve consecutive times elected a Representative in Congress from the second congressional district of North Carolina. He entered the House at the early age of 28 years, and his energy, ability and devotion to his country did not have to wait long for proper recognition. It is not too much to say that Mr. KITCHIN was the greatest debater and floor leader that the Democratic Party has had in the House of Representatives. It is not too much to think that in the forum of debate he had any superior in his day in the United States. His work in committee and in the councils of his party was equally able and useful.

For nearly a decade his position from the floor of Congress was of consequence to the country, and his influence in the committee and in the chamber in which he served was greatly and commonly felt. In those hard and strenuous days and nights of the World War I had opportunity extraordinary to learn the quality of the steel and the character with which CLAude KITCHIN was fashioned. Although just before, I fully recollected his affection, and the illness that struck him down in the prime of superb manhood and at the height of his power and usefulness brought deep personal grief to me, not only because of my affection for him, but because I realize the serious loss that the country suffered in being deprived of CLAude KITCHIN's services.

His gallant spirit was undaunted to the day of his death, and he never gave up. His love for his country reached the flood-tide, even as disease laid its hand heavily and more heavily upon his body. He never abated his intense interest in legislation and the government of his country. He never withdrew a letter from me in the campaign. He fully reciprocated his affection, and the illness that struck him down was coming in the Valley of the Shadow of Death his thoughts and solicitude were only for his family and his friends. Mr. KITCHIN sprang from a brave and manly race. Both himself and his brother ex-Governor William W. Kitchin, were almost perfect specimens of the finest physical, intellectual, and moral.

Mr. KITCHIN, when he wrote:

One who never turned his back, but marched breast forward. Never doubted clouds would break. Never dreamed though right were wrong, wrong would triumph. Slater fell to rise, is better far. Sleep to work.

On May 31, 1923, in his home district, where he was loved as probably no man had been loved before, the knightly spirit of the great Democratic leader was resolved with as much love and with as much grace as possible. He died as he lived, loved his friends, his family, his country, and his God—and quite unafraid.

I stood beside his grave and saw loving hands commit his body to his native soil, over it was laid with a holy love, while a vast multitude of North Carolinians stood.
by, overcome with sorrow, and dazed with the realization that they would see him and have him for their leader and champion no more.

And now—

The storm of life has softened to a breeze.

That gently wos the lilies on his grave;

No more of shipwreck, or of angry seas;

Yet—rest for the true and brave.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I understood there were to be memorial services for Claude Kitchin in the Senate. I understand from the statement just made by my colleague that that is not going to be done. I therefore ask a similar privilege to that just rendered to my colleague, and ask the same order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection permission is granted to the Junior Senator from North Carolina as requested.

Mr. OVERMAN. Claude Kitchin was indeed a great man. His career was comparatively a short one, but like a star of the first magnitude he gradually rose higher and brighter in the political firmament until he could be seen and admired by all. Fortunately his brilliant career was cut short before it had reached its zenith and his death caused the entire country to mourn. His fame, deservedly great, was not inclosed by the bounds of the State or section in which he was born; for the influence of his death was spread over the country by the press it was given the place of honor in all of the papers of the country and carried in big headlines which told the people of the passing of this great leader.

Few North Carolinians ever shed more lasting and glory upon their native State than did Mr. Kitchin. It was shortly after he entered the House of Representatives that he impressed his colleagues and his countrymen with his great abilities and common sense and they knew at once that a new leader had come among them. In the last 60 years the House has had few parliamentarians as Sam Randall, of Pennsylvania; Tom Reed, of Maine; James D. Richardson, of Tennessee; Champ Clark, of Missouri; and Joe Cannon, of Illinois; but a few of the greatest. Claude Kitchin was the equal of any of them in the quality of his superior, especially in the running debate. When he drew his keen Damascus blade all with whom he contended went down thoroughly discomfited before his able reasoning, his shining wit, and his biting sarcasm, but because the contest was always piloted by Mr. Kitchin upon such fair and friendly grounds none of the victims of his power ever went down with the sting which usually accompanies defeat. He was loved and admired both by his friends and opponents. He was recognized as a statesman of sublime courage, which was perhaps his chief characteristic. Other noble qualities which he possessed in a remarkable degree were his ringing sincerity, a strong love of truth and fair play, and an unanswerable faculty of hypercritical, or as he himself called it, "Son of Truth." Neither his friends nor his enemies could persuade him to depart from what he believed to be right. He never compromised his principles in a contest or question he would fight to the last ditch to establish it, and neither the thrill of winning a specious victory by compromise nor the enhancing of his reputation or popularity could move him from it.

The first time I ever met him was as a member of the platform committee of the State Democratic convention of 1890, both of us having had the honor of serving upon that committee, which was composed of some of the great leaders of the party, such as Gov. Thomas J. Jarvis, Josephus Daniels, Gov. R. A. Doughton, and James A. Lockhart. At that time the party was face to face with a crisis and the future success or failure of the party hung upon its action upon certain resolutions which had been presented to the convention by the leaders of the Populist Party. The resolution proposed that the Democratic Party was to be agregate with the Populists in the coming campaign, and it was submitted to the platform committee for recommendation. Four years before the Populists had fused with the Republicans and they had carried the State by a very large majority. The time had come for the party to wisecrack its resolution. When the resolution came before the committee Mr. Kitchin, Mr. Lockhart, and myself fought it bitterly. The vote was very close when Gov. W. W. Kitchin, who was also a member of the committee and who had been allowed to reconvene the Democratic Congress from North Carolina at that time, appealed to his brother to support the resolution, saying that W. J. Bryan, the Democratic presidential nominee, had written a letter advising such fusion of the party hanging upon the action upon such resolutions, and gave him a slap in the face of Mr. Bryan and would mean his (the government's) defeat for Congress and the defeat of the party in the coming campaign in the State. But Mr. Kitchin replied: "You are my brother, to whom I am devoted and whom I would be pleased to serve and support the integrity and success of the Democratic Party is nearer and dearer to me than your election to Congress and I cannot go with you on the resolution." Then he continued that outside and political influences were brought to bear upon him, but without avail. The resolution was defeated by a majority of one, Claude Kitchin casting his vote against it.

Mr. Kitchin was then a very young man, just beginning his political career, and I have always held as such sublime and heroic courage as was exhibited by him on that occasion, for when his youth, the time and place, and the influences brought to bear upon him are considered, it will be seen that such a vote could have been given by the very strong State in young man. The resolution was defeated by his vote and the result was the election of Charles B. Aycock as governor of the State, the reelection of his brother to Congress and a great Democratic victory, the discontinuance of his party avoided, and the preservation of its time-honored principles.

At another time in a great crisis was this wonderful courage and independence shown. The war was before Congress, and both parties were almost unanimously in its favor and the public sentiment throughout the entire country and the people of his State and district were in favor of it, yet against the advice and appeals of his friends Mr. Kitchin stood alone and against it as it was honest. He sincerely believed that war between this country and Germany could be avoided; that it was unnecessary, and therefore he voted against it. But when war was declared, with all his executive ability, he gave it his whole heart. He demonstrated his unbounded and patriotic support, leading his party and the Republicans as well in the support of all of the great appropriations and all legislative matters recommended by the administration on the ground that the same on the war to the end that we might achieve a glorious victory. He loved his country and his people, but never could he be swayed by party or personal considerations from doing that which his conscience told him was right and proper.

He was a great student and was thoroughly prepared whenever he undertook the discussion of a great question so that it was impossible to trap him or throw him off his base in debate. He always invited interruption, and was never so strong and invincible as when on his feet answering interrogatories.

Of high character, of unimpeachable integrity, of sublime courage, a great lover of truth, a splendid statesman, never deserting a friend nor stirring an enemy while he was down, few greater men have lived in our day and generation.

Within the circle of his home he was ever blessed with the devoted love of a noble wife and the tender and true love of his children, and he was never so happy as when surrounded by his wife and children in his beautiful home. His family worshiped him, his district, his State, the country, were proud of him and loved him, and the country at large felt the same pride and gave him the same confidence it always feels and gives a great public servant in whose courage and integrity it has complete confidence.

He was sick a long time, but he bore it all with the same courage and patience exhibited by him during his whole life. Finally worn, tired, and exhausted, he fell asleep. He so lived that when his summons came to join—

The immovable caravan which moves
To that mysterious realm where each shall take
His chamber in the silent hall of death,
Like one that draws the drapery of his couch
Swept from before him.

Mr. BRUCE and Mr. FRAZIER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that when I shall ask to join in the resolution, Mr. FRAZIER shall be allowed to join in the resolution, Mr. FRAZIER shall be allowed to join in the resolution.

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

Mr. FRAZIER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the record a statement of the resolution by the strong national council in regard to the effort to modify the setting aside of the
packers' agreement. The statement shows how the packers in the past have controlled the meat products to the injury both of the producers and the consumers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

[Farmers' National Council, Bliss Building, Washington, D. C., Hon. Herbert W. Baker, president; Mrs. George F. Hampton, treasurer; Benjamin C. Marsh, managing director]

WHY THE MEAT PACKERS FIGHT DESPERATELY TO HAVE CONSENT DECREE SET ASIDE

The Federal Trade Commission, in its report to the President on profiteering in 1916, said regarding the meat packers:

"Five meat packers, Armour, Swift, Morris, Wilson, and Cudahy, and their subsidiary and affiliated companies have monopolistic control of the meat industry and are reaching for like domination in other products. Their manipulations of the market embrace every device that is useful to them without regard to law. Their reward, expressed in terms of profit, reveals that four of these concerns have pocketed in 1915, 1916, and 1917, $140,000,000. However large, each of these profits is increased by the fact that these five corporations and their five companies are bound together by joint ownership, agreements, understandings, communities of interest, and family relationships.

"The combination among the Big Five is not a casual arrangement, but it is a deliberate design for 'proffiteering.'

"Big Five meat packers controlled 600 subsidiary concerns.

"The menace of this concentrated control of the National food supply is increased by the fact that these five corporations and their five hundred and odd subsidiary, controlled, and affiliated companies are connected together by joint ownership, agreements, understandings, communities of interest, and family relationships.

"The combination among the Big Five is not a casual arrangement but an almost countless number of by-product industries are similarly dominated; and not content with reaching out for mastery as to commodities which substitute for meat and its by-products, they have invaded allied industries and unregulated ones.

"The combination has not stopped at the minute integration but has gone on into a stage of conglomerate, so that unrelated heterogeneous enterprises are brought under control.

BIG FIVE MEAT PACKERS CONTROLLED 600 SUBSIDIARY CONCERNS

The commission stated:

"The menace of this concentrated control of the National food supply is being fast increased by the fact that the Big Five meat packers are already acquired but to insure their easy conquest of new fields are:

1. Srckoyards, with their collateral institutions, such as terminal yards, cattle-deal banks, and packing plants.
2. Private refrigerator-car lines for the transportation of all kinds of perishable foods.
3. Cold-storage plants for the preservation of perishable foods.
4. Branch-house system of wholesale distribution.
5. Banks and real estate.

BIG FIVE PLAN TO CONTROL NATIONAL'S FOOD SUPPLY NOW

Last year (1917) the Big Five's combined sales totaled $2,127,345,000. At the present rate of expansion, within a few years the big packers would control the wholesale distribution of the Nation's food supply.

BIG FIVE GET EASY CREDIT THROUGH CONTROL OF BANKS

The Big Five meat packers were represented, the Federal Trade Commission reported, 'on the board of directors through members of the individual families or through officers, directors, or confidential employees of the packing companies' in three banks in each of the cities: Boston; Kansas City, Mo.; Wichita, Kansas; and Omaha; 9 in New York; 25 in Chicago; 5 in St. Joseph, Mo.; 2 in each of the cities of South St. Paul and San Francisco; and 1 in Portland, Ore.; Denver, Colo.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Oklahoma City; Sioux City, Iowa; and East St. Louis, Ill. All of these are important packing centers.

BIG FIVE WANT TO CUT MILLIONS IN EVERY FIELD

In 1921 the gross income of corporations manufacturing food products, beer, and tobacco was $29,299,585,465, of which all food-manufacturing leather products $1,417,997,579—a total of nearly $10,000,000,000.

The packers' consent decree entered by the court in 1920 by agreement between the then Attorney General, A. Mitchell Palmer, and the meat packers, was largely due to the fear of the Big Five meat packers that Congress would enact legislation definitely keeping them out of these unrelated lines of business.

They had good reason to fear this. On May 26, 1908, the Supreme Court of the United States issued a permanent injunction against the big packers, ordering them to refrain from specified practices which were in violation of the antitrust law.

The Federal Trade Commission in its report on the meat-packing industry stated:

"But how little the big packers respected the courts of the United States has been and is being unfairly and illegally used to—

1. Manipulate livestock markets;
2. Restrict interstate and international supplies of foods;
3. Defraud both the producers of food and consumers;
4. Crush effective competition;
5. Secure special privileges from railroads, stockyard companies, and municipalities; and
6. Profiteer.

The packers' profits in 1917 were more than four times as great as in the average year before the European war, although their sales in dollars and cents at even the inflated prices of last year had barely doubled.

THE BIG FIVE MISKED NOTHING FROM HIDES TO CURLED HAIR

The commission's investigation showed:

1. "Control of the meat industry carries with it not only control of all kinds of fresh and preserved meats, but in addition a very great competitive advantage in more than a hundred products and by-products, arising in connection with their preparation and manufacture, ranging in importance from hides and oleomargarine to sandpaper and curled hair. In all these lines the Big Five's percentage of control, as compared with other establishments, is greater even than the percentage of animals killed, because of the fact that many of the small packers are not equipped or have been unable to utilize their by-products."

The Big Five were strongly entrenched themselves in the following among hundreds of lines of unrelated business:

1. All possible substitutes for meat, such as "fish, poultry, eggs, meats of vegetables, and have secured strategic points of collection, preparation, and distribution of these products."
2. Canned fruits, vegetables, etc.:
   - "Fruit and vegetable canning and preserving are remote from slaughtering and meat packing, but the big packers, through ownership of refrigerator car lines and their branch house systems of distribution, possess the advantages for control of this field of industry. The Big Five's advantage in this field rests not so much on their ownership of canning factories, although in some branches their output amounts to more than a quarter of the total trade, but on the fact that they have slowly growing control of the wholesale distribution of canned goods."
3. Staple groceries and vegetables—such as rice, sugar, potatoes, beans, and coffee, and they had 'increased their sales at such a great rate that in certain of these lines they have become dominant factors.'
4. Fertilizers, hides, leather, and wool: "The Big Five not only handle more than three-fourths of the hides and skins produced by interstate slaughterers but directly or through their subsidiaries, or through leases or contracts, tan a large part of the leather produced in the United States," the Trade Commission showed.

INSTRUMENTS OF CONTROL AND MONOPOLY

"These strategic positions, which serve not only to protect the controls which the big packers have already acquired but to insure their easy conquest of new fields are:"

1. Stockyards, with their collateral institutions, such as terminal yards, cattle-deal banks, and packing plants.
2. Private refrigerator-car lines for the transportation of all kinds of perishable foods.
3. Cold-storage plants for the preservation of perishable foods.
4. Branch-house systems of wholesale distribution.
5. Banks and real estate.

BIG FIVE PLAN TO CONTROL NATIONAL'S FOOD SUPPLY NOW

"Last year (1917) the Big Five's combined sales totaled $2,127,345,000. At the present rate of expansion, within a few years the big packers would control the wholesale distribution of the Nation's food supply."

BIG FIVE GET EASY CREDIT THROUGH CONTROL OF BANKS

The Big Five meat packers were represented, the Federal Trade Commission reported, "on the board of directors through members of the individual families or through officers, directors, or confidential employees of the packing companies" in three banks in each of the cities: Boston; Kansas City, Mo.; Wichita, Kansas; and Omaha; 9 in New York; 25 in Chicago; 5 in St. Joseph, Mo.; 2 in each of the cities of South St. Paul and San Francisco; and 1 in Portland, Ore.; Denver, Colo.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Oklahoma City; Sioux City, Iowa; and East St. Louis, Ill. All of these are important packing centers.

BIG FIVE WANT TO CUT MILLIONS IN EVERY FIELD

In 1921 the gross income of corporations manufacturing food products, beer, and tobacco was $29,299,585,465, of which all food-manufacturing leather products $1,417,997,579—a total of nearly $10,000,000,000.

The packers' consent decree entered by the court in 1920 by agreement between the then Attorney General, A. Mitchell Palmer, and the meat packers, was largely due to the fear of the Big Five meat packers that Congress would enact legislation definitely keeping them out of these unrelated lines of business.

They had good reason to fear this. On May 26, 1908, the Supreme Court of the United States issued a permanent injunction against the big packers, ordering them to refrain from specified practices which were in violation of the antitrust law.

The Federal Trade Commission in its report on the meat-packing industry stated:

"But how little the big packers respected the courts of the United States has been and is being unfairly and illegally used to—

1. Manipulate livestock markets;
2. Restrict interstate and international supplies of foods;
3. Defraud both the producers of food and consumers;
4. Crush effective competition;
5. Secure special privileges from railroads, stockyard companies, and municipalities; and
6. Profiteer.

The packers' profits in 1917 were more than four times as great as in the average year before the European war, although their sales in dollars and cents at even the inflated prices of last year had barely doubled.

THE BIG FIVE MISKED NOTHING FROM HIDES TO CURLED HAIR

The commission's investigation showed:

1. "Control of the meat industry carries with it not only control of all kinds of fresh and preserved meats, but in addition a very great competitive advantage in more than a hundred products and by-products, arising in connection with their preparation and manufacture, ranging in importance from hides and oleomargarine to sandpaper and curled hair. In all these lines the Big Five's percentage of control, as compared with other establishments, is greater even than the percentage of animals killed, because of the fact that many of the small packers are not equipped or have been unable to utilize their by-products."
"If we are to avoid indictments, we must immediately decide upon such a step as will first bring better feeling, by showing a disposition to cooperate."

Another committee of packers' employees stated that year:

"It matters now stand criminal prosecutions are sure to follow."

In 1910 the Federal Trade Commission made its memorable report on the entire meat-packing industry, the most complete exposé of big-business methods and manipulations ever made by a government agency. The Nation was shocked by the revelations as it has been shocked by the current revelations about Teapot Dome, the Veterans' Bureau, the Shipping Board scandal, and the Department of Justice.

HOW THE BIG FIVE WROTE THE LAW TO CONTROL THEM, AND CONTROLLED THEM "CONTROLLERS"
The Big Five meat packers next proceeded to control the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in the writing of the so-called "packers and stockyards act of 1912," keeping all feet out of it.

They defeated the effort of the progressive forces of the Nation to have the administration of the packers and stockyards act vested in the Federal Trade Commission, and put it under the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace.

They never even offered to convene the Senate

The decision of the Congress of the District of Columbia that the California Cooperative Canneries may intervene in action to set aside or modify the packers' consent decree appears to be a significant point in favor of the meat packers who projected the consent decree legislation to stop their monopolistic control of food distribution. The court asserts that a lower court would not be sustained in declaring the packers' consent decree to be a monopolistic combination illegal. "If its effect is to safeguard one public interest by the destruction of another," the circuit court of appeals recommends that the District of Columbia Supreme Court investigate whether the effect of the packers' consent decree has been to encourage a monopoly by the whole industry. This is an implied criticism of the lower court for entering the packers' consent decree of former Attorney General Palmer for agreeing to the consent decree and of present Attorney General Stone for not proceeding against the wholesale grocers with sufficient vigor at least investigating whether they are creating or threat a monopoly.

The decision does not set the consent decree aside nor modify it; it does indicate a question in the mind of the court whether such a consent would not be wise, however, as the imperative need of legislation to keep the meat packers out of unrelated lines of business, which will be sought in the next Congress. The possibility of a monopoly does not justify court protection of an established and growing monopoly, which the Federal Trade Commission's report on the meat-packing industry showed the Big Five packers to be even before the Armour-Morris merger. Definite congressional action, not the decision of a court, is the proper and orderly way to determine questions of such scope and importance.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SNOT TO END PACKERS' MONOPOLIES
In the Attorney General's petition for the entry of the packers' consent decree filed in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia February 27, 1919, he stated:

"This petition is filed and these proceedings are instituted to put an end to any and all monopolies which the defendants may have created or obtained in the interstate trade or commerce of hogs and swine for hogs and swine products and substitute foods and to prevent the continuance of unlawful monopolies by the defendants, in the aforesaid trade or commerce in the products and commodities so described or misrepresented as to induce a reasonable belief in the existence of, such sales, facilities, and advantages by which they have been enabled theretofore to more effectively perfect their attempts to monopolize; to compel the defendants to desist from dealing in certain of their goods and certain commodities and to limit in the manner hereinafter set forth the interests which the individual defendants may have in corporations handling certain substitute foods and unrelated commodities; and to dissolve any and all combinations, combinations of trade or commerce between the several States, which combine, combinations, or conspiracies are more fully hereinafter described, and to prevent said defendants from maintaining said contracts, combinations, or conspiracies with each other, or from entering into further contracts, combinations, or conspiracies with each other or with other packers or stockyards.

BIG FIVE MEAT PACKERS HAD MACHINERY COVERING THE NATION
Discussing the machinery the Big Five meat packers had established to enable them to continue and expand their monopolisation of food distribution throughout the United States, the Attorney General stated in this position:

"The parent companies operated as of June, 1913, 1,297 route cars, which constituted 90 per cent of the total number operated in the packing industry. Said route cars reach and serve dealers in 27,172 towns and operate in 87 of the States of the United States."

"Autotucks: This is a further development of the route-car plan. It had its origin in the development of the motor truck, and because of its freedom from rail restrictions and schedules it is enabled to reach a wider radius and smaller towns than is the route car. The autotucks have been adopted primarily as a supplement to the car routes. These autotucks reach and serve total of 20,886 towns throughout the United States."

CONTROL OF SUBSTITUTE FOODS
The Attorney General stated that in (default of adequate legislation) a decree of the court to prevent control of the Nation's food by the meat packers. He said:

"Having eliminated competition in the meat products, the defendants (the Big Five meat packers) next took cognizance of the competition which might be expected from what we here refer to as substitute foods," and stated:

"These attempts to monopolise have resulted in complete control in many of the substitute food lines. They have made substantial headway in certain cases in their endeavor to make rapidly increasing. New fields are gradually being invaded, and unless prevented by a decree of this court the defendants will within the compass of a few years control the quantity and price of each article of food found in the American home."

BIG FIVE CONTROLLED NEARLY SIX HUNDRED CORPORATION
The Attorney General stated:

"The parent companies of the individual defendants (the Big Five) and their families maintain and control 574 corporations, 559 concerns, including 173 towns, which have a significant minority stock interest in 95 others and an interest of unknown extent in an additional 93. Thus the total number of concerns in which they have control or interest is some 702. In the years that are past the parent companies have acquired or organised many other concerns and have maintained them so long as they were useful for their purposes. When no longer needed these concerns or organisations have been disposed of, and their businesses have been merged into that of the parent companies or that of other subsidiaries. Such dissolved corporations and concerns are omitted in the above compilation except in those instances where the names have been found to be trade names. The total of 702, above stated, therefore, falls far short of representing the total number of concerns that corporate and individual defendants have acquired or have organised in furtherance of the general scheme and plan of action already explained."

CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE CANNERIES DUMMY FOR ARMOUR & CO.
The fact that the California Cooperative Canneries is a dummy for or influenced by Armour & Co. is shown by the admission of Mr. Vernon Campbell, its vice president and general manager, before the Interstate Commerce Commission, representing the Attorney General, and the Department of Agriculture and Commerce, which held hearings in 1922 on Mr. Campbell's application for a modification of the packers' consent decree to permit Armour & Co. to combine the distribution of the canneries' fruit pack. Mr. Campbell admitted that Armour & Co. loaned his company $200,000, which was used to construct their first packing plant at San Jose, Calif., upon which Armour & Co. held the mortgage at the same time. He further admitted that Mr. Armour had given him Mr. Armour's authority to offer Mr. Armour's Indorsement for the notes of the California Cooperative Canneries, and that both Mr. Armour and Mr. Wilson (of Wilson & Co.) had told him "that they would not insist modification of the decree."

MR. CAMPBELL FOUND SUBSTITUTE DISTRIBUTOR
Mr. Campbell testified to this committee that in 1921—a full year after the consent decree went into effect—they had sold a larger per cent of their pack at that time than they had sold the preceding year at the same time, although claiming a smaller pack.

It was provided in Mr. Campbell's contract with Armour & Co. that the services of the canneries be paid for in the same manner as those fixed by the California Packing Co., and that such
products were resold by Armour & Co. at the usual market prices. If any saving was effected by Armour & Co. in such distribution, that saving was kept by Armour & Co. itself as additional profits and did not benefit the consumer.

The Big Five meat packers—

1. Agreed to the packers’ consent decree to prevent legislation being urged before Congress to keep them out of unrelated lines of business. Mr. Campbell said regarding the decree: “When I talked to Mr. Warren about it, now president of Armour & Co., I asked him why they had signed such a foolish arrangement, and he said they were holding a gun at his head and he had to do something.”

2. Knew any real and adequate packer-control legislation.

3. Under the control of the enforcement of the packers and stockyards act, and have made it largely a nullity, as producers know from prices they get and consumers from prices they pay.

4. Have succeeded in getting a dummy to be allowed to intervene to break down the packers’ consent decree, while they can seem to be satisfied with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that when I shall have yielded to the Senator from Maryland I may be allowed to resume my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from Maryland is not recognized.

Mr. BRUCE. I ask permission to have inserted in the Record an essay urging conventions in the matter of constitutional amendments, by Mr. George Stewart Brown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 22, 1924]

UNIONS CONTESTING ALL AMENDMENTS—RECENT ACTS OF RATIFYING LEGISLATURES CITING TO SHOW NEED OF PEOPLE BEING CONSULTED ON CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

(By George Stewart Brown)

NEW YORK, May 21.—The people who have to live under constitutional changes have a right to be consulted in making those changes. If radical constitutional changes, however desirable they may seem to their advocates, are made without consulting the people, that is not only unfair and unjust to the people, but it is bound to result in irritation, confusion, and disrespect for our institutions.

John Marshall said in one of his most famous decisions:

“The people made the Constitution, and the people can unmake it.”

It is the creature of their will. But this supreme and irresistible power to make or unmake resides only in the whole body of the people, and not in any subdivision of them. The attempt of any of the parts to exercise it is usurpation and ought to be repelled by those to whom the people have delegated the power of repeating it.”

After the experience of ratifications by legislatures in the case of the last two amendments no one can honestly claim that “legislatures” can be trusted to accurately record the will of the people of their States in ratifying Federal amendments.

A few glaring illustrations should be sufficient to demonstrate this to the most obtuse.

In Missouri and California the legislatures which voted to ratify the eighteenth amendment were elected at the same time that a popular referendum was held in those States on State prohibition. In both the people defeated the popular prohibition by large majorities. Yet in the teeth of that popular decision the Missouri and California Legislatures ratified. No man can honestly claim that those legislatures had the moral right to thus falsely record the assent of the people of California and Missouri to the eighteenth amendment.

In our own State of Maryland we are all familiar with the fact that our legislature which voted to ratify was a hold-over legislature, elected before the amendment was proposed by Congress, upon entirely different political and not necessarily the same constitutional principles as a national prohibition campaign.

It is as plain as a pikestaff that our Maryland Legislature had no popular mandate and therefore no moral right to record the assent of the people of Maryland to the eighteenth amendment.

In Ohio the people of that State on referendum, by a close vote in one of the largest popular votes ever held in the State of Ohio, repudiated their own legislature’s ratification of the eighteenth amendment itself. At the same time by a large majority they adhered to local prohibition. This showed that the people of Ohio had the sense to discriminate between local prohibition, remaining control, and embodying a police law in practically irrepealable form into our charter of liberty known as the Federal Constitution.

In California it is notable that ratifying legislatures in so-called dry States—and they were legislatures—had much mistaken the popular mandate. In both the States of California and Missouri, the people made the Constitution, and the people can unmake it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senate is not discussing the constitutionality of the Eighteenth Amendment, but is discussing whether or not the Senate should have the constitutional right to consider the Eighteenth Amendment.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that when I have yielded to the Senator from Georgia I may be allowed to re-state.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not—
Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I object. There is a very important motion that has been made this morning to take up the matter of Celler House bill 887. I understood that at the close of morning business that matter was to be brought before the Senate. I shall object to any further unanimous-consent agreement of this nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made and the Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I thought the Chair had recognized me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair merely presented the request of the Senator from Georgia for recognition, and the Senator from Missouri asked unanimous consent that he might be heard. The Chair in his haste had about considered the formula, but the Senator from Maine was on his feet making his objection known, and therefore the Senator from Missouri can not, of course, yield to the Senator from Georgia.

The Chair will say further that the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] stands in the same position as a resolution coming over from the previous day, and there being, strictly speaking, no unfinished business before the Senate, the Senator's motion is in order.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take up for consideration the motion made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KINKAID] to reconsider the action by which House bill 887 was passed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. WALSH] has the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then I make the point of order that the Senator from Maine has no right to address the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I did not catch the statement of the Chair with regard to the parliamentary situation. Will the Chair be good enough to repeat what he said?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion entered by the Senator from Montana on yesterday in the opinion of the Chair stands before the Senate in the same position as a resolution coming over from a previous day and was reached in its regular order prior to 2 o'clock. There being strictly speaking no unfinished business before the Senate, the Senate continued discussion of that motion in the nature of a resolution coming over from a previous day, and upon that question the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] has maintained his right to the floor. The Senator from Maine, as the Chair understands, wishes the Senator from Missouri to yield.

Mr. SPENCER. I call the attention of the Chair to Rule IX as to whether or not the motion of the Senator from Montana to proceed to the consideration of his report is in order after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The course it is in order after 2 o'clock, in the opinion of the Chair, because there was no unfinished business, and the motion is in the nature of a resolution coming over from the previous day.

LEASES UPON NAVAL OIL RESERVES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WALSH of Montana to adopt the report of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys submitted pursuant to Senate Resolution 147.

Mr. SPENCER. I call the attention of the Chair to the suggestion that under Rule IX, after 2 o'clock there is a regular procedure on the calendar itself, a general order, and that therefore the motion of the Senator from Montana is out of order if a point of order is raised. It falls at 2 o'clock, because after 2 o'clock there is a special order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Montana is out of order after 2 o'clock, in the opinion of the Chair, because there was no unfinished business, and the motion is in the nature of a resolution coming over from the previous day.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, this is an extraordinary situation. The Senate did proceed to the consideration of the motion; the Senator from Missouri claimed the floor to debate the motion, and not make a point of order that the motion is not properly before the Senate.

Mr. SPENCER. I did so because I did not want to debate the motion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Rule IX is as follows:

Immediately after the consideration of cases not objected to upon the calendar is completed—

We have not yet reached that, and therefore Rule IX can not possibly apply. That applies to what should happen after consideration of cases not objected to upon the calendar, and we have not yet reached that point—

and not later than 2 o'clock, if there shall be no special orders for that time, the calendar of general orders shall be taken up.

We may reach that in due course, but it is not before us now.

Mr. PUTMAN. Mr. President, prior to 2 o'clock, at the time this procedure of the Senator from Missouri started, he yielding the floor to various Senators. I made a parliamentary inquiry and asked that the unanimous-consent request should include the statement that any interruption would not interfere with the business before the Senate. This matter was pending as the business before the Senate before 2 o'clock, and by unanimous consent was to continue as such, notwithstanding the interruptions of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Even in view of reference to Rule IX, the Chair is of the opinion that the motion of the Senator from Montana is properly before the Senate. The Senator from Missouri is recognized, and is holding the floor to speak upon it.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, again I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that now and at any time while I am speaking here, if the judgment of the Senator from Montana leads him to defer this motion, which calls for no immediate action, I shall cooperate with him, for it is a duty and not at all a pleasure which I feel is imposed upon me at this time.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very glad to advise the Senator from Missouri that the Senator from Montana does not even entertain the idea of postponement.

Mr. SPENCER. Knowing the Senator from Montana as I do, I am afraid that that is true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a question?

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

Mr. SPENCER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Do I understand that the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Missouri means that the Senator from Missouri is likely to hold the floor until 7 o'clock this evening?

Mr. SPENCER. I shall finish as soon as I can, but I intend to discuss the matter at length.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I judge from the Senator's statement that he does not intend to have a vote on this motion today.

Mr. SPENCER. I have no desire to prevent consideration of the motion; I shall not speak merely to prolong the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana; but in the presentation of the reasons why I do not think it ought to be agreed to there will be some time consumed by me.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And that may be until 7 o'clock this evening?

Mr. SPENCER. I should think not; I can not conceive of it being so long as that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, the report which is now before the Senate has been somewhat changed from the report that was originally presented to the President on June 4. Some of the corrections which I indicated when the report was first presented to the committee have been made in this report. I do not have the opportunity to present other mistakes and misstatements which a casual reading of the report evidenced, and many of them are still in the present report.
June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 259) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fifteenth anniversary of the battle of Lexington and Concord, authorizing an appropriation to be made for such connection with the observance, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL CREDITS TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Delaware? Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that when I have yielded to the Senator from Delaware I may be allowed to resume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BALL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware asked not in the chair at the time the point of order was made, Senate Resolution 244, which will be read for the information of the Senate. Mr. ASHURST. Let it be read in full.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 244), which had been adopted from the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 13, agreed to December 19, 1923, authorizing the Committee of the District of Columbia to employ an assistant clerk, be, and hereby is, continued in full force and effect until the end of the Sixty-eighth Congress.

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

Having no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

POSTMasters AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I rise to make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. A short time ago there was presented to the Senate a message from the President vetoing the postal bill for the postal employees. I understand that immediate action was not taken because no entry of the message has been made in the Journal of the Senate as required by the Constitution. I rise to ask the Chair when an entry was made in the Journal of the President's veto message? How long does it take to make an entry in the Journal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Journal clerks are now entering in full the objections of the President to the bill, and that the Chair will be informed when that work of transcription has been completed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. My information is that the Chair has given no order to the clerks to enter upon the Journal the message, and I rise to ask if it is necessary for the Chair to issue such an order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not in the chair at the time the point of order was raised and decided; but the Chair is of the opinion that no special order need be given by the Presiding Officer to a clerk of the Senate to perform his duties.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So the situation is that when the clerks enter the message the Chair will be so informed, and the Senate will be informed by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding of the situation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thank the Chair. I shall renew my request for action on the veto at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will state his point of order.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not wish it to be established without dissent as a precedent or a part of the practice of the Sen-
ate that before the Senate may consider a veto message the objections of the President must first be entered upon the Journal. I do not so construe the Constitution, and I express my dissent to such precedent being established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order was made by the minority leader, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Robinson], and was sustained by the President pro tempore. Far be it from the present occupant of the chair so soon to override the decision of the President pro tempore.

Mr. ASHURST. It is not my view of the Constitution that before the Senate may consider a veto message the objections must be entered at large on the Journal. In other words, the President of the United States is not the agent of its clerk. Ninety-six Senators are not required to wait upon the tedious processes of a clerk. It would be absurd to say that the Senate would be powerless to act upon a message from the President of the United States unless and until a clerk had made certain black marks on certain white paper.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the Senator if he understood the minority leader to raise a point of order against immediate action?

Mr. ASHURST. I have great respect for the minority leader. Indeed, I disrever to say that he has led his party with a sagacity and an ability unsurpassed in the past 50 years of the Senate's history. I did not know he had made that observation; but since I am informed that he made the observation, I nevertheless adhere to my view of the Constitution.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that recently the President had appointed an oil commission, composed of a naval officer, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, and a petroleum engineer, to report among other things on a program and policy for oil for the Navy. I do not more fully comment upon that, for, as my recollection goes, that was not referred to in our testimony; but it is a significant fact in connection with the quotation which I have just made.

Why did the Navy lease the reserves?

At the time that the leases on the naval reserves were granted, the Government of the United States and the Navy in particular had already suffered many millions of dollars loss, not from the drainage of oil on the naval lands on which there was not ever the right to drill at will, but from the drainage of oil on the lands that require either of these things to be done—in fact, millions of barrels of oil stored in the ground would not be available in time to meet any emergency need for oil. It was abundantly established in the testimony that, for example, a certain territory owned by the Government and set aside for naval purposes was highly productive of oil, if the Government had the right to protect that source of supply to the edge of that naval reserve did so. The reason that the oil in the naval reserve was drained out, and flowed into the adjoining, the neighboring, the adjacent wells, was lost revenue, and the value of the oil which was sold to those who operated the adjoining property and neither the Navy nor the United States profited as they should; and the Government has lost millions of dollars due to the drainage of oil from the various lands by neighboring wells.

Up to the passage of what I speak of as the Daniels Act of June 4, 1920—I call it that because it came to the Congress with his approval, and was formulated by him—which directed the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the lands subject to the Navy's authority, and granted him authority to lease them in any way he thought best, and to examine and exchange the oil, Congress had provided no means whatever of protecting those properties from such drainage. The first attempt to use this power was the natural one of giving small leases to particular tracts immediately subject to drainage. While wide discretion was given the Secretary, and there is nothing in the act which requires advertising—a point that may come up for consideration later—or granting of leases on competitive bids; while there was nothing in the act that could be done with these lands that require either of these things to be done—in fact, certain clauses of the general leasing act of February 25, 1920, passed by the same Congress that passed the Daniels Act on June 4, 1920, seemed to indicate that the lease requirements were removed such requirements when the oil was to be taken for Government use—still, probably from habit rather than from much thought, formal proposals were drawn up in early 1921, advertised in April, and a lease was granted in June.

The long delay in permitting unrestrained drainage by the Standard Oil Co. so cut down the value of the ground—and I call the attention of the Senate to this in passing—that companies which in April offered royalties of 46 and 48 per cent, in June withdrew their bids.

The successful bidder in June lost heavily on the lease, and therefore the Government was never able to get bids nearly so high for any land offered in that vicinity.

Promptness in action is of the first importance in getting down offset wells, and experience shows that if the Government were never to drill any but offset wells and then only after advertising for competitive bidding, in connection therewith it would never receive its due share of what is called the flush, or the first production, which is the largest and in considerable part of the oil which is at bottom. "Thrice armed is he whose cause is just," but four times he who gets his well down "fast."

Accordingly, one of the things designed to be accomplished, and in fact has been accomplished, is that any leasing reserves Nos. 1 and 3 as units, No. 1 in California, and No. 3 in Wyoming, is that the Navy is in a position to put drills into the field overnight if need be at any point where danger is threatened, and with leases who have established reputa-
tions for unusual skill and promptness. The Navy can then be assured of getting oil from any part of its reserves as quickly as its neighbors can, if not more quickly.

The heavy handicap of Government red tape is effectively overcome by the political inactivity in the leasing of oil lands. A good many more barrels of oil than could result from any policy of delayed leasing strip by strip.

I venture those observations, Mr. President, at this time, in order that there are two sides upon the question of competitive bidding. My own judgment, as I am now advised, is that competitive bidding is as a general policy a desirable, if not an essential, method in the leasing of oil lands. But it has been pointed out in the Wyoming reserve-reserve No. 3—it has been pointed out that it serves to increase the economical layout and economical methods of development. Economical layout and economical methods of development are important matters, which in the view of some persons, who have an opinion on the subject, are worth consideration.

Furthermore, the leasing in large units presents the most economical layout and most economical methods of development. The Wyoming reserve reserve No. 3 pay a royalty of 22 per cent. But there are two sides to the question.

If it is wise to hold oil in the ground anywhere, that is where it is held in the Wyoming reserve; it is kept in the Wyoming reserve; it is kept in the Wyoming reserve because it is kept in the Wyoming reserve. If it is wise to hold oil in the ground anywhere, that is where it is held in the Wyoming reserve; it is kept in the Wyoming reserve; it is kept in the Wyoming reserve because it is kept in the Wyoming reserve. The Wyoming reserve No. 3 has been pointed out to be the most economical and the most economical methods of development. It is a question of whether there are two sides to the question.

The operation of the leases is under a very real control through the Bureau of Mines, and over the larger part of the western half of reserve No. 1 is California. The Navy reserves the right to hold back drilling as long as it cares to do so. In other words, the drilling on the naval oil reserves is, generally speaking, confined to such drilling as is in a liberal judgment is necessary to protect the oil in those naval reserves from drainage, whether from direct drainage or from the loss of oil pressure, which results in the same loss of oil.

If it is wise to hold oil in the ground anywhere, that is where it is held in the Wyoming reserve; it is kept in the Wyoming reserve; it is kept in the Wyoming reserve because it is kept in the Wyoming reserve. If it is wise to hold oil in the ground anywhere, that is where it is held in the Wyoming reserve; it is kept in the Wyoming reserve; it is kept in the Wyoming reserve because it is kept in the Wyoming reserve. The Wyoming reserve No. 3 has been pointed out to be the most economical and the most economical methods of development. It is a question of whether there are two sides to the question.

It is also true that in this lease the lessee has the priority preference right of drilling when the time comes, if it ever does come, that the Navy wants to drill that land.

With regard to the royalties in the leases, there has been no criticism of the royalties paid for the California lands. They are admittedly higher than the regular Government royalties for public land and higher than those paid for similar undeveloped land leased from private owners. In the case of the Wyoming reserve—reserve No. 3—it has been pointed out that the actual royalty now accruing from the Navy lands—about 17 per cent—this is higher than that from the private lands adjacent.

That is true; but it is not the whole story. The lands immediately adjacent to the naval reserve No. 3 pay a royalty of 30 per cent and other blocks farther away pay 33 1/3 per cent, but the great bulk of the oil taken from Government lands in the Salt Creek field is under lease at lower rates, so that the actual average for the field as a whole, comparable to the reserve, is 22 per cent.

The leases outside the reserve are flat royalty—that is, the amount does not increase, no matter how big the wells may be. Within the reserve the royalties vary from month to month, depending upon the average yield per barrel.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) declares agriculture to be the basic industry of the country, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Winslow, Mr. Hoehn, and Mr. Rayburn were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed enrolled bills of the following titles, and they were therupon read and the President pro tempore signed:

H. R. 1306. An act for the relief of Henry McGuire;
H. R. 1830. An act for the relief of Charles T. Norman;
H. R. 4830. An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded lands, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor;
H. R. 6955. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue its bonds in any sum not to exceed $100,000 for the purpose of constructing a schoolhouse in said town and equipping the same," approved June 22, 1920;
H. R. 6952. An act to authorize the city of Los Angeles, in the State of California, to construct and operate a line of railroad for making useful the lands comprising the MacArthur Military Reservation, in the State of California;
H. R. 6950. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Cordova, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $100,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in said town of Cordova, Alaska;
H. R. 8072. An act for the relief of William H. Nelson;
H. R. 9111. An act directing the remission of customs duties on certain property of the United States imported by the War Department;
H. R. 9314. An act to amend section 98 of the Judicial Code;
H. R. 9361. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande;
H. R. 9402. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Fullerton & Portsmouth Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River to connect the city of Portsmouth, Ohio, and the village of Fullerton, Ohio;
H. R. 9467. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Alabama and Georgia, through their respective highway departments, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Chattahoochee River, at or near Alaga, Ala., connecting Houston County, Ala., and Early County, Ga.;
H. R. 9515. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware State Highway Department to construct a bridge across the river near Rehoboth, Del.;
H. R. 9517. An act granting the consent of Congress to the North Texas Co., of St. Jo, Tex., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Texas, to construct a toll bridge across the Red River in the vicinity of Wilburton, Okla.;
H. R. 9610. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Lowndes County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Tombigbee River; and
H. R. 9632. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Georgia, through its highway department, to construct a bridge across the Oconee River.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent that after I shall have yielded to the Senator from Massachusetts I may be allowed to resume the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to introduce a resolution, which, without objection, will be received and read.

The principal clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 258), as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives to act upon the resolution of the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to this resolution, and of course it is perfectly proper that it should be agreed to; but I want to serve notice right now that if the Senator from Missouri yields any more, I am going to make a point of order about it.

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator from Missouri will not yield unless he has unanimous consent to resume.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will arrange it so that the Senator will not get consent for the point of order.

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator from Missouri will not yield unless he has unanimous consent to resume.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will arrange it so that the Senator will not get consent for the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair names as the committee under the resolution presented by the Senator from Massachusetts the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Logan] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Robinson].

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CONCESSION. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I inquire when this notification to the President is to be made.

Mr. LODGE. I suppose in time to reach him before 7 o'clock.
Mr. WALSH of Montana. Whenever to-day the Senate shall conclude to adjourn?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know what the arrangement will be. Mr. ROBINSON. The Senate has agreed to adjourn not later than 7 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Not later than 7. We should have to go before that, because under the concurrent resolution Congress will adjourn 7 o'clock.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This resolution does not arrange for the adjournment of the Senate Instantaneously?

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, no. The President will simply be notified at the proper time that the Senate is ready to adjourn.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is a formality that is universally observed.

The PRESIDENT OF MISSOURI. Mr. President, I trust it will be so employed as not to interrupt the speech of the Senator from Missouri.

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION LOANS

The PRESIDENT OF MONTANA (Mr. Lodge in the chair). Will the Senator from Missouri permit the Chair to interrupt him long enough to name the committee provided for under Senate Resolution 208? The committee will be composed of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McLEAN], and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. OBERMAN].

LEASES UPON NAVAL OIL RESERVES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WALSH of Montana to adopt the report of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys submitted pursuant to Senate Resolution 147.

Mr. SPENCER. The first point that I discussed and had nearly completed—I wish it were the last instead of the first—was the matter, that was under the report which the Senator from Montana insists that the Senate shall adopt without having any opportunity to read or consider it, and was that it was not intended at any time that the store of oil thus negotiated, the royalty would be within the naval reserves; but that the policy of Secretary of the Navy Daniels, in his keen desire to protect the Navy, was to refuse to take steps to conserve the oil, for which the Secretary of the Navy was not essential, and which he did not take, doubtless with the best of intention. He intended to use the oil he did obtain for current purposes, and therefore the statement of the report is inaccurate, if it is not a misstatement.

I referred to the reasons why the Navy leases were made, and I said that within the naval reserves the royalties vary from month to month, dependent on the average yield per well. It may go as high as 50 per cent of the product of oil; and if the wells in Teapot had turned out as big as they were in the neighboring part of Salt Creek at the time the Teapot lease was negotiated, the royalty would have been 50 per cent instead of 10. The low royalty is due to the wells being small. There is much less oil in the ground covered by the Teapot Dome lease than either the Government or the lessees anticipated when the Government entered into the contract.

The Senator from Montana insists that the Senate shall adopt without opportunity to examine the report which the Senator from Montana now insists we shall adopt without opportunity to examine it may result in the conclusion that as far as the two great naval oil leases—the one to Sinclair in Wyoming and the other to Doheny's company in California—are concerned, whatever may be said about the technicalities of their grant now before the court for decision and not before the Senate, the leases themselves have been of great benefit to the United States, and that either one of the leases would be glad to cancel the leases and get back the money which has been spent in pursuance of their contract with the Government.

The hearings will never sustain the finding that the Government has been cheated in those leases, though there is a real doubt as to whether the validity of the granting of the leases is assured. Those questions, as I have said, are now before the court. Probably that is one reason why there is no recommendation in the report in connection with these matters.

The mere fact that there was much less oil in the naval reserve than either the Government or the lessees anticipated is not the whole story. One of the features of the Mammoth Oil contract with Sinclair is that the Mammoth Oil contract is the contract incident to the lease with the Sinclair Oil Co.—was that the company agreed to pay and paid the Navy full Mid-Continent prices for the oil as against the contract with the Government. That may seem like a best of fact. As a matter of fact, it means that the price for oil in the Salt Creek district in Wyoming where the oil was located is one thing, and the price of oil in the middle of the continent where it may have been taken by a pipe line, where refineries and markets are available, is another thing. The price of oil in the Mid-Continent territory is much higher than the price of oil in the Salt Creek district. Therefore the provision in the contract that Salt Creek prices should not control, but that Mid-Continent prices should control is not the same thing as the contract price at the Salt Creek price. The Navy had a further advantage of 10 cents per barrel based on a year's average in the price at which it draws or may draw fuel oil under the exchange provisions of the contract.

It will also be remembered—and I call attention to this in passing—that for each barrel of royalty crude oil turned over to the Mammoth Co. in Wyoming the Navy is entitled to a full barrel of bunker fuel oil delivered free at a specified Atlantic or Gulf coast terminal. The fuel oil in the first year of operation under the contract varied in price from 1.5 cents to 1.23 cents per gallon more than the simultaneous prices of crude oil at Mid-Continent. The average received by the Navy for Teapot royalty for the year was $1.65 per barrel, and bunker fuel oil was selling at approximately $2.20 a barrel, so even at the current prices the Navy got more than the smaller wells the Navy, under the contract, takes out far ahead.

Incidentally, the possession of this contract by the Navy raised prices in the entire Salt Creek district and permitted the Government in terms to contract royalty oil at Mid-Continent prices. This in the year 1923 resulted in a clear gain in one year of $8,000,709, which did not come to the Navy because it was outside of the naval reserves; but it was money that came to the Government and the reclaimed lands and the State of Wyoming and the reclamation fund and the 10 per cent that went into miscellaneous receipts of the Government.

Mr. President, so much for the first point of the report to which I have called attention. On page 5, line 2, of paragraph 2, the report provides that the act which was then being discussed in the report—authorized the Secretary of the Interior to lease any producing wells within the reserve, and further—

I call attention to this—authorized the President to lease all or any part of any claim—

That is, placer-milling claim—within which there should be neither producing wells.

It refers to the full or accurate statement. It refers to section 184 of the act of February 25, 1920, which has also been construed to authorize not only what the report said but also to authorize the President to lease claims in naval reserves included in the withdrawals of September 14, 1925, which have been or may hereafter be drawn in question on behalf of the United States in any department or judicial proceeding.

I call the attention of the Senate, on page 10 of the report, to what undoubtedly is a mere mistake and does not affect any great issue. The report reads that three of these claims that have been drilled to the shallow Shamoon sands yielded, it was claimed at the time they were first brought in, from three to eight barrels of oil per day.

The Senator is mistaken in regard to the number of wells. The record shows that four were found, that was four, and that the cost of the fourth well, as he will find on page 428 and 1197 of the record, was $1,252.45.

On page 10 of the report, in making its argument as to why lessees who had claims were content to surrender their rights if they could get a lease from the Government, the statement is made:

Their application for a lease was undoubtedly an admission that they were not entitled to patent for the land, for obviously they would not have surrendered themselves and their claims if they were content to get any part of the case they were entitled to a patent for the entire 160 acres embraced in the claim.

The argument would be unanswerable if the premises were conceded, but the difficulty is that the facts are not correctly stated, and the argument is based on the fact that they got not leases for one well, but leases for the
whole 160 acres upon which they may have had many wells. The fact was brought out in the record on pages 445 and 447. It was better to take a lease undisputed for 160 acres with the right to drill as many wells as they desired on that 160 acres than to have the Secretary of the Interior pass upon questions on petition for review, not as of right on the part of the petitioner but as of right, because the Secretary himself explained. The fact is that in the Department of the Interior to pass upon questions on petition for review, not as of right, but as of right, and to recognize in the practice of the department is undoubted; it is not a correct statement. This report has to do with fundamental rights in connection with the oil leases, and it ought to be accurate, not for one moment claim either here or elsewhere that there is any intentional misstatement, but the misstatements are there nevertheless. The fact is that a right to land can be founded not only upon—

a discovery of oil antedating the withdrawal order of September 27, 1900, but as well upon the order of July 2, 1910, and also upon diligence in seeking such discovery from the date of withdrawal until discovery was actually made.

On the same page, page 10 of the report, a statement is made which, I am sure, must have been inadvertently made, because it is a misstatement of what the Assistant Secretary of the Interior said. No one, judging from what the senior Senator from Montana has often said upon the floor of the Senate and in the committees, holds a higher opinion of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior than does the senior Senator from Montana. The statement, however, that he makes at the bottom of page 10 and in the first line of page 11 is this:

Secretary Fall, in his letter to the President, treats this action seriously, but Assistant Secretary Finney, intimately familiar with the practice of the department and with all of the laws in relation to the disposition of the public domain from an experience of over 20 years in the department, asserts that no such proceeding is recognized by the rules of practice of the department.

In other words, that under the rules of practice and under the practice of the department there was no authority for the Secretary of the Interior to review a case, as he did do in the case to which the Senator from Montana is referring. What Mr. Finney said, as found on page 2332 of the record, was:

There is—

Not that there is not—

There is a sort of supervisory power recognized in the Secretary, and claims do sometimes file a request or petition—I think petition is a better name than anything else—for the exercise of some supervisory power by the Secretary to give the matter another review. Quite a number of such have been filed at various times. Now it is maybe I should say it is a mere privilege. * * *

It does not act as a superseded.

But the fact that it always had been done; that it did have recognition in the practice of the department is undoubted; and the statement to the contrary in the report is a mistake.

The subject of the supervisory power was also covered even more carefully on page 1600 of the record, as follows:

It is specifically provided for in the circular entitled "Rules of practice in cases before the United States district land offices, the General Land Office, and the Department of the Interior," approved December 9, 1910, reprinted July 19, 1921, with amendments. The circular provides:

SUPERVISORY POWER OF SECRETARY—RULE 85

Motion for the exercise of supervisory power will be considered only when accompanied by positive showing of extraordinary emergency or exigency demanding the exercise of such authority.

I submit to the Senate how unwise it would be for the country which has always recognized which states that upon the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior no such supervisory power of the Secretary is recognized by the rules of practice of the Department, when the exact opposite is the fact, as the Assistant Secretary has explained. The fact is that in the Department of the Interior there is that supervisory power of the Secretary of the Interior to pass upon questions on petition for review, not as of right on the part of the petitioner but as of right, because the Secretary himself explained. The fact is that in the Department of the Interior there is that supervisory power of the Secretary of the Interior to pass upon questions on petition for review, not as of right on the part of the petitioner but as of right, because the Secretary himself explained. In leaving this subject, I want to quote from the syllabus of a decision on June 19, 1895, in Volume III, Land Decisions, 595, as follows:

The privilege of discussing a case orally before the Secretary is accorded within the discretion of the department, but not as a matter of right.

The syllabus of the decision of July 19, 1900, in Volume XXX, Land Decisions, 161, reads:

The Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his supervisory power over the land part of the Department, may, even in the absence of an appeal, transfer the consideration of any matter pending before the General Land Office to the department, and, after due opportunity to the parties in interest to be heard, may render decision thereon, correcting and obviating errors or irregularities in the proceedings or decisions of that office.

The next point in the report to which I desire to call attention is found on page 11. Undoubtedly the time which elapsed between May 14, when we closed the hearings, and June 4, when this report was presented to the committee, was not sufficient to enable even one so diligent and so familiar with this matter as the senior Senator from Montana thoroughly to review and study the testimony. There were thousands of pages of testimony that, in a sense, ought at least to have been reviewed. In view of the circumstances the mistakes that occurred were to be expected, and undoubtedly there will be many more that will be manifest upon a careful examination. The senior Senator has as yet had adequate time afforded him to go through the testimony or even to examine the report.

The argument the Senator makes on page 11—and it is interesting to note how he is hoisted by his own petard in that instance—is this:

The facts are that all of the claims were held or controlled by the Pioneer Oil Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co., which in turn is a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co., and the Pioneer Oil Co. and the Standard Oil Co. are the same company.

One or more of these companies had at least since 1910, been endeavoring to secure a lease of naval reserve No. 3, or some portion of it. They were all amply able to undertake the development of the territory and were potential competitors for the lease. Sinclair paid, or at least offered to pay, to the United States $1,000,000, more than the execution of the lease a million dollars nominally for the claims as reported, as above stated, to be worthless.

I will resume that quotation in a moment:

All those claims in the Salt Creek district—and there were many of them—had more or less foundation. No one knows how much. I doubt if they had much foundation. I think that many of them were equitable claims, which upon legal proceedings would have been disallowed. I agree with the Senator from Montana in that general observation. I think when the Secretary of the Interior came to execute leases of this property to Sinclair's company, the Mammoth Oil Co., he said, in effect, we are not going to have all those outstanding claims unlawfully; we are going to get a lease there shall not be constant litigation between those claimants, with or without good ground for their claims, and the Government of the United States. Therefore he made with Sinclair's company, one of the conditions of this lease that they acquire all those outstanding claims and quitclaim them to the Government of the United States so that the title of the Government of the United States to this land should be unquestioned. Then your lease to this ground, the title of which is thus unquestioned in the United States, will be granted. Sinclair, in pursuance of that condition in his contract, paid a million dollars to secure the control of those claims. The senior Senator from Montana does not think that that million dollars was paid for those claims; the senior Senator from Montana thinks that those claims were absolutely worthless; but doubtless the senior Senator from Montana, like any other lawyer in this body, has often found that claims that were deemed by himself and the Salt Creek district—aud the United States. Therefore he made with Sinclair's company, one of the conditions of this lease that they acquire all those outstanding claims and quitclaim them to the Government of the United States so that the title of the Government of the United States to this land should be unquestioned. Then your lease to this ground, the title of which is thus unquestioned in the United States, will be granted. Sinclair, in pursuance of that condition in his contract, paid a million dollars to secure the control of those claims. The senior Senator from Montana does not think that that million dollars was paid for those claims; the senior Senator from Montana thinks that those claims were absolutely worthless; but doubtless the senior Senator from Montana, like any other lawyer in this body, has often found that claims that were deemed by himself and his clients to be worthless when it came to litigation were found to have as the result of the judgment or decree in the case, not to be so worthless as had been imagined, but, on the contrary, to have substantial merit. That was precisely what was in the mind of the Secretary of the Interior when he said:

All those claims must be wiped out and the title to the Government must be secured before the Government will grant you this lease.

In any event a million dollars was paid for those claims, and the report goes on to say:

Though that construction of the transaction is denied by Sinclair—

That is, that he paid the million dollars not for the claims but for other purposes, perhaps bribery, and to discourage competitors—
Though that construction of the transaction is denied by Sinclair, your committee is of the opinion that the payment was not made in fact for the purpose of the title of these claims but to remove from the field a formidable competitor for the lease and that the true nature of the transaction was thoroughly understood by Secretary Full.

What does the senior Senator from Montana want the Senate of the United States to do? He wants the Senate of the United States to pass this report without opportunity to examine and by its adoption to say, in effect, "We, the Senate, never having read the report or knowing anything about the facts, declare that the $1,000,000 which Sinclair paid and which, as a matter of fact, he did pay to the holders of those claims against the Government in the Salt Creek district was paid not to cancel those supposed claims, which were worthless, but it was a corrupt bargain to discouragement to the competitors, and the Secretary of the Interior was a party to it, and between the two that corrupt, illegal act was consummated."

I undertake to say for myself that without far stronger evidence than we have yet secured I should not attempt to pass judgment on the matter. There was no need in this report of attempting to take such snap judgment, and it is not fair to ask the Senate of the United States to pass their judgment without sufficient evidence to warrant an unfair inference and without any opportunity to examine into the facts.

But look at it further. The weakness, the ridiculousness, of the conclusion arrived at by the senior Senator from Montana is apparent from the very face of the statement. His conclusion is absurdly erroneous.

If the Plains Oil Co. is controlled by the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, as the senior Senator from Montana declares in this paragraph, and if the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana owns one-half of the Sinclair Crude Oil Purchasing Co., as is stated on page 13 of this report—that company which purchases and conveys the Teapot Dome oil eastward—it follows, if the senior Senator from Montana is correct, that there was an attempt on the part of one subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. to drive another subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co., or, in other words, that the right hand was at war with the left hand, a ridiculous conclusion, Q. E. D., and emphasizes, if I may say so, what I want to say to the Committee, that for a long time there has been no adequate opportunity either to prepare a correct or fair report or to examine the report even as made.

On page 10 the Senator makes the following statement:

"That is, the naval oil reserve No. 3—has never exceeded seven or eight thousand barrels daily, the conclusion being that the pipe line by the Sinclair Crude Oil Purchasing Co. is in progress, that company having assumed whatever obligation in that regard was due from the Mammoth Oil Co. under the lease."

Unquestionably this pipe line would not have been built when it was built if the pipe line company had not secured the Salt Creek field and the matter is this: that a pipe line—I think 700 miles long—has been built from the Teapot Dome and the Salt Creek district that carries the oil from that field to where it can be refined and used, and the Sinclair Co. were required by their contract to build that pipe line, and, more than that, the Government were given the prior right to transport every barrel of their oil through that pipe line before any other customer could be served—a right in itself that was and is of exceeding value.

On the same page—page 16—the report reads:

"The daily production of the Salt Creek field may reach 175,000 barrels, but by agreement between the operators the output was limited to—".

The original report said "is limited to—"

To 40,000 barrels, that amount being all that can be handled by the local refineries.

The inference is clear that a limitation of 40,000 barrels per day is in force. There was an original limitation. There is no reason or need for extending that limitation. It has been extended. That is, that a pipe line has been built which would transport all the oil from the Salt Creek field, including Teapot Dome, is not producing over 90,000 and 100,000 barrels of oil.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President,

Mr. President, as a matter of fact that I can not yield, unless with unanimous consent to resume. I am sure the Senator from Montana does not desire to take me off my feet, or plan so to do, and yet he was the one who gave notice that if I continue on I would raise the point of order that I had yielded the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely desire to remark that the Senator is not discussing the committee's report at all. He is discussing my original document.

Mr. SPENCER. As I said at the outset, there was submitted on June 4 a report, and the next day, or the next day after, an amended report was produced, with which was made the statement that when the committee on the floor of the Senate, certainly in the committee, that there were no substantial changes between that and the original report, except that certain concluding paragraphs were left out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It was changed in the particular the Senator is now talking about.

Mr. SPENCER. And it may be that here and there there will be an item to which I refer that is corrected in the amended report. I repeat that that is true of the whole of the errors and misstatements were corrected. If they had all been corrected there would have been no necessity of the duty that is now imposed upon me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. All were corrected that seemed to need correction.

Mr. SPENCER. I know that the next misstatement which I had marked had been corrected in the majority report, for on page 17 the report inadvertently referred to oil which was delivered to the Navy when it never meant the Navy; it meant the Shipping Board. That happened to strike my eye quickly, and I pointed the attention of the senior Senator from Montana to it, and that correction has been made. There is no need of comment upon it.

On page 17, at the bottom of the page, there occurs this statement:

"When on the stand Admiral Robison, who succeeded Admiral Griffin and represented the Navy Department in connection with the contracts, insisted that considerations connected with the national defense were influential in the course pursued with relation to them, which I asked an opportunity to present at an executive session."

In other words, the Navy Department said, in effect, "We took certain action with regard to that oil in the naval reserves which we would like to discuss in executive session. Questions of national defense were involved."

Now, the concluding paragraph on that page reads as follows:

"No information was conveyed to the committee which, in its opinion, had not in substance been made public, nor has the committee been able to appreciate how the public interest would be subserved or the committee promise promoted by secrecy with reference to any feature of the contracts."

I do not care particularly about the slur on Admiral Robison. I do not care about the Senate's committee saying that the Navy did not know what they were talking about when they examined the national defense. I do not care about the statement that this matter be brought up in executive session; but the statement is made that no information was conveyed, when the record will show that when that matter was discussed by the committee, five of them being there. Those members were represented in this report and two members—the Senator from Utah [Mr. Suroor] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Lenroot]—dissent, as will be found on page 163 of the record. It is not a fair statement, and it ought not to go out with the sanction of the Senate.

On page 18—and I call the attention of the Senator again, as I hurriedly proceed, to the fact that I do not pretend that this is any exhaustive examination of this report. It is the mere picking up here and there, from casual examination, of the mistakes that are apparent to those who have examined it. I want the opportunity to examine it carefully and to have it examined carefully; but the mere physical matter of time has absolutely prevented since June 4, and every Senator in this Chamber will recognize how impossible it has been to give any adequate consideration to such matters in the last few days of this session.

On page 18 the statement is made—and this has to do with a fundamental policy—on the point of drainage and its effect:

"On this point there is no difference of opinion among the geological experts."

We have a very interesting difference of opinion, as I shall hope to show a little later.

They differ only as to the extent and seriousness of the drainage and the appropriate means of meeting the situation.

If the Government oil reserve were to be indicated by a Senator desk, before which I stand, on which at any point oil could be drilled without private land or any preemption, and where every was not Government land and to which the Government did not have
title were represented by the adjoining desk, all experts agree that if the adjoining holders were to sink producing wells along on the line of their land the result would be that those wells would work the oil from the adjacent Government lands, and that the loss of oil to the Government in the ground would be great, and the gas pressure which is necessary for bringing the oil to the surface would be lessened by these adjoining wells, that it would not be available to drive oil to the surface in the Government wells when they saw fit to drill them.

All experts agreed upon this. Some experts are of the opinion that the drainage, that loss of pressure, was so great that the oil would be wasted; it would be drawn away; it would be drained by wells that were perhaps as far as 2 miles distant; and if the Government left their oil fields alone, and never sunk oil wells or produced any oil, but relied upon the hope that the oil would remain in the ground, it would happen that when, in the course of 5, 10, 15, or 20 years the Government, in expectancy of realizing its rights, should sink its oil reservoirs and say, "Now we will drill our wells and get out our oil," it would be found that the wells were barren wells, and that the oil that was once there in the ground had been drained away by the adjoining land and is a real drain and is a real difference of opinion as to how far drainage impaired adjoining land, and as to how extensively it was necessary to sink protecting wells.

The report says:

As to this it is easily discernible.

Notice what seems to be an exceedingly unfair inference—

that those welded to the policy of keeping the oil in the ground minimize the importance and the effect of the drainage that may take place, while those who advocate or are tolerant of the policy of extracting the oil and storing it magnify the loss that has ensued or that may ensue.

Generally speaking, the experts of the geological Survey belong to the former class—

Those who believe in keeping the oil in the ground—

and those of the Bureau of Mines to the latter.

The latter class being those who believe in taking it out of the ground and storing it.

I undertake to say, in passing, that it can be demonstrated beyong peradventure, and that every argument of economy and of efficiency requires that oil that is poured into the ground be taken out of the ground and should be stored—not used but stored—ready for any emergency that may result, for, as I said before an emergency for oil is an emergency, and can not be met by oil in the ground that may take months or a year or two to get it out of the ground.

The efficiency of the Navy of the United States, in the opinion of every navy in the world, has been doubted by reason of the fact that there are a million and a half barrels of oil stored at Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands, which they know is ready for instant use; and 2,400,000 more barrels of it will be stored in the tanks that are about nearing completion. Not one barrel of all that oil so long as it remained in the ground was of the slightest help to the Navy in meeting any emergency need for oil.

More than that, it is fair to state that those who believe that the drainage is slight and that a mere lineal well, a well along the line, will protect the whole area back of it are mainly those who are what I might call aerial or surface geologists, men of culture and of standing in their profession but having to do with the geological manifestations upon the surface. Those who have had to do with the geology underground, with the drilling of wells, with the production of oil, who know about the accumulation of oil wells and their products, are all agreed that the drainage is severe and it should be guarded against. Oil will work the whole area back of it from the interior if the Government desires to preserve its oil.

On page 18, about a third way through the second paragraph, it says:

On the escape of the gas through a well, paraffin or asphalt carried as a base is precipitated and gumes up the passage leading to the orifice, effectively shutting off eventually the exit of oil through it or the escape of gas.

Many people think that a pool of oil is a pool of liquid; that if you had a dipper and could get down to the pool of oil you could dip it up; that it is a liquid mass of black, crude oil with asphalt or paraffin base. That is not an oil pool, Mr. President. An oil pool is merely a great body of sand in the interstices of which there is oil, and the amount of it or any reserves of it depends upon the porous character of the sand, and when we get oil from an oil well we draw out of the ground the oil that is there, and it is true that as that oil is drawn out the paraffin that is in the oil has a tendency to clog up the oil well, that it is a drainage that is accomplished and is accomplished by every practical well driller, who cleans out his well as often as necessary.

As soon as a well ceases to produce because of being paraffined up it is cleaned out so that it may produce freely.

On page 18 we have an unequalled statement which is eminently unfair. The impression it creates I am sure could not be intended by any fair man who wrote it. It states, in regard to these leases, that "the Government actually realizes for use as fuel but 6 per cent of the total content of the reserves under the plan being followed." Any man who reads it would conclude at once that the Government actually realizes for use as fuel but 6 per cent of the total content of the reserves under the plan being followed. That is not the case.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Knox in the chair. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I can not yield unless I have unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed, for I have been warned upon the other side that if I yield again I will be taken from the floor.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator can get the floor again.

Mr. SPENCER. I regret that I can not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. NORBECK. I do not think the Senator understands what I am after.

Mr. SPENCER. It is not up to the Senator from Missouri; it is up to the Chair. If the Senator has any point of order that entitles him to be heard, I shall, of course, wait for him to state it, but I can not yield.

Mr. NORBECK. If I understand correctly—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make a point of order?

Mr. NORBECK. If I understand it aright, the protest is against taking a vote. I just want to submit that yielding does not bring the matter to a vote. The debate will go on just the same afterwards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SPENCER. On page 19, at the end of the first paragraph quoted from the Proceedings of the Senate of the United States, in the opinion of the Government in the world, has been doubted by reason of the fact that there are a million and a half barrels of oil stored at Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands, which they know is ready for instant use; and 2,400,000 more barrels of it will be stored in the tanks that are about nearing completion. Not one barrel of all that oil so long as it remained in the ground was of the slightest help to the Navy in meeting any emergency need for oil.

More than that, it is fair to state that those who believe that the drainage is slight and that a mere lineal well, a well along the line, will protect the whole area back of it are mainly those who are what I might call aerial or surface geologists, men of culture and of standing in their profession but having to do with the geological manifestations upon the surface. Those who have had to do with the geology underground, with the drilling of wells, with the production of oil, who know about the accumulation of oil wells and their products, are all agreed that the drainage is severe and it should be guarded against. Oil will work the whole area back of it from the interior if the Government desires to preserve its oil.

On page 18, about a third way through the second paragraph, it says:

On the escape of the gas through a well, paraffin or asphalt carried as a base is precipitated and gumes up the passage leading to the orifice, effectively shutting off eventually the exit of oil through it or the escape of gas.

As a matter of fact, what actually happens, and about which there can be no dispute, is that that is only one-third of what the Government gets. The Government gets 6 per cent of its royalty in oil and gets two-thirds of its royalty in permanent storage, in which this 6 per cent is stored. The Government's portion is three times that which this report leads any man who reads it to assume was the total return to the Government from the oil reserves of the United States. The Government gets three times that in royalty; but by its own contract—

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield, Mr. President; but under the ruling of the Chair I can not. But under its own contract it takes two-thirds of its royalty, and has that represented by tanks and storage facilities, and keeps the other third in oil itself.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Mr. President—

Mr. SPENCER. On page 19—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. SPENCER. I can not yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. A point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.
Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator, now occupying the floor, lose the floor if he yields to another Senator for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not think that if the Senator yields for the purpose of permitting another Senator to ask a question he will lose the floor.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, under that statement, I yield with pleasure for a question. I was informed differently by the Chair.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have no question to ask, but the Senator has declined to permit questions to be asked on the floor that he would lose the floor. I do not understand that the Senator would lose the floor by permitting a Senator to inquire as to the matter he is discussing.

Mr. President, such was my understanding.

Mr. SPENCER. A question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a moot question which is presented, and therefore the Chair makes no ruling on it.

Mr. WALSH. The fiction has grown up in the Senate to the effect that a Senator may hold the floor and also yield it in an hour like this, when every moment is precious. A Senator may not, in the very nature of events, hold the floor and also yield the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator hold that a Senator can not yield the floor to have a question put to him?

Mr. ASHURST. After a Senator has spoken twice on the same day, upon the same question, he may not yield for a question without losing the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Then the proper practice has never been followed in the Senate, if that is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield the floor to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SPENCER. I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would like to have a decision of order. I understood the Chair to make a decision and then withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair said it was a moot question, because no question had been asked. Does the Senator desire to ask a question?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Arkansas asked a question, and the Senator declined to yield, because, he said, he would lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant was not in the chair at the time when the Senator from Arkansas asked the question. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, on page 19 of the report—

and the Senator will be quite as glad as I am to know I am more than half through with the report—it is stated:

In 1920 highly productive wells were brought in in territory immediately outside the southeastern extremity of naval reserve No. 1.

That is in California.

and Secretary Daniels, prior to his retirement on March 4, 1921, had called for bids for the drilling of 22 offset wells within that reserve.

This is not in accordance with the facts as they appear in the hearings. Lieutenant Commander Stuart was asked the following questions and gave the following answers (page 770 of the record):

Commander STUART. After seeing this, as I recall it, the bids were made on the 16th of April, 1921.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, the proposal for the bids?

Commander STUART. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Who has control of such bids as are submitted by whom?

Commander STUART. Edwin Denby, Secretary of the Navy.

Senator WALSH. You do not recall that prior to that time Secretary Daniels had called for bids for any drilling on any of the reserves?

Commander STUART. No, sir; I do not think he had. It has been talked about, but Secretary Daniels was very loath to start any drilling on the reserves because of the prime purpose of the reserves.

Lieut. Commander Stuart on page 769 corroborated this general statement. It has for the committee some interest, because the subject has been the subject of a good deal of discussion, and the misstatement is unfortunate.

On page 20, about a third through the first paragraph—and I only make a passing observation, because the record does not show what the exact fact is—the following is stated:

Doheny submitted two bids, one of which was in strict conformity with the proposals and the other offering to do the work at a loss, not securing to him a preference right to a lease of practically the eastern half of the reserve. (Rec., pt. 4, p. 1905.) His alternate proposal was accepted and the contract entered into accordingly under date of April 25, 1922. The negotiations for this contract were carried on simultaneously with those culminating in the lease of naval reserve No. 3.

The inference is that no other bidder had any opportunity to compete under the different provisions called for under the contract provision. As a matter of fact, the Department of the Interior had written a letter, of which I have seen a copy, but which did not come to the committee in time for our hearing, which shows that other bidders had the same opportunity which Mr. Doheny had.

On page 20, at the beginning of the last paragraph, it is stated:

The conditions giving rise to this lease (in naval reserve No. 1) are of such supreme importance as to require detailed attention.

Then, having said that the matter was of such supreme importance, it starts out with the statement:

There was here no impending loss from drainage.

Evidently it was entirely overlooked that large actual loss had occurred from many wells drilled in a section where the loss was impending, and was severe. Yet it is, as the Senator states, a question of extreme importance about which this misstatement is made.

On page 24, speaking of the financial relations between Mr. Doheny and Secretary Fall, the committee recites in its report:

its sinister import is appreciated when it is born in mind that without competitive bidding—

As a matter of fact the records will show there was competitive bidding; there were others who had the opportunity to bid—

as heretofore explained. Doheny got from Fall in the month of April following the contract for the construction of the tanks at Pearl Harbor, in which it is a preference right to a lease of a large share of naval reserve No. 1, to be followed, without competitive bidding, by a lease of the entire reserve, comprising over 20,000 acres, estimated to contain $5,000,000,000 barrels of oil, out of which, Doheny told the committee, he would be in luck if he did not make $100,000,000 profit.

The fact of the matter is there were others seeking the lease. There were others who were negotiating for it, and at least one of them was conferring with the Secretary of the Interior in the matter.

The statement is not fair as to its absolute lack of competitive bidding.

On page 25 we have a reference to section 36 in the reserves of California which is entirely inaccurate:

The State of California, apparently relying upon the return of the surveyor and the mention of the character of the land appearing on the map, prepared by him showing that section 36, by its character, filed an application in the Land Office asking to be permitted to select other lands in lieu of said section 36, a right it was entitled to exercise under the granting act, if that section was indeed mineral in character.

Here is where the misstatement begins:

This application was denied upon the ground that the lands applied for had already been appropriate, and the motion was amended so as to be directed to other tracts, section 36 as a base having been withdrawn by an amended application filed in 1905.

The facts are that on January 4, 1902, the State of California applied this section 36 as a base for new land—pages 1475—1477—that is, when a section of land has been granted to a State by the Government and it is found that the section granted to the State is mineral land, that section is not permitted to take possession of that section thus designated as mineral but is permitted to use that section as a base for making entry upon equivalent land. On November 20, 1905, the State withdrew section 36 as the base, as will be shown on page 1481 of the record. Those were the only relations of section 36 to new land selections. The misstatement was evidently taken because the land surveyor had classified section 36 as mineral land. The second action was eventually taken because the department, on the report of Special Agent Ryan, had classified the land as then being not mineral land, but the statement of the report in regard to section 36 is quite inaccurate.

Mr. President, on page 27, in referring again to the right of review before the Secretary of the Interior, about which I made
some comments awhile ago and which I shall not now repeat, the report states:

Such a proceeding as that entertained by the Secretary of the Interior is wholly unknown in the practice of the land department. No precedent for it was known by anyone so far as the committee was able to learn.

This declaration goes out from the committee, and the committee wants the Senate to adopt it, that the action of the Secretary of the Interior in hearing these matters was in violation of the practice, of all procedure, and against the uniform course of action. If the committee had taken pains to look at page 1600 of the hearings, they would have found that statement to be doubtful as to its accuracy; that such practice is no longer the rule of procedure as it has been again and again demonstrated and expressly affirmed in opinions.

On page 28

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BURSUM. Would it not be possible for the Senate to agree to take a vote on this proposition without so long a debate?

Mr. SPENCER. I should be very glad to end the necessity of debating this question.

Mr. BURSUM. This is the last day of this session—

Mr. SPENCER. I recognize that fact.

Mr. BURSUM. To my mind the proposition of taking all the time in a debate at this time is simply outrageous and un-American.

Mr. SPENCER. I recognize the force of that. I hope it will not be applied to me. I will stop right now if the Senator from Montana will not ask for the immediate adoption of his report. If that is adopted, that puts the Senate back of his report, and will I not have an opportunity, and a fair opportunity, to examine that report before we vote on it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BURSUM. Let us vote on it now. What is the difference?

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON. I inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether he thinks he is justified in preventing the Senate from doing other business in order to escape a vote on the majority report made by the Senator from Montana respecting the oil investigation?

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator from Arkansas that I have no intention of preventing a vote. I have no desire to indulge in what is commonly called a filibuster.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will pardon me, that is not the question I asked him. I asked the Senator from Missouri whether he is justified in preventing the Senate from transacting any other business in order to avoid a vote on the majority report presented by the Senator from Montana; and in that connection, if the Senator will indulge me for a brief statement, I would like to state that apparently the Senator, in order to keep the Senate from registering its will on the subject matter of this report respecting the oil-lease investigation, has taken the floor and proposes to debate the report until the session ends. If he does that, he must take responsibility for the defeat of the deficiency appropriation bill, for a denial of a vote on the veto message of the President respecting the postal employees salary bill, and all other measures that are pending before the Congress. I want the Senator from Missouri to understand that if he filibusters against a vote on the report offered by the Senator from Montana, the majority report of the committee, he will by his doing so defeat all measures that are now pending before the Congress.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ROBINSON. Permit me to finish my statement, with the Senator's indulgence.

The Senator has been occupying the floor and taking unbridled liberty, and I will resume the floor so as to prevent the Senate from transacting any business except such business as he desires to be transacted. If he wants to take responsibility for defeating the general deficiency appropriation bill and for preventing a vote on the veto message of the President and for defeating all conference reports that may be outstanding, he can do so by pursuing the course he is now pursuing, but he must bear the consequences.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. I must advise you to stay with the Senate from Arkansas; I have just said, that the Senator from Missouri is not the only one who is concerned in this report. This is a voluminous report, with more or less testimony. I am one of many who have had no opportunity to read it or examine it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts finish?

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. LODGE. I have not finished.

Mr. SPENCER. After the Senator from Massachusetts has finished, Mr. Lodge. I will be very brief. I do not propose, for one, to have that report chucked down my throat this afternoon before I have had an opportunity even to examine it, and I do not think any of us ought to be subjected to that. This is not a report to be adopted by the Senator from Missouri or by the Senator from Montana. It is a report for which the Senate is to be responsible, and we ought to have reasonable opportunity to read it and express our views, if we desire to do so. I did not bring up this report. I do not know who did; but it cannot be finished up in this afternoon.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri kindly yield to me?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield for a further question.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator from Massachusetts, the leader of the majority, that he endorses the filibuster indulged in by the Senator from Missouri or by the Senator from Montana. It is a report for which the Senate is to be responsible, and we ought to have reasonable opportunity to read it and express our views, if we desire to do so. The country can not be deceived. Neither the Senator from Missouri nor the Senator from Massachusetts can devolve the Senate or the country. This is a deliberate filibuster and an effort to prevent the Senate from passing upon the report made by the Senator from Montana, and in order to do that the leader of the majority and the Senator from Missouri are both willing, according to their statements just made, to defeat the general deficiency appropriation bill, to prevent a vote on the veto message of the President, to defeat outstanding conference reports, including that on the naval bill—anything to prevent the Senate from voting on this report on the oil-lease investigation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SPENCER. There shall be no misunderstanding.

Mr. WAlSH of Montana. Mr. President—

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SPENCER. I do not yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. A point of order, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I make the point of order that the Senator from Missouri has yielded the floor.

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. Under the liberality which generally characterizes the proceedings of the Senate, the Chair can not sustain that point of order.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I give notice that if the Senator from Missouri again yields to anyone, I shall insist that he yield the floor.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. SPENCER. After the notice given by the Senator from Montana, I must decline to yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee—

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. A point of order.

THE PRESIDENT OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.
point of order would be made against him. He has yielded
twice already on this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent,
Mr. HEFLIN. He yielded twice to interruptions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And now, therefore unanimous consent
yielding, the point of order is directed, as the Chair
recollected. At any rate, the Senator from Missouri has the
floor.

Mr. SPENCER. There shall be no misunderstanding about the
parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves if I can
help it. If the argument and the facts back of the Senator from
Arkansas were equal to the eloquence and power of his state-
ment, no further consideration would be unnecessary.
If there had been any desire to filibuster, would the Senator
from Missouri have yielded again and again on request with the
mercy condition that he could resume when Senators had fin-
lshed? If there had been any such desire to cut off other busi-
ness from the Senate, would that have happened?

Mr. ROBINSON. If

Mr. SPENCER. Will the Senator please let me finish? More
than that, I said when I started and I repeat now that if the
Senator from Montana will defer not only to my request but
that which has just been advised by the Senator from Massa-
chusetts, which was indicated by the five members of the Com-
mittee on Public Lands and Surveys who signed the report—
Mr. SPENCER. Just a moment—and which does not carry a
single recommendation that requires immediate action, but is on
the table and the Senate has ordered 10,000 copies of it printed
for distribution and information—if the mere point of asking
the Senate to adopt as its own a report about which in the
nature of the case they know nothing, I will yield instantly,
and I certainly would not do that if any filibuster was in my
mind. More than that, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas
that while I regret that the pointing out of some of what
seemed to me the mistakes and misstatements and unwarranted
inferences of the report I say frankly that they result only from
a casual examination. They are not nearly as complete as they
doubtless they may have been in number to require some
time to state them before the Senate.

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

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.
Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the parliamentary inquiry.

In view of the friendly notice which has been served from the
other side—

Mr. SPENCER. I am sure that was not the purpose of the
Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. No, indeed. I just wanted to ask the
Senator three questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri
will proceed.

Mr. SPENCER resumed his speech. After having spoken for
some time

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Sen-
ator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massa-
chusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not yield under the
order.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri
will state the point of order.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Earlier in the session the
President of the Senate declared that no action on the Presi-
dent's veto message could be taken under the Constitution until
the veto message had first been entered on the Journal. I in-
quire of the Chair if the reading of the veto message is not an
entry on the Journal of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hardly under-
stands the Senator's point of order.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I inquire of the Chair if the
reading of the President's veto message to the Senate is not an
entering of that message upon the Journal of the Senate?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will anticipate the
Chairman's statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no control
over the address of the Senator or what he is to say or what he is
speaking about.

Mr. KING. I beg the Chair's pardon. The Chair does not
understand what I was stating.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, the Chair does.

Mr. KING. The parliamentary inquiry is whether a parlia-
mentary inquiry may be made relative to a matter which is not
proprietary in discussion and does not relate to the
right of the occupant of the floor to continue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion
that a parliamentary inquiry can be made at any time. The
Chair, moreover, the opinion is that the Senator is entitled to
examine the matter, that the mere reading of the President's
message is not spreading it upon the Journal in accordance with
the Constitution.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Then, I inquire if the Chair
will not make an effort to ascertain whether it has been entered
on the Journal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri
will proceed.

Mr. SPENCER. Commencing on page 27 of the report is a
very interesting discussion of two cases against the Southern
Pacific Railroad Co. In each of which the Government was a
party, having to do with the Special 33, to cancel adjacent to that
section and within the exterior reserves. There
were two cases. The question involved in each case was
whether the land was known to be mineral when it's
survey was approved. In one case the decision was on the
Government; that is, that the land in question in the
United States district case was mineral at the time of the
approval and in the other case it is the opinion of the
Court of appeals reversed the case and the Supreme Court
reversed that decision, as I recollect, and sustained the contem-
tion of the Government as decided by the United States
district court. The second case was directed to land inside of the
reserve and was decided by the district judge, pending the appeal
in the first case to the United States Supreme Court, and relying
upon the opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals in the first case,
which was unfavorable to the Government, the right of the
Government was disallowed, and the report goes on to say—and
here is where I cannot subscribe to the statement of the report,
because it is neither a fair nor an accurate statement. The report
reads:

No appeal was taken from that decision—

That is true,

though the time for appeal had not expired when the decision of the
Supreme Court was rendered in suit No. 1.

It was in suit No. 1 that the Government secured final judg-
ment.

The facts as to the tracts within the reserve involved in suit No. 2
are substantially identical with the facts in the first case.
The truth of the matter is that in the second case there was
fraud and in the other case there was not fraud, which fact
differentiates entirely the two cases. In the first case, which
was the Elk Hills case, it was found that the railroad company
had committed fraud and the case decided favorably to the
United States because the railroad company had committed
fraud in the second case the decision was in favor of the
railroad company because it had not committed fraud.

Senator DILL asked this question when Mr. Palmer was before the
committee:

In the Elk Hills case there was fraud?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir.

Senator DILL. In the Southern Pacific case there was fraud?

That is case No. 2. The witness replied:

It was purely a question of fact as to whether the Government had
established fraud on the part of the railroad company

When it came to the knowledge of taking the appeal in the second case
the Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, stated that he could not consis-
tently make an appeal to the Supreme Court, that case having been
made prior in another suit and after appeal had been taken.

Mr. KING. I ask what object is there, what purpose can be served in
asking the Senate of the United States to adopt the report and
say In effect: "The Senate of the United States hereby decides that the Attorney General of the United States, Mitchell Palmer, ought to have taken an appeal, and if he had taken an appeal the questions in the two cases, the one in which he did not, the royalty was only paid into an appeal fund but with the criticism of the Government would have won both cases." The statement is not borne out by the facts. It is beyond our function. There is no need for it, it is going outside of anything that has to do with the legitimate purposes of the committee. I do not like it.

On page 30 the question of the employment of the marines in evicting certain trespassers from the capture of Dome is raised. It is clearly not proved, but what the criticism is somewhat warranted, and yet I call the Senate's attention to this fact. The custom in the oil fields and mining region since the inception of the custom law has been to have that trespasser retain his physical possession by physical action against the trespassers.

There are those in the Senate like the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Atwood) and others who are familiar with mining law who well understand the practice, since the mining law was first established that the man in possession by physical means prevented dispossession by trespassers. This places the burden of proof upon the trespasser it it is received on account of the construction of the leases and is consistently supported everywhere in the mining region. Had the Mammoth Oil Co., which was then actually in possession, held wholly under placer mining title, they would have immediately proceeded through the District Court of the United States to have the trespassers cut out; if the Mammoth Oil Co. had had an undisputed right there, a title to the land, or a placer mining right, they would have acted against the trespassers themselves; but because the Mammoth Oil Co. was held under a lease from the Government they were afraid to do this for fear of getting into difficulty with the Government itself. They immediately brought the matter to the attention of the Government, when the trespassers had the right of the Government lessee, and they said to the Government, "Here we are; we are your lessee; we are on the land; we are fulfilling our contract; we are protecting our royalty; and here are the trespassers who are mining on this land which we have leased from you." It was then up to the Government either to throw the trespassers off by physical means or to authorize the Mammoth Oil Co. to do it. This was the situation which seemed to warrant the use of the marines. I do not defend it, but the statement in the report is a conclusion with which I do not entirely agree.

I call the attention of the Senate to one or two more things in connection with the lease, and I shall hasten to a conclusion as quickly as I can. For, Mr. President, I should like again to say, as I said when I began, that I regret as much as any man in the Senate the time that I have taken up on a subject which is interesting to me. A majority of Senators can not, however, let the majority report come before the Senate for possible adoption without calling the Senate's attention to what I believe are serious and many mistakes that are stated in the report. It is obvious that any errors can be corrected and which ought to be corrected in any report that is finally adopted by the Senate. More than this, if there had been any emergency, if there were any recommendation in the report that needed action, I should not have interposed objection, and I certainly have no intention to filibuster in these closing hours of this session.

On page 32, beginning in the second paragraph, there is this statement, to which I refer very briefly and leave it:

Your committee can not believe that a lease under which the Government receives 6 per cent of the oil in the ground and the lessee gets 94 per cent, where the Government receives 6 per cent and the lessee gets 94 per cent on a lease under which the royalty of oil is about 12½ per cent, but in the naval oil reserve No. 3 lease the Government gets about 17 per cent—three times as much as the report indicates to be the Government's share.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House recoiled from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 58, and 59 to the bill, and agreed to the further conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, that MR. MADDEN, MR. ANTHONY, and MR. EVANS OF Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill, (S. 2397) to authorize the payment of claims under the provisions of the so-called war minerals relief act, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed bills, Joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 2295. An act to provide for a rearrangement of the public land reservations in the State of Oregon. June 28, 1925. Referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, for report, and to the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, for consideration of its provisions.

S. 3397. An act to remit the duty on a carillon of bells to be imported for the New York World's Fair, 1933. June 29, 1925. Referred to the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, for consideration of its provisions.

Enrolled bills passed:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution in relation to a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States in the war of the American Civil War, and in the District of Columbia in the World War; and

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civil positions within the Department of the Interior and its field service."
the efficiency of the Navy and has made it a power in world matters which it never could otherwise have been.

How unfair, then, it is even to attempt to indicate that under these leases 9 per cent comes to the Government "and the lessee gets a scheme whereby it is never required to account for the construction of tankage." It is an unfair statement.

Again, on the same page, the statement is made:

If the Secretary of the Navy consulted with anyone competent from experience in affairs of such magnitude to advise him concerning the terms of the lease, viewed as a business proposition, the fact was not divulged.

That statement is corrected somewhat a little later, but it is grudgingly done, as I shall show. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of the Interior from the beginning was in constant conference with Mr. Williams, by reason of its geological and mining skill and equipment, was best qualified to advise him. Yet the report states:

If the Secretary of the Interior consulted with anyone competent from experience in affairs of such magnitude to advise him concerning the terms of the lease, viewed as a business proposition, the fact was not divulged. Evidently he conceived himself quite competent to negotiate with such veterans in the oil business as Sinclair and Doheny. It is true he conferred with officials of the Bureau of Mines, technically qualified by reason of their skill or success in business.

The Senate of the United States is asked to indulge and to adopt these conclusions which are thrown into the report. It is intimated that with such experts as Sinclair and Doheny on the one side the Secretary of the Interior, without and advised from anywhere, would have tardy time of it; when, as a matter of fact, the leases, according to the best evidence that we could get from unprejudiced sources, are the best leases the Government ever secured and, so far as the character of the leases themselves is concerned, they are of the utmost advantage to the Government of the United States.

Evidently the conscience of whoever wrote the report operated before he finished the paragraph, for at the end of the paragraph, after having stated that—

If the Secretary of the Interior consulted with anyone • • • the fact was not divulged. • • • Evidently he conceived himself quite competent unaided to negotiate with such veterans in the oil business as Sinclair and Doheny—

Grudgingly this is added:

It is true he conferred with officials of the Bureau of Mines, technical men, not chosen by reason of their skill or success in business.

There is no Senator who has had any dealings with the Bureau of Mines who does not know what competent men are in it. They are in a condition to tell what a competent bureau it is. What is the object of asking the Senate of the United States to slur, insult, to cast a reflection upon the Bureau of Mines, which has had in it such men as A. Williams, Chester Naramore, J. O. Ambrose, F. B. Tough, men of high standing, whose opinions were always sought. When the committee wanted experts to go to the Wyoming field and give us an opinion, they turned to these men, who, according to which we could rely, where did we go? We took Mr. Lewis from the Bureau of Mines, because he and Mr. Clapp were the best men the Senate could find in the United States. And now, because the Bureau of Mines on certain matters does not quite agree with the senior Senator from Montana, he wants the Senate to adopt a report, which no Senator has had the opportunity to read or consider, the statement that while the Secretary of the Interior consulted with the Bureau of Mines, yet they were "not chosen by reason of their skill or success in business." I say it is unfair. I do not hesitate to say that these leaving that subject that that paragraph alone would subject this report to ridicule by every competent oil man in the country; that it would stamp upon it the evidence of partisanship and unfairness; and that it would make it the subject of discussion and ridicule upon the Bureau of Mines and make such statements as are contained in the paragraph which I have just quoted.

Now, on the first paragraph of the first page on page 32.

A disposition is evident—

Says the report—

In some quarters to discuss or overlook the very suggestive circumstances shown in the hearings indicating corruption in connection with the Sinclair and Doheny leases, the flagrant disregard of the law and the unwarranted assumption of authority that attended their execution, the abandonment of the settled policy of the Government evidenced by them—

When the whole result of the hearings indicates that there was no established policy of the Government that was abandoned?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SPENCER. I can not yield, under the ruling of the Chair, will I yield if I may say, until the Senator consent to resume in the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. SPENCER. There was no settled policy of the Government. It was shown in evidence that under the administration of Secretary Daniels, when he executed leases and took oil out of the ground, he did it for the immediate use of the Navy. The present administration has taken all out of the ground and stored it for use by the Navy as it may become necessary in an emergency, but not for immediate use. The questions of law that are involved in connection with these leases, and in regard to which the report says that they were granted in "flagrant disregard of the law," are now before the courts. I am talking to many men who are lawyers of standing and distinction. This report seeks to have the Senate of the United States declare that the legal propositions involved in these leases were flagrant disregards of law. They are doubtful propositions. Every one of them is submitted before the courts of the land now for decision, and the courts of the land are competent to decide them, not the Senate of the United States.

On page 32 there is a paragraph headed—"And I consider unjust this very briefly—" The leases as good bargains, and then there follows a more or less extensive criticism—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order, not to ask any dispositions to take the Senator consent to resume.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. ASHURST. I understand that under the new a Senator may speak twice on the same day. If so, therefore, if the Senator from Missouri should yield, and business should intervene, he would be entitled to be recognized again, because he could speak twice, and a question would not take him off the floor unless he had spoken twice.

The reason why I raise this point is because some conference reports and some bills, especially the motion made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Furrow], require attention. They are bills that ought to be attended to and disposed of. Therefore, I say to the Senator, my view of the rule is that a Senator has a right to speak twice, and a question would not take him off the floor until he had spoken twice.

Mr. SPENCER. Does not the Senator from Arizona think I have spoken quite long enough instead of speaking twice? I would much prefer to quickly conclude, as I hope to do.

The President. With the illuminating and gratifying hope I will say nothing more.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not yet exactly understand the point of order.

Mr. SPENCER. Does not the Senator from Arizona think I have spoken quite long enough instead of speaking twice? I would much prefer to quickly conclude, as I hope to do.

The President. With the illuminating and gratifying hope I will say nothing more.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not yet exactly understand the point of order.

Mr. SPENCER. Does not the Senator from Arizona think I have spoken quite long enough instead of speaking twice? I would much prefer to quickly conclude, as I hope to do.

The President. With the illuminating and gratifying hope I will say nothing more.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not yet exactly understand the point of order.

Mr. SPENCER. Does not the Senator from Arizona think I have spoken quite long enough instead of speaking twice? I would much prefer to quickly conclude, as I hope to do.

The President. With the illuminating and gratifying hope I will say nothing more.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not yet exactly understand the point of order.

Mr. SPENCER. Does not the Senator from Arizona think I have spoken quite long enough instead of speaking twice? I would much prefer to quickly conclude, as I hope to do.

The President. With the illuminating and gratifying hope I will say nothing more.
Mr. HARRELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8086) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved August 1, 1914, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

Enrolled Bill Presented

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 7, 1924, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2257) to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the laws affecting the establishment of the United States Veterans' Bureau and the administration of the war risk insurance act, as amended, and the vocational rehabilitation act, as amended.

Index on Naval Oil Reserves

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, The President pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. NORBECK. I move that the Senate now take up Order of Business No. 733, House bill 7269, to authorize and direct the establishment of a great deal. I am sure there is no one in the Chamber who ought to be brought up, and I recognize the fact that the Senator from South Dakota has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to be

The observations of the Senator from Montana, Mr. President, I am sure we can have a vote on the matter pending before the Senate in a few moments.

Mr. NORBECK. I move that we now take up the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The President pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KING. As I understand, there is now pending before the Senate the report submitted by the Senator from Montana, and the question before the Senate is the adoption of that report. The parliamentary inquiry is, May that be set aside by a motion of the character just submitted by the Senator from South Dakota?

The President pro tempore. Undoubtedly the Senate can take up any measure that it pleases to take up.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, touching the motion made by the Senator from South Dakota, I desire to say that I do not feel it at all necessary to continue the debate on this pending motion. The observations of the observations of the Senator from Montana, Mr. President, I do not intend to take the Senator off the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from South Dakota? If the Senator from South Dakota insists upon his motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill to which he refers, I am going to ask that we are desirous of adopting this report to vote that motion down, and then take a vote on the report, and then proceed to the consideration of the bill referred to by the President.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, not only do I desire to take up the bill to which I have referred, but I desire to move the Bursum bill as an amendment to it after we get it up.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that lead to some debate. Mr. President, if I desire to say further that I am heartily in favor of the bill referred to by the Senator from South Dakota and desire to see it passed, but I do not think the matter before the Senate ought to be displaced. Why should we move the Bursum bill and then vote on it, and then proceed to the consideration of the bill spoken of by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. NORBECK. This is the last and only chance to do something in the way of equity toward the wheat farmers who were robbed during the war by Government interference and by the Government taking their profits away from them, the President pro tempore. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have been sitting here for several hours, watching the financial condition of this country, which I think Senators ought to know, and I suppose this is the only time we will have, if we are going to have—as is evidently the case—a filibuster against the adoption of the report of the Senator from Montana. That is evident to everybody. Therefore I am going on to discuss this question right now.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, who has the floor? Will the Senator who has the floor allow me to submit a request for unanimous consent?

The President pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NOSMACK] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. NORBECK. I do.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent that we take a vote now upon this report, and, immediately following that, that we take up the bill in which the Senator from South Dakota is interested.

Mr. LODGE. I object, Mr. President.

The President pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. LODGE. If Senators want a vote on the bill of the Senator from South Dakota, do not let them mix it up with this other matter.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from South Dakota is debatable.

The President pro tempore. Undoubtedly.

Mr. OVERMAN. Therefore, I rise to debate it.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I say, if he does not design to discuss it, there are others who do. I am propounding a parliamentary inquiry as to whether the Senator from South Dakota is holding the floor to discuss his motion or not. If he wants to discuss it, of course, that is his right.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not intend to take the Senator off the floor.

The President pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota has moved to take up a certain bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I say, if he does not design to discuss it, there are others who do. I am propounding a parliamentary inquiry as to whether the Senator from South Dakota is holding the floor to discuss his motion or not. If he wants to discuss it, of course, that is his right.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not intend to take the Senator off the floor.

The President pro tempore. Mr. President, I will state that I should like to speak upon this matter a while; and I recognize the fact that he is too busy to assist.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, in reply to the question, I will state that I should like to speak upon this matter a while; but I will yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a moment with the understanding that I do not yield the floor.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to be long, because I recognize the fact that Senators have matters here that ought to be brought up, and I recognize the fact that two important appropriation bills have to be settled this evening, if settled at all; and therefore I am not going to speak at any length. Let the Senator go ahead if he wants to, and I will get the floor next.

The President pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Transfer of Machinery, etc., to Agricultural Department

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I intend to offer an agriculture relief measure as an amendment. This was drafted by Congressman WILLIAMSON who has never been too tired and never too busy to assist in agricultural relief. The measure is along the line originally suggested by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRUSEM], whose energy and resourcefulness has been a marvel to us all and who has worked tirelessly for the relief of the farmers and the ranchmen of his State. It also embodies one or two important features suggested by Congressman SUMMERS, of Washington.

Mr. President, I propose to offer the following as an amendment to House bill 7269:

Title II

To Encourage and Promote the Sale and Export of Agricultural Products Grown within the United States

That out of funds herefore appropriated and now in the custody of the War Finance Corporation the President of the United States is authorized and directed to pay (a) 35 cents per bushel bounty on each
bushel of wheat grown in the United States and exported therefrom and a proportionate bounty on all products manufactured wholly from wheat: Provided, That such products are manufactured within the United States and exported therefrom; (b) 15 cents per bushel bounty on each bushel of corn grown in the United States and exported therefrom and a proportionate bounty on all products manufactured wholly from corn: Provided, That such products are manufactured within the United States from corn grown therein.

Sec. 2. It is hereby provided that whenever the President of the United States finds that the importation of wheat or corn, or their derivatives, is injuring the interest of the farmers or either of their derivatives, except under such regulations and limitations as shall be prescribed by proclamation, the President shall proclaim the same.

Sec. 3. All powers necessary for the proper administration of this title are hereby conferred on the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I want to again remind the Members of this Senate that during the war every commodity was permitted to seek its natural price level except that of wheat. The Government not only depressed the market by interference but actually fixed the price much below the prevailing market. Not only that, but when the Government Grain Corporation had a monopoly in the handling of grain it took out a profit of more than $50,000,000, which was not returned to the wheat growers.

It is proposed in this measure to redistribute that profit to the wheat growers and do it in such a way as will bring the price of wheat as near as possible to that of its pre-war purchasing value for one year.

Mr. President, it is proposed that the Government pay an export bounty of 15 cents per bushel on wheat. The Agricultural Department's head advised me, that, based upon the records for last year, the cost of such a bounty would be $48,000,000. It is believed that the domestic prices will naturally follow the export price; if it will increase, it will bring an increase of about 35 cents per bushel to the wheat farmer on all the wheat sold, both in foreign and domestic markets.

The objection has been raised that this will increase the cost of flour and the cost of bread. It is admitted that it will increase the cost of flour. But, Mr. President, the cost of bread was just as high when wheat was $2 per bushel as now. Therefore, it need not increase the price of a single loaf of bread in the United States.

This measure also provides for an export bounty of 15 cents per bushel on corn. The export market by preference but also corn. To pay even a bounty of $4,000,000, some money to be used in the payment of bounties will not be a burden on the taxpayer. The Government took the money away from the farmers. This measure proposes to return it to them in the shape of bounties to be paid to the American farmer on all products grown in the United States.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill the Senator has been advocating, except the rider. I am not going to stand for a vote at this late hour for some rider on a bill that appeals to me because it appeals to the farmers. It is not a good measure for us to consider it, and everybody knows that. The country ought to know what we have been doing here and what the financial condition of the country is. I am therefore, to make a very short statement in regard to that matter.

The Senate will continue to consider the bill when they sit again.
only the round figures, and I will ask that this statement go into the Record as an appendix to my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[See Appendix 1.]

Mr. OVERMAN. In the Post Office Department there are 52,000 more; in the Department of Labor there are 55 more; in the Navy Department there are 10,000 more; in the Treasury Department there are 25,000 more; in the Department of Commerce there are 2,083 more; in the Department of Agriculture there are 6,980 more; in the War Department, in the Peace Department there are 8,000 more, and in the State Department there are 1,900 more. I will do justice to the Secretary of State by saying that he has had to have a good many more officeholders of the new complexion, which really grew out of war, and I ask to have his letter printed as an appendix to my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[See Appendix 2.]

Mr. OVERMAN. The total amounts to 108,000 more officeholders.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, what is the total number of officeholders?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have not added up the figures. There are over five or six hundred thousand, perhaps more than that. The tremendous increases in the officeholders, not in bureaus which were established growing out of the war, but in the legitimate work of the departments, is 108,000. I stated early in the session, as some may remember, that the Congress was spending money like drunken sailors. That is an extravagant statement, of course, but we do not seem to consider the taxpayers in our appropriations. We do not seem to care anything about them. You can get any sort of a bill through this body, and for the expenditure of money. Not counting the bonus, not counting the Veterans' Bureau, not counting the Shipping Board, we are spending to-day a billion dollars more than we spent in 1915. The Senator from Utah smiles.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, I do.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have testimony here to show that, added as I was, by an expert in the Treasury Department, and I ask to have this put in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[See Appendix 3.]

Mr. OVERMAN. This shows the regular annual appropriation for 1925 for the Departments of Commerce, of Justice, of Labor, of the Navy, of the Post Office, State, and Treasury, taken from the acts as approved by the President, but the figures for 1925 were taken from the bills as passed by the Senate up to June 2, 1924. I want to say, however, that what is known as the second deficiency or the second urgent deficiency bill is not counted in this statement, because the bill has not passed. I do not know how much money will be saved; I do not know it will amount to over $158,000,000, but the bill which is to come from the House for the consideration of the Senate, for the bill ought to pass. There is a difference now between the Senate figures and the President's figures, and Mr. Root is in favor of the Senate standing by what it did. We will have another meeting of the committee, probably, and I hope we can agree. I do not know, but even as it passed the House it carries $158,000,000, and the bill will be here directly.

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

Mr. OVERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator gives us the startling information that the increases in the ordinary expenses of the departments of the Government amount to a billion dollars?

Mr. OVERMAN. The increase in the number of officeholders is 108,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. What I want to ask is whether these tremendous increases have not occurred under the rule of the Republican party?

Mr. OVERMAN. Many of them have. But I am not going to reflect upon the Budget. I do not think I am called upon to cast any reflection on those splendid gentlemen. They are fine men, and do what they believe to be their duty. The men are splendid men, but the system is bad. It just adds that many more officeholders to draw pay from the Government.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I agree with that. I am fully in accord with that, and took that position before the bill establishing the Budget was passed.

The tax table does not include the expenses for the Shipping Board or the Veterans' Bureau. Deducting the war expenses, which were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>8,695</td>
<td>10,423</td>
<td>-1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Department</td>
<td>19,455</td>
<td>17,092</td>
<td>-2,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Department</td>
<td>268,893</td>
<td>320,764</td>
<td>-41,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor (the 1925 figures do not include 657 persons with the department at a minimum salary of $1 per year)</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Department</td>
<td>32,970</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>-9,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce (the 1915 figures do not include 812 temporary employees)</td>
<td>9,389</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>-2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>16,229</td>
<td>21,261</td>
<td>-4,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of War</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>16,481</td>
<td>-5,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>-1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>458,961</strong></td>
<td><strong>505,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>-46,951</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108,951 employees at an average salary of $1,800 per year equals an expenditure of $194,491,800.

APPENDIX 1

Comparison of the personnel of the departments for 1915 and 1923

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>8,695</td>
<td>10,423</td>
<td>-1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Department</td>
<td>19,455</td>
<td>17,092</td>
<td>-2,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Department</td>
<td>268,893</td>
<td>320,764</td>
<td>-41,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor (the 1925 figures do not include 657 persons with the department at a minimum salary of $1 per year)</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Department</td>
<td>32,970</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>-9,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce (the 1915 figures do not include 812 temporary employees)</td>
<td>9,389</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>-2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>16,229</td>
<td>21,261</td>
<td>-4,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of War</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>16,481</td>
<td>-5,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>-1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>458,961</strong></td>
<td><strong>505,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>-46,951</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

The Hon. Lee S. Overman,
United States Senate.

My Dear Senator Overman: In reply to your letter of April 22, 1924, I am pleased to enclose herewith a memorandum showing the number of employees in the Department of State in Washington and in the field for the years 1915 and 1925. It will be noted that the number of employees in the field for 1915 has been approximated, as under conditions existing at that time it was impossible for the department to ascertain the exact number of employees in every office abroad on any given date. The number given may be considered as sufficiently accurate for all practical purposes.

At the risk of exceeding your request I desire to mention a few important facts which are illustrative of the increasing responsibilities of this department.

In 1915 we maintained abroad a total of 41 embassies and legations, whereas the number is now 53.

As an index to the growth of consular activities the total of consular fees collected for 1915 was $1,495,029.80, whereas for 1923 it was $6,805,470.81, a difference of $5,307,441.01.

In 1915 there was no passport visa control, whereas in 1923 the Consular Service issued 498,671 alien passports and rendered 90,566 passport services to traveling American citizens.

In the Department of State in 1915 there were issued 23,119 passports, whereas in 1923 the number was 125,656.

I am sorry not to have figures covering the number of entries and clearances of American vessels from foreign ports in 1915, but you are aware of the fact that at that time there were very few American vessels on the seas, whereas in 1923 there were 20,638 arrivals at American consular posts.

In the matter of health issued to vessels clearing for the United States in 1915 the fees from this source amounted to $87,956.13, whereas in 1923 they amounted to $1,166,686, the fee for this service remaining the same.

It is needless to mention to you that the increase in important international problems to be handled, both as regards their complexity and their number, is more than commensurate with the significant growth of routine duties to which I have referred.

This increase has added greatly to the activities and responsibilities of the Diplomatic Service upon which the Government must rely for the receipt of accurate and prompt information regarding political tendencies and developments abroad. Furthermore, the vast expansion of the war of our commercial interests in foreign countries has greatly increased the demands made upon the Diplomatic Service to afford protection and proper assistance to American commercial interests.

I trust that this information will fully cover the purposes of your request.

Very sincerely yours,

Charles E. Hughes.

Number of employees of the Department of State in Washington and in the field during the years 1915 and 1923.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>2,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One way of marking the changing times: A small stack of books—seven volumes—shows the correspondence of the American consulate at Mazatlan, Mexico, during the years 1908 and 1909; another stack of 32 volumes shows the correspondence for the years 1915 and 1919. In this decade the number of visitors increased about 100 per cent.

¹ Estimated and does not include contingent employees.
² Included 213 permanent employees and estimated number of temporary employees.
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Partial list of services performed by American consular officers during fiscal year ended June 30, 1925.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Number of Entries/Clearances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection and welfare cases</td>
<td>76,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths of Americans abroad</td>
<td>1,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of Americans</td>
<td>5,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport Service (Americans)</td>
<td>90,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport visas (aliens)</td>
<td>4,027,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section certificates (Chinese)</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptions and complaints</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exitation cases</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extradition cases</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamen shipped</td>
<td>28,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamen discharged</td>
<td>5,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamen desert</td>
<td>2,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaman continued</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamen relieved</td>
<td>5,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary trade reports</td>
<td>10,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprints to trade inquiries</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade opportunities (agents)</td>
<td>8,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinfections certificates</td>
<td>8,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notarial services</td>
<td>197,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consular invoices</td>
<td>806,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing certificates</td>
<td>2,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills of health</td>
<td>39,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary reports</td>
<td>15,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American vessels entered</td>
<td>26,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American vessels cleared</td>
<td>20,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous correspondence</td>
<td>904,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters received</td>
<td>1,007,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total fees collected for years 1922-23: $8,805,470.81

Gross cost of Consular Service 1922-23: $4,480,000.88

Net gain to the Government: $4,325,469.93

APPENDIX 3

The regular annual appropriation figures for 1925 for Commerce, Justice, Labor, Navy, Post Office, State, and Treasury were taken from the acts as approved by the President, but all other regular annual appropriation figures for 1925 were taken from bills as passed by the Senate up to June 2, 1924, and prior to action by Congress.

Deficiencies and special acts are included in figures for 1915. In 1925 only the regular annual and permanent and indefinite appropriations passed up to June 2, 1924, are included. Deficiencies and special acts for the service of 1925 to be passed in the future must be added for purposes of exact comparison.

The attached table does not include the expenses for the Shipping Board or the Veterans' Bureau.

1 The regular annual appropriation figures for 1925 for Commerce, Justice, Labor, Navy, Post Office, State, and Treasury were taken from the acts as approved by the President, but all other regular annual appropriation figures for 1925 were taken from bills as passed by the Senate up to June 2, 1924, and prior to action by Congress.

2 Deficiencies and special acts are included in figures for 1915. In 1925 only the regular annual and permanent and indefinite appropriations passed up to June 2, 1924, are included. Deficiencies and special acts for the service of 1925 to be passed in the future must be added for purposes of exact comparison.

Comparison of appropriations, fiscal years 1915 and 1925.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Appropriations, fiscal year 1915</th>
<th>Appropriations, fiscal year 1925</th>
<th>Decrease (-) or increase (+) fiscal year 1925 compared with 1915</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$13,856,439.90</td>
<td>$11,379,016.00</td>
<td>$2,477,423.90 (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11,877,439.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,402,439.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 1925 over 1915, minus Post Office appropriation.

2 The regular annual appropriation figures for 1925 for Commerce, Justice, Labor, Navy, Post Office, State, and Treasury were taken from the acts as approved by the President, but all other regular annual appropriation figures for 1925 were taken from bills as passed by the Senate up to June 2, 1924, and prior to action by Congress.

Deficiencies and special acts are included in figures for 1915. In 1925 only the regular annual and permanent and indefinite appropriations passed up to June 2, 1924, are included. Deficiencies and special acts for the service of 1925 to be passed in the future must be added for purposes of exact comparison.
A Few of the Outstanding Accomplishments of the Republican Administration, 1921-1924

Peace with Germany

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, when the Republican administration came into control of the Government, in 1921, the country was still in a state of war with the Central Powers, due to the stubborn refusal of a Democratic President to conclude any treaty of peace which did not provide for the entry of the United States into the League of Nations and did not subordinate this country to the domination of foreign influences. The first and most important care of the administration became the conclusion of peace with Germany and her allies. Treaties were quickly arranged; diplomatic and trade relations were resumed with the enemy countries; and the strained relations with European nations which had grown out of the Versailles treaty were adjusted.

The Fiscal Situation

As a result of the war, our people had accumulated a debt of $26,596,701,648.01 as against a pre-war indebtedness of one billion. Of this sum $11,000,000,000 was made up of advances to our allies during the war. No arrangements whatever had been made for the collection of the funding of these advances. No country except England had paid a dollar on account of either principal or interest. At the same time, current expenditures of the Government were proceeding at the rate of more than five and a half billions yearly. Government obligations were below par. In spite of this appalling state of the public finances, due at least in part to the unprecedented extravagances of the former administration, the retiring Democratic President had seen fit to disapprove the Budget and accounting bill, designed to bring system and economy into the Government's business.

Reduction in Expenditures

The Republican administration took steps immediately to improve the public credit and to curtail expenditures.

Mr. Glass. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I wish the Senator would allow me to get through and then I will gladly answer any questions he may desire to ask.

Included in the totals of appropriations, almost two billions is made up of fixed charges growing out of the war—interest on the public debt, sinking fund contributions, and the payments to ex-service men. The administration has thus reduced the actual cost of the public service to a little more than $1,000,000,000 yearly, practically the amount expended annually before the war.

The Budget System

This retrenchment in expenditures was made possibly largely by the inauguration of a Budget system immediately after the beginning of the Republican administration. This was the greatest piece of fiscal legislation in the recent history of the country. Not only has machinery been set up under the President whereby any one with intelligence can plan the country's business, but the committee arrangements in both Senate and House have so been altered as to consolidate and unify the legislative system for the consideration of appropriations and expenditures. The entire credit for the existence and the wonderful achievements of the Budget system must be given to a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

At this point I wish to place in the Record a table showing total appropriations, including Postal Service—payable from postal revenues—and estimated and indefinite appropriations, and a table showing total appropriations, including permanent and indefinite appropriations but excluding Postal Service, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Total appropriations</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>$1,760,920,530</td>
<td>$1,074,647,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>3,906,284,200</td>
<td>2,828,676,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>4,248,140,767</td>
<td>1,511,166,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>4,465,044,914</td>
<td>1,625,096,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase.
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Total appropriations excluding Postal Service and estimated permanent
and indefinite appropriations

Fiscal year | Total appropriations | Reductions |
---|---|---|
1921 | $2,756,085,648 | |
1922 | 2,075,614,623 | 681,471,025 |
1923 | 2,515,745,089 | 256,632,260 |
1924 | 1,706,965,628 | 157,779,231 |

† Increase.

I want to call attention now to the total gross debt as of June 30, 1921, and the reductions taking place, as follows:

Statement showing reduction in the total gross debt for the fiscal years 1922, 1923, and 11 months of fiscal year 1924

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Total gross debt</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1921</td>
<td>$23,767,450,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1922</td>
<td>22,963,351,768</td>
<td>$1,014,098,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1923</td>
<td>22,740,707,365</td>
<td>1,223,644,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 1924 (11 months)</td>
<td>21,444,903,696</td>
<td>2,343,446,826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order that Senators may know just what the sales were of war supplies, the proceeds of which were covered into the Treasury in each of these years, I want to put in the Record at this time a statement giving the amount in each year, as follows:

Receipts from sales of war supplies covered into the Treasury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>&quot;</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>$183,480,237,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>99,067,236,523</td>
<td>84,412,900,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>77,961,236,924</td>
<td>22,505,999,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924 (11 months’ basis)</td>
<td>38,292,571,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I now want to call attention to the question of expenditures, shown in the following table:

Total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>$2,368,260,189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>2,768,952,065</td>
<td>400,691,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>3,532,260,266</td>
<td>765,303,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924 (11 months)</td>
<td>1,844,466,773</td>
<td>483,903,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Includes public debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts.

‡ Eleven months’ period ended May 31, 1924, compared with corresponding period for the fiscal year 1923.

REFUNDING THE FOREIGN DEBT

Mr. President, legislation was adopted establishing a commission to take up with the various nations the question of refunding their indebtedness to this country, amounting to about eleven billions of dollars. The commission has met with material success. It secured an arrangement with Great Britain—our largest debtor—to fund the entire British debt into long-term bonds and provide for the immediate and continued payment of the interest and of installments on the principal. This was approved by Congress and by the British Government and is now in effect. A debt settlement has also been reached with Finland and Hungary, while negotiations are in progress with all other debtor nations. As the result of the active prosecution of these matters by the administration, the annual income of the Government has been increased by the sum of $190,000,000, representing principal and interest payments by foreign nations. This has been a material help to the Treasury.

BALANCING THE BUDGET AND REDUCING THE NATIONAL DEBT

The fiscal year 1922 began with a deficit of more than $700,000,000. Due to the economies of the administration the deficit was converted into a surplus of $500,000,000 by the end of the year. The excess of receipts over expenditures during the fiscal year 1923 was again more than $300,000,000. It is estimated at the Treasury that there will be a similar surplus at the end of the current year. At the same time the administration was thus bringing the Government’s expenses within its income, or balancing the budget, substantial reductions were being made in the public debt. This stood at $29,000,000,000 in 1919. It has been reduced following the inauguration of a Republican Congress in that year to about $24,000,000,000, where it stood at the time of President Harding’s inauguration in March, 1921. With the active assistance of the present administration it has been cut down to $21,544,806,391—an average reduction of more than $390,000,000 yearly.

RESTORATION OF PUBLIC CREDIT

With this vigorous handling of the Nation’s finances, the interest rate on the Government’s short-time borrowings was reduced from 6% per cent to 4 per cent, a saving of millions to the Treasury. Government bonds, which had been selling at about 85 cents on the dollar, returned to par—which meant two and a half billions of dollars in the pockets of the holders of Liberty bonds.

TAX REDUCTIONS

In the face of the large reductions in the public debt and the annual additions to the Treasury surplus, the internal revenue taxes have been reduced—first by the act adopted in November, 1921, and more recently by the act which has received the President’s signature. The act repealed the obnoxious excess-profits tax, the most damaging of all taxes to ordinary business, reduced high surtaxes, increased the exemption of suppliers with families, and repealed most of the so-called nuisance taxes. The act also reduced individual income taxes, and specially reduced the taxes on earned incomes. These large decreases in the tax burden of the people have been possible solely by the most rigid economy practiced by the administration and by the application of common-sense principles to the conduct of the Government’s business.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The establishment of budgetary reforms, which have made it possible the curtailing of the public expenditures and the reduction of the national debt but have also permitted a substantial reduction in the tax burden upon the people, will not, however, be brought to completion without the reorganization and rearrangement of the executive departments which have the Government’s business in charge. The departments have shown a marked improvement in their efficiency under the Republican administration. They have practiced rigid economy. They have eliminated all unnecessary expenditures. They have reduced the number of Government employees nearly 100,000. Further economy can be made. Immediately after the present administration came into power, Congress established a Joint Committee on Reorganization, which has since been engaged in an intensive inquiry into the details of Government administration. The committee has just laid its report before Congress, recommending the elimination of a number of superfluous bureaus and offices and a comprehensive rearrangement of the entire departmental system. The legislation necessary to accomplish these reforms is now before Congress, and its enactment will complete the compliance of the administration with its promise to introduce sound business principles into the management of the Government.

REDUCTION IN THE ARMED FORCES

The Republican administration has reduced the Army and the Navy to a proper peace-time basis. The Regular Army now numbers 140,000 officers and men, and the Navy, including the Marine Corps, 115,000 officers and men. Temporary posts and camps have been relinquished, surplus property disposed of, operating agencies have been consolidated, and other reforms introduced into the administration of the Military and Naval Establishments. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been saved as the result of these changes, without impairing in the slightest degree the efficiency of our fighting forces for purposes of the national defense.

PREPAREDNESS

The National Guard and the naval reserves have been reorganized and made into an effective support for the regular Military and Naval establishments. Summer camps and training schools have been conducted with regularity. The organ-
ized reserves of the two military arms are now in skeleton stage to insure the national defense against any emergency. These arrangements make possible the progress and development of defense plans, and a state of national preparedness, with a maximum of efficiency and at a very moderate public expense.

**DISARMAMENT**

One of the earliest efforts of the administration, in connection with the rehabilitation of France and Belgium, and the maintenance of the peace of the world and to prevent the recurrence of such devastating conflicts as the late war, was directed to bringing a reduction in the armaments of the major powers. At the invitation of the President, the Arms Conference was called in November, 1921. It was in session three months, and unanimously adopted the administration's proposals definitely limiting armaments on the sea. It resulted in the recognition of this country's open-door policy in China, the withdrawal of Japanese troops from Siberia, the return of Shantung to China by Japan, the abandonment of the long-standing Anglo-Japanese alliance, and the recognition of the American claims in relation to Yap Island. It retained America's proper position in the Pacific and set up machinery for the adjustment of disputes arising in the Orient. This was the most brilliant and far-reaching diplomatic achievement in history, and beyond any doubt accomplished more in the direction of securing world peace than any step which has ever been taken by this or any other country. It has made possible a tremendous lightening of the tax burden, not only in the United States, but in all the leading nations of the world.

**GERMAN REPARATIONS**

Throughout, by means of unofficial observers, the administration has maintained close contact with the endeavors of European nations to reach an adjustment of the problems connected with the rehabilitation of France and Belgium, and the payment of reparations by Germany. In recent months, the Government named representatives to sit on the commission of experts created to formulate a plan for the final and complete settlement of these matters. In every case, the United States has been ready for a prompt and judicious solution of the high position in the family of nations which America has reached under the Harding-Coolidge administration.

**MEXICO**

The long-standing differences between this country and Mexico has been adjusted satisfactorily to both nations, and the United States has resumed diplomatic relations with that country.

**PHILIPPINES**

At the close of the Democratic administration in 1921, the prestige and authority of the United States in the Philippines had sunk to its lowest level since the American occupation of the islands in 1898. Due largely to a desire on the part of the Democratic Governor General to encourage and hasten Philippine independence, the government of the islands had been increasingly engrossed in administrative affairs. Government credit was exhausted, the currency was depreciated, the public finances were in a state of collapse, and immediately after his inauguration, President Harding dispatched a commission to the islands to make a thorough investigation of these conditions. He later appointed as Governor General one of the ablest of public administrators in Washington to rectify the condition. Under his guidance and direction the fiscal system in the Philippines has been reorganized and rehabilitated. Corrupt public officials have been removed from office and punished. The public credit has been improved, and the American people in the Far East never was higher than it is today.

**DOMESTIC AFFAIRS—CARE OF THE VETERANS**

The principle for which President Harding and President Coolidge have consistently contended is that the Government shall treat with liberality and generosity all our former soldiers and sailors who were wholly or partially disabled in the service of their country. The administration has steadfastly striven in every possible way to lighten the burden of those of our soldiers and sailors who have been disabled by their service to help the dependents of those who lost their lives in their country's service. No other administration in the Nation's history has provided more generously for the ex-service men. In 1921, the Veterans' Bureau was established all Government agencies dealing with former service men were consolidated, and the work of relieving disabled war veterans and their dependents for health and expedited. The rates of compensation for disabled veterans were the most difficult and perplexing of the many questions that the administration had submitted its report. The plan which it formulated was approved and a commission to the islands to make a thorough investigation of the American veterans. The administration has maintained close contact with the allied nations. This is the family of nations which has made so much for the protection of American interests, and the public finances were in a state of collapse. Immediately after his inauguration, President Harding dispatched a commission to the islands to make a thorough investigation of these conditions. He later appointed as Governor General one of the ablest of public administrators in Washington to rectify the condition. Under his guidance and direction the fiscal system in the Philippines has been reorganized and rehabilitated. Corrupt public officials have been removed from office and punished. The public credit has been improved, and the American people in the Far East never was higher than it is today.

**IMMIGRATION**

The enactment of restrictive immigration legislation was one of the most important tasks of the administration. Under the immigration policy which had long been followed by this country, the arrival of great numbers of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe was operating to change, to a dangerous degree, the character and composition of our people. Our standards of citizenship were being depressed, our balance of population upset, our ideals and institutions threatened, and our prisons and asylums filled with the socially unfit, as the result of the advent of inferior racial groups and groups having nothing in common with those peoples which had settled and developed the country. The administration sought, and Congress enacted, legislation which for all time will put an end to this menace. The Johnson-Reed Immigration Law establishes the maximum of $250,000,000 as the quota base for immigration, and fixes the annual quota from each country at 1 per cent of its representation in the foreign-born population of the United States as it stood in that year. The law will restrict immigration to about 150,000 persons a year. It will permit the restoration of the original balance in our population. It will diminish the numbers of the deplorable immigrant classes. It will reduce crime, and prevent unemployment. The Immigration Restriction Act is one of the most notable achievements of the present administration.

**THE TARIFF**

Hand in hand with the restriction of immigration goes the Fordney-McCumber tariff. The restriction of immigration is almost universally approved by reasonable men. Our railroads, our shops and factories, our mines and our farms, should be operated by our own people. One of the objects of restricting immigration is to keep out low-priced foreign labor, and to insure employment for Americans. But a curtailment of immigration would be of little value for this purpose if we were to permit goods produced in foreign countries to be dumped into our markets. Every shipload of goods produced abroad and brought into America for sale takes just as much employment from American laborers as goods produced in our own country. The Republican administration has stood, as every Republican administration has stood, for the protection of American workmen and American industries from unfair competition with the cheap labor of foreign countries. Under the Fordney-McCumber tariff our industries and our labor have prospered. There are now few idle factories, and there is but little unemployment. Wages are high and prices good. Our revenues from customs have more than doubled the market price of American products during the last completed fiscal year (1923) to almost $300,000,000.
The administration has rendered material and timely aid to agriculture—the country’s oldest and most important industry. During 1921 a congressional joint committee on agricultural inquiry conducted intensive research to determine the economic status of the Government in the food and livestock business, and in January, 1922, the Secretary of Agriculture, at the request of the President, called a national agricultural conference, which proved to be the most representative gathering of practical farmers and representatives of farm organizations and allied associations which had ever been brought together in this country. Following the recommendations of its own committee, the national conference, Congress has passed a number of laws designed to assist the agricultural interests of the Nation. One of the most important was the agricultural credits act of 1923, providing Government agencies to handle agricultural loans and authorizing the establishment of credit and exchange accounts with farmers under the government supervision to loan money on livestock security and on farm products in transit to market. The War Finance Corporation was revived and empowered to loan money to those engaged in marketing agricultural products who have a practical purpose. The financial relief to farmers made possible by these measures has meant a return of the market to the farmers and has restored the livestock industry. Millions of dollars were appropriated for the extension and improvement of rural roads.

This is only an illustrative list of the things which the Government has done in the last three years in aid of the agricultural communities of the country. But it shows that legislation in the interests of agriculture has been one of the chief concerns of the administration. Many proposals for farmer relief have been before Congress, but none have had the universal support of the agricultural interests themselves, and this is the principal reason why further relief legislation has not been passed Congress at the present session. The failure of these bills to secure the endorsement of Congress cannot obscure the fact that farmer-relief legislation of a practical kind has been adopted, which will beyond question mark the beginning of the return of prosperity to our farmers.

Under the Republican administration peace has been concluded with our former enemies and friendly relations established with the entire world. The administration of the Government has been placed upon a permanent and stable basis, and we became a Nation. Taxes have been cut. Yet the national debt has been reduced and the national credit restored. Rigid economy has supplanted extravagance in the Government departments and in the Army and Navy, and our yearly expenditures have been cut almost in half. Sound tariff and immigration policies have been put in force. Our export trade has grown. Unemployment has been eliminated. There are but few idle factories. The situation of the farmers, which under the former administration had become desperate, has been improved. The President will judge the administration and the Congress by these results. Except by those who look upon the Government as a dispenser of gratuities, these results will be regarded with general satisfaction.

The achievements of the Sixty-Seventh Congress under President Harding

The Sixty-seventh Congress 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 and the Navy to a peace-time basis.

It passed the peace resolutions with Germany and Austria and brought about a limitation of armament through an international conference. It passed the budget bill, vetoed by President Wilson, and put the budget system into operation. It reduced Government employees over 100,000. It curtailed the expenses of the Government through economy and good business management, and was thus enabled to reduce the national debt from $26,594,207,878 on August 31, 1919, to $21,544,856,380 on May 31, 1924. It repealed the soda and ice cream, clothing, drug store, and freight and express taxes. It reduced the burden on the taxpayer nearly $1,000,000,000 a year.

It combined the activities in behalf of the disabled and inured soldiers in the Veterans’ Bureau, as desired by the service man, and provided $50,000,000 annually for soldier-relief work. It restricted foreign immigration to a 3 per cent basis. It established the 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 grain 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 antinaive act. It passed the bill prohibiting the sale of filled milk. It provided for the monthly payment of Civil War pensions. It brought about independent citizenship for women. It created the United States Coal Commission, and made possible the prosecution of war profiteers and grafters.

It passed a permanent tariff law, protecting agricultural products and reviving the operation of our industries, to the end that 5,000,000 idle men were able to find employment. It enacted the Capper-Linthrop-Anderson-Strong bill, establishing a system of rural credits.

The Sixty-Eighth Congress passed the tax reduction bill. It granted the soldiers’ bonus. It passed the bill permanently restricting immigration. It extended for nine months the power of the War Finance Corporation to advance credit to agriculture. It authorized the settlement of the indebtedness of Hungary to the United States made by the World War Foreign Debt Commission. It remitted the remaining payments on the Chinese indemnity. It authorized the postponement of payments by settlers on reclamation projects. It expanded the Coast Guard to prevent illegal entry of aliens and of liquors, narcotics, and dutiable goods.
It authorized the participation of the United States in two international conferences for the control of the narcotic traffic. It relieved drought-stricken farmers in New Mexico and made appropriations to check cattle diseases in the Southwest. It passed a bill reorganizing the diplomatic and consular service.

These, Mr. President, are but a few of the acts that have been passed under this administration.

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

During the delivery of Mr. Smoot's speech, Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SMOOT. For what purpose?

Mr. WARREN. I wish to make an announcement regarding appropriations.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it has been the custom in the Senate, on the last day of each session, for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, representing the majority, to make a statement of the appropriations made during the session, for the ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Appropriations also to make such a statement. The Committee on Appropriations has been too busy during the last few days to afford the chairman of that committee an opportunity to prepare any but an imperfect statement of appropriations, for, with so many conference reports being acted upon in the last few hours of the session, involving many thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars, it is only possible to determine upon the exact amounts appropriated after the session has ended. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee shall have the privilege of inserting in the Record early next week a statement showing the total appropriations made by the present session of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the request?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest that there be considered on the request of the Senator from Wyoming the further request that the ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Overman], may be granted the same privilege.

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, I have no objection to that being done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1925

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in accordance with the usual custom at the close of a session, I present herewith three tables: (a) Recapitulation of appropriations by acts and irrespective of fiscal years, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, December 5, 1923, to June 7, 1924; (b) comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1924 and 1925; and (c) comparison of Budget estimates and appropriations, fiscal year 1925.

The appropriations by acts, irrespective of fiscal years, made during the Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, amounted to $3,784,123,324.35, plus $186,833,288.49 in the second deficiency appropriation, for the fiscal year 1925; a substantial reduction of the estimate of $10,047,095.77. Really not a great change. Indeed, this is a compliment to the Bureau of the Budget. It shows the result of the application of scientific principles. It is a cheerful exhibit of what comes from all working together and in harmony.

Prior to the Budget law, Congress was confronted with estimates amounting to millions and millions of dollars which were monuments to waste and extravagance. Now an estimate means something. It has investigation behind it. So long as the Bureau of the Budget continues to function we may not expect to see the former great gap between estimates and appropriations, because the Bureau of the Budget is deserving of the highest praise. General Dawes, who inaugurated, and General Lord, who followed, are entitled to congratulation, commendation, and continued confidence.

The following shows the total appropriations for fiscal years and amounts that follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>$7,062,587,633.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>$7,014,645,568.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>$4,177,602,190.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>$3,931,062,084.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>$4,013,149,877.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>$3,928,125,950.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appropriations for 1925 are less than the same for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>$3,544,061,674.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>$2,477,858,974.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>$2,046,610,141.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>$1,800,983,768.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, the following facts are respectfully submitted: The appropriations for 1925 are approximately $189,000,000 less than for 1924.

The public debt has been reduced from $25,478,592,113.25 on August 31, 1919, to $21,847,905,880.50 on May 31, 1924, a reduction of $4,139,696,222.75.

The excess of receipts over expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, will not be less than $500,000,000.

The number of executives and civil employees of the Government has been reduced from 377,750 on August 1, 1918, to 544,671 on December 31, 1923, a reduction of 373,098.

This is practically down to pre-war normal conditions, exclusive of postal personnel.

The total revenues of the Postal Service have gone from $344,403,211.90 for the fiscal year 1918 to approximately $572,630,000 for the fiscal year 1924, an increase of $228,136,788.01.

The number of veterans in the nation's veterans in the service has been reduced from 71,500 on armistice day, November 11, 1918, to 54,671 on December 31, 1923, a reduction of 16,829.

This is a practical, down to pre-war normal conditions, exclusive of postal personnel.

The number of executive and civil employees of the Government has been reduced from 377,750 on June 30, 1918, to 544,671 on December 31, 1923, a reduction of 373,098.

This is practically down to pre-war normal conditions, exclusive of postal personnel.

The total revenues of the Postal Service have gone from $344,403,211.90 for the fiscal year 1918 to approximately $572,630,000 for the fiscal year 1924, an increase of $228,136,788.01.

Our Government has rehabilitated and completed the training of 54,362 ex-service men and women, thus enabling them to meet their handicap as a result of physical or mental disability incurred in the military service, and 54,362 ex-service men and women are now receiving vocational training.

Our Government, through the operations of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, in cooperation with the States, has rehabilitated 13,651 persons disabled in industry or incapacitated by industrial accidents, and in addition we now have 18,000 persons in the processes of being rehabilitated.

The entry of public lands by homesteaders and others for the fiscal years 1921 to 1925, inclusive, amounted to 52,413,798 acres, or in the Government, the General Land Office, for direct purposes, for the three fiscal years amounted to $30,903,340.80.

The number of farms on our reclamation projects now number 47,000,000, and the combined receipts of the General Land Office, for all purposes, for the three fiscal years amounted to $30,903,340.80.

The number of miles of Federal-aid roads completed under the Federal highway act up to March 1, 1924, was 33,086, and 13,800 miles are now under construction.

1 This sum includes $301,000,000 carried in the two acts that failed.
### Recapitulation of Appropriations by Acts and Irrespective of Fiscal Years, Sixty-eighth Congress, First Session (Dec. 3, 1923, to June 7, 1924)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of act</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS, FISCAL YEAR 1925</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$58,575,274.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>26,455,106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive office and independent offices</td>
<td>398,775,740.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>263,250,455.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative establishment</td>
<td>14,229,016.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>276,105,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, office, Commerce, and Labor: Commerce</td>
<td>63,209,497.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>26,455,106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>263,250,455.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>14,229,016.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasury and Post Office:</strong> Post Office</td>
<td>734,413,600.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>613,645,195.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>War:</strong> Military activities</td>
<td>255,615,279.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmilitary activities</td>
<td>72,355,186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, regular annual acts</strong></td>
<td>2,107,045,220.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACTS, FISCAL YEAR 1924 AND PRIOR YEARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First deficiency act, fiscal year 1924</td>
<td>156,871,655.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent deficiency act, fiscal year 1924</td>
<td>2,335,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, deficiency acts</strong></td>
<td>159,206,655.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS ACTS CARRYING APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent expenses, United States Senate, fiscal year 1924</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution of suits to cancel oil leases, fiscal years 1924 and 1925</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief of drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico, fiscal years 1924 and 1925</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, fiscal year 1924</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous relief and other acts</td>
<td>267,790.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, miscellaneous acts</strong></td>
<td>2,992,790.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, regular, deficiency, and miscellaneous acts</strong></td>
<td>3,229,042,585.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERMANENTS AND INDEFINITES, FISCAL YEAR 1925</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>12,360,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent offices</td>
<td>6,457,301.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>27,243,269.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>2,103,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasury:</strong> Interest on public debt</td>
<td>1,399,031,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinking fund and other public debt retirement funds</td>
<td>482,277,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary permanents and indefinites</td>
<td>26,773,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>War:</strong> Military activities</td>
<td>6,583,321.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmilitary activities</td>
<td>1,226,962.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District of Columbia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, permanents and indefinites</strong></td>
<td>1,455,080,738.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>3,784,123,324.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification of foregoing appropriations by fiscal years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>$3,622,735,959.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>149,444,680.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 and prior fiscal years</td>
<td>12,532,733.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,784,123,324.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparison of Appropriations by Departments and Establishments, Fiscal Years 1924 and 1925

[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]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Office</th>
<th>Appropriations, fiscal year 1924</th>
<th>Appropriations, fiscal year 1925</th>
<th>Decrease (−) or increase (+), 1925 compared with 1924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative branch:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>$13,110,081.60</td>
<td>$14,229,016.00</td>
<td>+$1,118,934.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>1,705,140.00</td>
<td>1,705,140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,816,021.60</td>
<td>14,229,016.00</td>
<td>−586,205.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Office and independent offices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>50,411,500.00</td>
<td>30,344,000.00</td>
<td>−20,067,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>3,304,500.00</td>
<td>3,304,500.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, construction of</td>
<td>19,000,000.00</td>
<td>19,000,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>12,220,000.00</td>
<td>12,300,000.00</td>
<td>+800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>88,750,030.00</td>
<td>70,936,024.00</td>
<td>−17,814,306.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>40,925,603.00</td>
<td>39,575,274.00</td>
<td>−1,350,329.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>3,228,400.00</td>
<td>3,228,400.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, construction of</td>
<td>19,000,000.00</td>
<td>19,000,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>12,220,000.00</td>
<td>12,300,000.00</td>
<td>+800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>88,750,030.00</td>
<td>70,936,024.00</td>
<td>−17,814,306.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce, Department of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>19,541,621.34</td>
<td>23,399,905.00</td>
<td>+4,398,283.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>1,958,956.00</td>
<td>1,958,956.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21,503,577.34</td>
<td>23,392,905.00</td>
<td>+2,489,327.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior, Department of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>254,774,660.00</td>
<td>224,616,000.00</td>
<td>−30,158,660.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>3,925,400.00</td>
<td>3,925,400.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>20,392,600.00</td>
<td>20,392,600.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>327,096,460.00</td>
<td>290,929,700.00</td>
<td>−37,126,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice, Department of, and judiciary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>21,122,556.00</td>
<td>21,371,430.00</td>
<td>+2,448,874.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>875,000.00</td>
<td>875,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21,997,556.00</td>
<td>21,371,430.00</td>
<td>−626,126.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor, Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>7,246,411.00</td>
<td>7,956,516.51</td>
<td>+710,105.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>566,640.00</td>
<td>566,640.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,838,051.00</td>
<td>7,981,516.51</td>
<td>+143,465.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navy, Department of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>294,480,828.00</td>
<td>275,105,067.00</td>
<td>−19,375,761.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>510,672.00</td>
<td>510,672.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>2,180,050.00</td>
<td>2,180,050.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>297,221,550.00</td>
<td>277,387,067.00</td>
<td>−19,834,483.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Office Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable from the postal revenues— Regular annual</td>
<td>596,652,111.55</td>
<td>613,645,195.25</td>
<td>+16,993,083.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>337,248.00</td>
<td>337,248.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable from other Federal revenues— Increased compensation</td>
<td>11,520.00</td>
<td>11,520.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>597,000,879.59</td>
<td>613,645,195.25</td>
<td>+16,644,315.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparison of Appropriations by Departments and Establishments, Fiscal Years 1924 and 1925—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Appropriations, fiscal year 1924</th>
<th>Appropriations, fiscal year 1925</th>
<th>Decrease (−) or increase (+), 1925 compared with 1924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>$15,262,975.79</td>
<td>$15,001,646.29</td>
<td>−$261,329.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>134,000.00</td>
<td>106,000.00</td>
<td>−28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,502,975.79</td>
<td>15,027,646.29</td>
<td>−475,329.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasury Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>$1,236,934,694.04</td>
<td>120,768,405.00</td>
<td>−$1,116,166,289.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>10,749,292.00</td>
<td>10,749,292.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>940,000.00</td>
<td>940,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public debt redemption funds</td>
<td>511,968.125.00</td>
<td>482,777,975.00</td>
<td>−29,190,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>31,056,095.41</td>
<td>26,773,100.00</td>
<td>−4,281,995.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,730,707,204.45</td>
<td>1,519,819,480.00</td>
<td>−210,887,724.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>War Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>251,544,581.00</td>
<td>255,615,279.13</td>
<td>+$4,070,698.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>900,000.00</td>
<td>900,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, military</td>
<td>252,444,581.08</td>
<td>256,515,279.13</td>
<td>+$4,070,698.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmilitary—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>85,822,747.00</td>
<td>72,355,186.00</td>
<td>−$13,467,561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>5,843,321.00</td>
<td>5,883,321.00</td>
<td>−$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonmilitary</td>
<td>91,666,068.00</td>
<td>78,038,507.00</td>
<td>−$13,627,561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, War Department—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>337,367,328.00</td>
<td>327,970,485.13</td>
<td>−$9,396,842.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>6,102,057.00</td>
<td>6,102,057.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>6,743,321.00</td>
<td>6,583,321.00</td>
<td>−$160,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350,212,706.00</td>
<td>334,553,786.13</td>
<td>−$15,658,919.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District of Columbia:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>23,047,555.00</td>
<td>20,455,105.00</td>
<td>+$2,592,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>1,795,067.00</td>
<td>1,226,962.00</td>
<td>−$568,105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>1,512,843.00</td>
<td>1,226,962.00</td>
<td>−$285,881.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,355,465.00</td>
<td>27,001,067.00</td>
<td>+$6,656,602.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>2,436,410,006.78</td>
<td>2,167,045,220.34</td>
<td>−$269,364,786.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased compensation</td>
<td>35,811,983.00</td>
<td>35,811,983.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent relief acts unclassified</td>
<td>622,709.88</td>
<td>622,709.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,473,844,799.78</td>
<td>2,167,877,813.00</td>
<td>−$306,066,986.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less sum payable from postal revenues</td>
<td>596,989,539.56</td>
<td>613,645,195.25</td>
<td>+$16,655,655.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, exclusive of sum payable from postal revenues</td>
<td>3,416,109,338.25</td>
<td>3,008,480,763.94</td>
<td>−$407,639,714.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This sum includes $105,467,000 for refunding internal revenue taxes erroneously collected.

Note—Appropriations herein stated do not include the amounts pertaining to the second deficiency bill and the field service classification bill, both of which failed of enactment. The amount for the fiscal year 1925 in the latter bill was $20,957,767.94 and the amount for the same year in the former bill is approximately $175,000,000.
(C) Comparison of Budget Estimates and Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1925—Continued

[The appropriations for 1925 include amounts carried from fiscal year 1924 in regular annual appropriations acts, and amounts estimated under permanent and indefinite appropriations.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or establishment</th>
<th>Budget estimates submitted Dec. 3, 1924</th>
<th>Supplemental Budget estimates submitted Dec. 7, 1924</th>
<th>Total Budget estimates fiscal year 1925</th>
<th>Appropriations, 1925, regular annual and permanent and indefinite</th>
<th>Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriations compared with estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative branch:</td>
<td>$13,783,030.25</td>
<td>$988,625.40</td>
<td>$14,771,661.65</td>
<td>$14,229,016.00</td>
<td>−$542,645.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,783,030.25</td>
<td>988,625.40</td>
<td>14,772,661.65</td>
<td>14,229,016.00</td>
<td>−$542,645.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive office and independent offices:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Board</td>
<td>30,344,000.00</td>
<td>30,344,000.00</td>
<td>30,344,000.00</td>
<td>30,344,000.00</td>
<td>30,344,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' Bureau</td>
<td>349,065,000.00</td>
<td>349,065,000.00</td>
<td>349,065,000.00</td>
<td>349,065,000.00</td>
<td>349,065,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive and other independent offices:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>308,729,131.16</td>
<td>308,729,131.16</td>
<td>308,729,131.16</td>
<td>308,729,131.16</td>
<td>308,729,131.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>6,457,591.79</td>
<td>6,457,591.79</td>
<td>6,457,591.79</td>
<td>6,457,591.79</td>
<td>6,457,591.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>405,186,722.95</td>
<td>405,186,722.95</td>
<td>405,186,722.95</td>
<td>405,186,722.95</td>
<td>405,186,722.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department proper</td>
<td>28,728,925.00</td>
<td>28,728,925.00</td>
<td>28,728,925.00</td>
<td>28,728,925.00</td>
<td>28,728,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, construction of</td>
<td>18,500,000.00</td>
<td>18,500,000.00</td>
<td>18,500,000.00</td>
<td>18,500,000.00</td>
<td>18,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>12,360,750.00</td>
<td>12,360,750.00</td>
<td>12,360,750.00</td>
<td>12,360,750.00</td>
<td>12,360,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>69,590,675.00</td>
<td>69,590,675.00</td>
<td>69,590,675.00</td>
<td>69,590,675.00</td>
<td>69,590,675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Department of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>24,045,025.00</td>
<td>24,045,025.00</td>
<td>24,045,025.00</td>
<td>23,939,905.00</td>
<td>−105,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>24,048,025.00</td>
<td>24,048,025.00</td>
<td>24,048,025.00</td>
<td>24,048,025.00</td>
<td>24,048,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior, Department of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>232,129,680.00</td>
<td>232,129,680.00</td>
<td>232,129,680.00</td>
<td>224,616,000.00</td>
<td>−7,504,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions</td>
<td>39,945,651.00</td>
<td>39,945,651.00</td>
<td>39,945,651.00</td>
<td>38,634,455.00</td>
<td>−1,311,196.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>27,243,299.00</td>
<td>27,243,299.00</td>
<td>27,243,299.00</td>
<td>27,243,299.00</td>
<td>27,243,299.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>299,312,600.00</td>
<td>299,312,600.00</td>
<td>299,312,600.00</td>
<td>299,312,600.00</td>
<td>299,312,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice, Department of, and judiciary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>21,378,456.00</td>
<td>21,378,456.00</td>
<td>21,378,456.00</td>
<td>21,371,430.00</td>
<td>−7,026.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Department of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>6,677,576.51</td>
<td>6,677,576.51</td>
<td>6,677,576.51</td>
<td>7,956,516.51</td>
<td>+1,278,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>6,702,576.51</td>
<td>6,702,576.51</td>
<td>6,702,576.51</td>
<td>7,981,516.51</td>
<td>+1,278,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy, Department of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>276,395,794.00</td>
<td>276,395,794.00</td>
<td>276,395,794.00</td>
<td>275,105,062.00</td>
<td>−1,290,727.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>278,395,794.00</td>
<td>278,395,794.00</td>
<td>278,395,794.00</td>
<td>278,005,062.00</td>
<td>−1,290,727.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable from postal revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>613,093,183.50</td>
<td>613,093,183.50</td>
<td>613,093,183.50</td>
<td>613,645,195.25</td>
<td>+552,011.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>14,988,446.29</td>
<td>14,988,446.29</td>
<td>14,988,446.29</td>
<td>15,001,646.29</td>
<td>+39,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>14,988,446.29</td>
<td>14,988,446.29</td>
<td>14,988,446.29</td>
<td>15,027,646.29</td>
<td>+39,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 293) to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 16, 1921.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8588) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the United States marine hospital reservation and improvements thereon at Detroit, Mich., and to acquire a suitable site in the same locality and to erect thereon a modern hospital for the treatment of the beneficiaries of the United States Public Health Services, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) declaring agriculture to be the basic industry of the country, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed enrolled bills of the following titles, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 4088. An act to establish the upper Mississippi River wild life and fish refuge; and

H. R. 9434. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Georgia and Florida, through their respective highway departments, to construct a bridge across the St. Marys River.

MARINE HOSPITAL RESERVATION AT DETROIT

Mr. FERRIS. Now, Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERRIS. I merely wish to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 888, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the United States marine hospital reservation and improvements thereon at Detroit, Mich., and to acquire a suitable site in the same locality and

CONESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or establishment</th>
<th>Budget estimates submitted Dec. 3, 1923</th>
<th>Supplemental Budget estimates submitted Dec. 3, 1923, to June 7, 1924</th>
<th>Total Budget estimates fiscal year 1925</th>
<th>Appropriations, 1925, regular annual and permanent and indefinite</th>
<th>Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriations compared with estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>$122,212,965.00</td>
<td>$122,212,965.00</td>
<td>$120,768,405.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on public debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public debt redemption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,521,264,040.00</td>
<td>1,521,264,040.00</td>
<td>1,519,819,480.00</td>
<td>−1,444,560.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Department: Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>258,124,006.00</td>
<td>258,124,006.00</td>
<td>255,615,279.13</td>
<td>−2,508,726.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>900,000.00</td>
<td>900,000.00</td>
<td>900,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, military</td>
<td>259,024,006.00</td>
<td>259,024,006.00</td>
<td>265,615,279.13</td>
<td>−2,508,726.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmilitary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>71,733,765.00</td>
<td>71,733,765.00</td>
<td>72,355,186.00</td>
<td>+621,421.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>5,683,321.00</td>
<td>5,683,321.00</td>
<td>5,683,321.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, nonmilitary</td>
<td>77,417,086.00</td>
<td>77,417,086.00</td>
<td>78,038,507.00</td>
<td>+621,421.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, War Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>329,857,771.00</td>
<td>329,857,771.00</td>
<td>327,976,465.13</td>
<td>−1,887,305.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>6,583,321.00</td>
<td>6,583,321.00</td>
<td>6,583,321.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>336,441,092.00</td>
<td>336,441,092.00</td>
<td>344,553,786.13</td>
<td>−1,887,305.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>26,652,850.00</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>26,659,650.00</td>
<td>+7,605.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>1,226,922.00</td>
<td>1,226,922.00</td>
<td>1,226,922.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,879,772.00</td>
<td>6,500.00</td>
<td>27,886,622.00</td>
<td>+7,605.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular annual</td>
<td>2,176,082,300.71</td>
<td>1,009,295.40</td>
<td>2,177,092,318.11</td>
<td>−10,947,065.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and indefinite</td>
<td>1,455,080,738.85</td>
<td>1,455,080,738.85</td>
<td>1,455,080,738.85</td>
<td>−10,947,065.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>3,631,163,046.56</td>
<td>1,009,295.40</td>
<td>3,632,173,054.96</td>
<td>−10,947,065.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Post Office (payable from postal revenues)</td>
<td>613,093,183.50</td>
<td>613,093,183.50</td>
<td>613,093,183.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, exclusive of Post Office</td>
<td>3,018,069,946.06</td>
<td>1,009,295.40</td>
<td>3,019,079,971.46</td>
<td>3,008,480,763.94</td>
<td>−10,599,107.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—The estimates and appropriations herein stated do not include the amounts pertaining to the second deficiency bill and the field service classification bill, both of which failed of enactment. The amount for the fiscal year 1925 in the latter bill is $26,357,767.84 and the amount for the fiscal year 1923 in the former bill is approximately $175,000,000.
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to erect thereon a modern hospital for the treatment of beneficiants of the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a subject matter now before the Senate, and there can be but two questions under consideration.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose. This is the first time that I have ever made such a request. Mr. SMOOT. I will object, and that will end it. I wish to go on with my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah declines to yield.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chafee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had recessed from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 38 and 59 to the bill (H. R. 9559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, and concurred therein, and that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 29 and 94.

After the conclusion of Mr. Smoot's speech,

REPLY TO MR. SMOOT

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has with fulsome praise recounted the accomplishments of Republican leadership in the House. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is one thing that the Senator from Utah has omitted. He has omitted to point out that the Republican leaders have not been the most consistent in their attacks on the Government in part because they are in despair. The farmers and laborers and little people have been so ill-treated by this Government and its agencies under the reactionary policies of the Republican Party that they have abandoned the Republican Party and have adopted the policies of the Democratic Party.

Do I exaggerate what has occurred? I put in the Congressional Record an answer to your question: Is it any wonder that they put that policy upon the country, that they made that determination? I ask you, is it any wonder that the shrinkage of fifteen hundred million dollars has caused a substantial diminution of credit of fifteen thousand million dollars? Is it any wonder that the people are feeling hurt? Well, they do not exaggerate. Is it any wonder that the people are feeling hurt? Well, they do not exaggerate. Is it any wonder that the people are feeling hurt? Well, they do not exaggerate. Is it any wonder that the people are feeling hurt? Well, they do not exaggerate. Is it any wonder that the people are feeling hurt? Well, they do not exaggerate.
little unemployment. Fortunately we have a recent record from the Department of Labor concerning unemployment. The last report is for the month of April, and it shows that since April, 1923, there has been a decrease in employment in 33 of the leading industries of the country and an increase in only 13. It shows in dollars and cents on the pay roll in various industries in one year has been 22.5 per cent in men's clothing; 20.7 per cent in cotton goods; 19.6 per cent in automobile tires.

One great textile group of industries, as a whole shows a decrease of 11.4 per cent in number of workers on the pay roll and 13 per cent in wages since last year.

From the figures of the Department of Labor it is evident beyond a shadow of a doubt that over 400,000 more workers are out of employment in the manufacturing industries now than a year ago, with a total loss of about $5,000,000 monthly.

Comparing unemployment in March and April of this year, we find in one month alone a decrease of 11.4 per cent in the number of employees on the pay rolls in the men's clothing industry and 16.6 per cent in wages.

The report also shows, out of every five persons employed in this country in 1920, there is one in five out of employment today. It shows that there are only recurrences of employment caused by reason of having names taken from the pay roll, and it makes no record of hundreds of thousands of people of this country who are working short hours or reduced wages.

One of the 12 leading groups of manufacturing industries of which I speak has shown a decrease of 11 per cent in number of workers on pay rolls, and 13.4 per cent in wages since last year.

The iron and steel group showed a decrease of 2 per cent, and the leather group a 11 per cent decrease, chemical a 7 per cent decrease, and a 2 per cent decrease.

From the figures of the Department of Labor it is evident beyond a shadow of a doubt that over 400,000 more workers are out of employment in the manufacturing industries now than a year ago, with a total loss of about $5,000,000 monthly.

Comparing employment in March and April of this year, we find in one month alone a decrease of 11.4 per cent in number of employees on the pay rolls in the men's clothing industry and 16.6 per cent in wages.

INDEX NUMBERS OF EMPLOYMENT OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR SHOW THAT SINCE 1920, 22 PER CENT OF THE WORKERS THEN EMPLOYED ARE NOW UNEMPLOYED. (See U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR STATISTICS: "EMPLOYMENT IN SELECTED INDUSTRIES, APRIL, 1924," ESPECIALLY PAGES 3, 4, AND 11.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma for his second address upon this motion.

JURISDICTIONAL EFFECTS OF DEFLATION POLICY

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, when I was in Oklahoma a few days ago attending a bank directors' meeting, in discussing the agricultural conditions in that section of the country I was asked by some of the farmers who know the development of large areas of land that they are paying $1.25 a day for laborers on the farm, and the laborer has to feed himself. Believe me, the man who is laboring on the farm under those conditions, with a woman and two or three children depending upon him for support, is not contented. He should not be contented.

If you want to make Bolsheviks, that is the way to manufacture them. If you want to cause violence and discontent, all you have to do is to contract credit and currency until you bankrupt hundreds of thousands and millions of people in the country.

Mr. FEES. Will the Senator yield for just one question? Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator would lose the floor.

Mr. OWEN. I can not yield. I will thank the Senator to permit me to finish. I will yield the floor in one moment.

The responsibility for this policy can not and must not be laid on the shoulders of the President. The majority in control of this Chamber on May 17, 1920, was Republican. A Republican Senator, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCallister], offered a resolution declaring that the Federal Reserve Board, which was being criticized by me for pursuing that evil course. The resolution was agreed to. I was present, but the following day—May 18, 1920—I registered my vehement protest.

In June, 1920, immediately following, the Republican Party leaders in national convention assembled put a plank in their national platform declaring for the policy of deflation and currency.

A chosen representative of that convention, as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, Senator Warren G. Harding, put it in his speech of acceptance, declaring it a "courageous and intelligent declaration of credit and currency.

The Republicans took the full and complete responsibility of deflating the credit and currency of the country and the terrible consequences ensued. They can either not escape or escape the consequences of deflating and ruining our industry and commerce.

If it is vain for them to say that members of the reserve board were appointed as Democrats. The board was an agency of the Government and subject to the domination of the party in power, and the majority of that Federal Reserve Board entertained the view expressed in the Republican platform on deflation, and therefore were Republicans and not Democrats.

The Republican Party, which passed the McCallister resolution favoring deflation of credit and currency, May 17, 1920, which passed the resolution in the national platform favoring deflation of credit and currency, and nominated and elected a President who pledged himself in his speech of acceptance, declaring it a "courageous and intelligent deflation of credit and currency.

The Republicans took the full and complete responsibility of deflating the credit and currency of the country and the terrible consequences ensued. They can either not escape or escape the consequences of deflating and ruining our industry and commerce.

If it is vain for them to say that members of the reserve board were appointed as Democrats. The board was an agency of the Government and subject to the domination of the party in power, and the majority of that Federal Reserve Board entertained the view expressed in the Republican platform on deflation, and therefore were Republicans and not Democrats.

The Republican Party, which passed the McCallister resolution favoring deflation of credit and currency, May 17, 1920, which passed the resolution in the national platform favoring deflation of credit and currency, and nominated and elected a President who pledged himself in his speech of acceptance, declaring it a "courageous and intelligent deflation of credit and currency.

The Republicans took the full and complete responsibility of deflating the credit and currency of the country and the terrible consequences ensued. They can either not escape or escape the consequences of deflating and ruining our industry and commerce.

If it is vain for them to say that members of the reserve board were appointed as Democrats. The board was an agency of the Government and subject to the domination of the party in power, and the majority of that Federal Reserve Board entertained the view expressed in the Republican platform on deflation, and therefore were Republicans and not Democrats.

The Republican Party, which passed the McCallister resolution favoring deflation of credit and currency, May 17, 1920, which passed the resolution in the national platform favoring deflation of credit and currency, and nominated and elected a President who pledged himself in his speech of acceptance, declaring it a "courageous and intelligent deflation of credit and currency.

The Republicans took the full and complete responsibility of deflating the credit and currency of the country and the terrible consequences ensued. They can either not escape or escape the consequences of deflating and ruining our industry and commerce.

If it is vain for them to say that members of the reserve board were appointed as Democrats. The board was an agency of the Government and subject to the domination of the party in power, and the majority of that Federal Reserve Board entertained the view expressed in the Republican platform on deflation, and therefore were Republicans and not Democrats.

The Republican Party, which passed the McCallister resolution favoring deflation of credit and currency, May 17, 1920, which passed the resolution in the national platform favoring deflation of credit and currency, and nominated and elected a President who pledged himself in his speech of acceptance, declaring it a "courageous and intelligent deflation of credit and currency.
I want to put this fact in the Record simply to indicate whether the policy of definition of 1920 was a Republican policy or whether it was a Democratic policy.

The Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge,  
United States Senator.

My dear Senator Lodge: My attention has been called to a resolution introduced into the Senate by Senator King (Congressional Record of June 3, p. 10571 f.) with regard to the Lausanne treaty and the so-called Chester concession. The friends concluded with Turkey are now before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate together with the information which I felt might be useful to the committee in its consideration of these instruments. I do not feel that the letter would be an advance for me to enter into any detailed discussion of the various allegations contained in the statement accompanying Senator King's resolution. At the appropriate time and as desired by the Foreign Relations Committee I shall be glad to furnish full information with regard to any matters pertinent to the consideration of these treaties.

Certain of the statements of Senator King are of such a character, however, that I did not feel that I should allow them to pass unchallenged, although the unerriness has been indicated in the information which I have already laid before the committee.

1. The charge "that the United States participated in the Lausanne conference apparently for the sole purpose of securing and conferring the so-called Chester concession, and that in pursuance of that purpose and essential rights of American nationals in Turkey were sacrificed and Armonia forsaken, if not betrayed," is absolutely unfounded. As I stated in January, 1923, there was no stage in the negotiations of the Lausanne conference from position determined by the so-called Chester concession. This had been granted before negotiations of our treaty with Turkey had been begun. This Government took no part in securing it; this Government made no barrier of any of its rights for this or any other concession. Senator King, in referring to the date of our negotiations with Turkey, has apparently confused the negotiations between the allied powers and Turkey with the negotiations of the American plenipotentiary at Lausanne and the Turkish representatives. The latter negotiations were not initiated until subsequent to May 1, 1923. While the United States was represented at Lausanne during the earlier phase of the negotiations and it had not prior to May, 1923, undertaken the negotiation of a treaty.

2. Senator King contrasts the action of this Government in 1920 with respect to the Serres treaty with that of 1923, indicating that these actions are a reversal of the course of the earlier attempt. It is possible that the Senator does not recall that the United States was represented at the San Remo conference in 1920, which had under consideration the treaty of Serres, in the same capacity as at Lausanne. The United States, however, was neither a party to the treaty of Serres nor to the Lausanne treaty of peace between the allied powers and Turkey.

3. In view of the fact that the reference in Senator King's statement to my memorandum of October 20, 1922, with regard to the near eastern settlement is inaccurate I beg to include a copy of the full text of this memorandum which was given to the press at that time. At the Lausanne conference this Government stood for the principles outlined in this memorandum and was able to obtain substantial guarantees with respect to the points of interest which this communication outlined.

4. Senator King states: "The Allies declined to make concessions to the Turks, both on the subject of the capitulations and upon the Armenian case. The conference was deadlocked largely upon these two points, and it was finally dissolved on January 4, 1923."

"Meanwhile, on April 10, 1923, the crafty Turks ratified the Chester concession. The conference was resumed on April 23, 1923, and the American observers who, during the first session of the conference, advised the Allies, who were hesitantly in others, transferred their support in all matters to the Turks, with the result that the Turks were enabled to impose their views and will upon the Allies."

This statement is totally inaccurate. In the draft treaty of peace as communicated to the Turks by the Allies on January 31, 1923, it is provided in article 26: "The high contracting parties agree to abrogate the capitulations relating to the regime of foreigners in Turkey, both as regards conditions of entry and residence and as regards fiscal and judicial questions."

Thus prior to the adjournment of the conference on February 4 the Allies had agreed to abrogate the capitulations. This was not one of the points which brought about the interruption of the conference. Nor was the issue with respect to the Armenian instrumental in deadlocking the conference in February, 1923, since the Turkish plenipotentiary had agreed to the provisions of the allied treaty as communicated on January 31, which related to the protection of minorities. The statement that the American representatives after the adjournment "transferred their support in all matters to the Turks, with the result that the Turks were enabled to impose their views and will upon the Allies," is utterly false.

6. In answer to the allegation that the treaty surrenders American rights and interests, I would call your attention to the fact that the Americans who have interests in Turkey, whether philanthropic or commercial, have urged its ratification.

A Senator King's remarks with regard to the status of American philanthropic and missionary work in Turkey are both inaccurate and misleading. In this connection it is significant that the Americans who are responsible for carrying on this work in Turkey have indicated that they would be more inclined to urge the ratification of the treaty with Turkey, and have submitted encouraging reports of recent progress.

In case there are any further points in Senator King's statement on which the committee may desire to obtain additional information, I shall be most happy to furnish it.

I am, my dear Senator Lodge,  
Very sincerely yours,

Charles E. Hughes.

(Inclu: Aide-memcre of October 30, 1922.)

The following communiques were transmitted to the British, French, and Italian Governments through the American embassies at London, Paris, and Rome on October 30:

"AIDE-MEMOIRE"

The conference proposed for the purpose of drawing up a treaty of peace with Turkey will have primarily to deal with the problems resulting from the state of belligerency between the allied powers, Turkey, and Greece. The United States was neither at war with Turkey nor a party to the armistice of 1918 and does not desire to participate in the final peace negotiations or to assume responsibility for the political and territorial adjustments which may be effected.

While maintaining this reserve in regard to certain phases of the Near East settlement the Government of the United States does not desire to leave the impression that it regards its interests as less entitled to consideration than those of any other power, or that it is prepared to relinquish the rights enjoyed in common with other powers, or to commercial opportunity, or that it is unconcerned with the humanitarian interests involved.

For the purpose of clarity certain subjects of particular American concern may be briefly stated:

1. The maintenance of capitulations which may be essential to the appropriate safeguarding of non-Muslim interests.

2. The protection, under proper guaranties, of philanthropic, educational, and religious institutions.

3. Appropriate undertakings in regard to the freedom of opportunity, without discrimination or special privilege, for commercial enterprises.

4. Indemnity for losses suffered by Americans in Turkey as a result of arbitrary and illegal acts.

5. Suitable provisions for the protection of minorities.

6. Assurances touching the freedom of the Straits.

7. Reasonable opportunity for archeological research and study.

This brief summary, while not exhaustive, may serve to indicate the general nature of American interests. To safeguard such interests the American Government, in the manner this Government is prepared to send observers to the proposed conference if this agreement is agreeable to the powers concerned. Without participating in the negotiations of the treaty of peace, these observers would be able to report to this Government its position in greater detail than is possible in this aide-memoire, and they could also inform the American Government of the attitude of other powers in matters where there are mutual interests.

A second object in view in submitting this suggestion is the elimination of any possible cause of misunderstanding. It is considered appropriate to call attention to the attitude of the United States in respect to the treaties and agreements which have been made with respect to Turkish territory, which provide for the establishment of zones of special commercial and economic influence, such, for example, as the tripartite agreement of 1929, are con-
Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Record a letter addressed to me by a former citizen of Sacaton, Ariz., with reference to the Pima Indians.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

611 MARYLAND AVENUE NORTHEAST, WASHINGTON, D. C., June 6, 1924.

Hon. CHARLES W. MCNARY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. President:

On September 3, 1910, I was commissioned as missionary by the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America and assigned to assist the Rev. Charles H. Cook, D. D., missionary in charge of the work among the Pima Indians at Sacaton, Arizona. I went specifically to work among the Pimas since December 23, 1870. Doctor Cook being honorably retired in 1914, I succeeded to the work founded by him. When Doctor Cook went among the Pima Indians they were an agrarian people, cultivating and farming their own lands by irrigation, and from the reports of the earliest travelers through that section of the country the Pimas were one of the first original people to irrigate their lands from the Gila River. The country to the east of them was taken up by white settlers and the water appropriated from the river that had plenty of water to irrigate their crops. Gradually, by the appropriation of the water from the river by the whites, the supply of water for the Pimas diminished until only what had been cultivated by them for centuries became a barren waste.

The Pimas have always been a law-abiding peace-loving tribe of Indians, and one of their boasts is that they have never shed the blood of the white man, and by reason of their unaffected friendship to the Federal Government the Pimas aided the Government troops to subdue the Apaches in campaigns costing the Federal Government more than $24,000,000.

Gradually, by reason of the white settlers above them diverting the waters from the river, the cultivated land of the Pimas was reduced to barren and desert lands. Being wards of the Government they could not protect their rights through the courts. Therefore, the only means left to become rational was to become rational in their mode of life, and become more like the whites in all things. At this time Doctor Cook, with the help of several high officials of the Presbyterian Church, the Indian Rights Association, and other friends, brought this matter to the attention of the late President McKinley, who, in a letter to Doctor Cook said: "That this injustice would be righted and that the Pimas, who are a proud people and who glory in their agricultural supremacy of ancient times, would have a portion of the waters of the Gila restored to them, which would revive their pristine vigor and the fruits of their industry would not perish from the earth. The untimely death of the late President McKinley retarded the work of righting the wrong done the Pimas and Doctor Cook passed to his reward in 1917, without the work being accomplished. And it was at this time that I undertook to complete the work begun by Doctor Cook 23 years prior to his death.

In February, 1923, the Arizona Christian Endeavor Union held its State Convention at Tucson and selected the high honor of the office of president of this worthy organization upon me. I was assured by this organization that it would back me in the fight we were making to get justice for the Pimas. I was sent as one of the delegates to the World's Christian Endeavor Union, held in Des Moines in the first part of July, 1923.

On Friday, July 6, 1923, I had the honor to deliver an address before 15,000 delegates at that convention. Those delegates, by rising vote, pledged themselves to do all within their power to see that the rights both of the Indians and the Pimas, should have been won. I spoke before numerous chambers of commerce, Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs throughout the country in behalf of these Indians.

As a result of this long chain of circumstances I was sent to Washington in the fall of 1923 to assist in securing an adequate bill for the proper relief and care of the Pima Indians. This is an accomplished fact. The so-called Cameron San Carlos bill has passed the Senate and House. Therefore, my dear Senator, in writing this I can, through you, express to all the full appreciation of the citizens of Arizona and voice the sentiment of the great church organizations and the various national societies interested in a full measure of Government recognition, righting a wrong that has persisted for over fifty years, as provided in this legislation, better known as the Cameron bill.

No individual can claim the sole honor of this splendid accomplishment of right and justice, nor do I believe any individual expects all the credit for the personal efforts which have been done by individuals and organizations than any other, because I came here and saw the first steps taken and have remained here actively engaged, with full knowledge of every move made by all until the final victory which we are assured by Doctor Cook, that is both active and important. Full praise and glory are due to the various church organizations, Protestant, Catholic, and Mormon; to Kiwanis and Rotary clubs throughout the United States; to women's clubs and other special organizations; Indian Rights and Welfare Associations; chambers of commerce and other similar civic organizations; also, to newspapers and other publications. Individually allow me to mention the untiring efforts of Judge O. J. Bajen, president of the San Carlos Association, and its members; Senator Henry F. Ashurst; Congressman Homer P. Snyder, chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee of the House; Congressman Harris J. Bixler, of the Rules Committee of the House; Senator C. L. MaNary, chairman of the Buchanan Committee of the Senate; Senator John W. Hare, chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate; Senator Wesley L. Jones, speaker Gilbert, of the lower House; Congressman Nicholas Longworth, of Cincinnati, John S. H. Cook, of Caspar, W. T., Hunt, of Arizona; Hon. Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior; Hon. Charles H. Burke, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; Gen. Lord, Director of Federal Budget; and Hon. Bascom Smith, secretary to the President, who, by his help to the lower House, was vigorous in passing the bill in that body. He received wonderful support from Congressmen Butterfield, chairman of the Committee and from other Senators, who were to defeat the bill.

Also I must mention with all emphasis the interest and personal efforts of our great President, Calvin Coolidge, who in the darkest eleven days of our time came to the rescue to make sure our hopes were not in vain, and to this great and peerless leader we extend our heartfelt thanks for his noble and humane consideration. With all the tributes thus paid I would be desirous that I not say with all earnestness and truth that but for Senator Bajen, the House of the bill which has been so widely acclaimed, is the work of the Senator, which has brought about the passage of the bill, and is the greatest credit of all in passing this legislation. Senator Cameron was commissioned by the people of Arizona with the pledge to secure the San Carlos Dam. He came to Washington with everything against him to do what had often been said was the impossible. He realized his task and was undaunted. He smiled at defeat and renewed each time his determination to win. He was ever buried in Casa Grande, Ariz., but, true to his promise, nothing seemed to deter him.

When I came to Washington December last to feel out the situation nothing was on the horizon but dark clouds of impossibility. I spent long days talking with officials, the leaders, to whom it was said, without exception they all said, "It cannot be done." One day after much study and thought I entered the office of Senator Cameron, and there in the outer office received no encouragement, but was admitted to the inner office after the outer office, which was the most characteristic of the genial statesman I handed him the rough draft of a San Carlos bill and seated myself opposite him. He read it with silent emotion, and when through his nose and with his usual vigor he pounded his fist upon the desk between us and said, "I will not let me live until the United States Senate meets again in January I will introduce this bill and pass it this session." This was my first and only encouragement.

Like a whirlwind the battle was won. CAMERON in rapid succession secured a unanimous report of the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate, passed the bill by a unanimous vote, even in the face of opposition of those old-time leaders. Well do I remember seeing him in action on the Senate floor one day with all the force in him pound his fist, in a passionate appeal, on the desk of one of the leaders opposite which sent shivers to my heart, but evidently it carried the day, for the bill passed. Senator CAMERON did not stop there. He immediately followed up his victory and helped marshal all forces for the battle in the lower House of Congressmen and House Appropriations. Time passed. A vote seemed impossible because of the nearness of the adjournment of Congress and the impending legislative jam which always occurs. CAMERON was more determined than ever. His telephone calls, and letters, and personal visits to House leaders, Interior Department, Director of the Budget, and especially to the President and the White House. Finally, on Monday, June 2, 1924, the critical hour came. Only four more days remained before the bill was to disappear. Senator Cameron called me into his office and said:"ley, we are at the breaking point; all our ammunition has been used without avail; all except one load. That will be used this very morning."
Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, in connection with the letter just read, I am permitted by the Speaker to print the following verses, which were ordered to be printed in the Record:

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President: You will recall that I have conferred with you several times about legislation providing for the construction of the San Carlos Dam in Arizona, as embodied in my bill, S. 906, which passed the Senate unanimously on April 30. Since it has been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House and reported favorably to the House by a unanimous vote of that committee.

The first of the week Chairman Stout of the House Committee on Indian Affairs and Congressman Theodore E. Burton called upon the Speaker and asked special recognition under suspension of the rules for the consideration of the San Carlos bill in the House. The Speaker granted, and I hope you will pardon the presumption on my part in making the personal request that, if consistent, you express your interest in this matter to the Speaker. I am sure, if this is done, special recognition will be given, and so it would only require a few minutes to pass the bill, as a roll of the House discloses no opposition to it in either party. As this legislation has been favorably inquired by the Interior Department, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has been working diligently for it and its enactment at this session, there is no occasion for debate, so I feel I am not inconsistent in preferring this request.

My dear Mr. President, if these were merely a political measure affecting me or my district, I would not feel justified in trespassing upon your time in this way, but there is a deep moral issue involved, as is attested by the support that has been given to this legislation by the heads of the Protestant, Catholic, and Mormon Churches of this country from coast to coast. I venture there is not a Member of Congress who has not received appeals in behalf of this legislation. As the head of our Nation, I can appreciate your feeling of deep responsibility to the Indians who are the wards of the whole Nation, and it is on this ground that I now appeal to you, as this bill will right a wrong which the Pima Indians have suffered at the hands of the white people for the past half century or more. The Pimas have always been the outstanding friends of the white men among the Indians of the West, and have an unbroken record of never having shed the blood of a white man. But the white settlers have done them an almost irreparable injury. They have absolutely deprived these Indians of their water, and as a consequence the Indians have been for the past few years in destitute circumstances and are now facing starvation.

"Permit me to again call your attention to the fact that President McKinley sponsored in the main this same relief legislation, and had it not been for his untimely death this bill would have been righted during his administration."

"Inasmuch as I have exhausted every means of securing a vote in the House on this measure, I am appealing to you as a last hope, and I know you will not fail us."

I have the very earnest hope that you will find time to give this your personal attention.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph H. Cameron.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, in connection with the letter just read, I am permitted by the Speaker to print the following verses, which were ordered to be printed in the Record:

He called a stenographer and hurriedly dictated a letter to the President, as follows:

"Mr. President: I have conferred with you several times about legislation providing for the construction of the San Carlos Dam in Arizona, as embodied in my bill, S. 906, which passed the Senate unanimously on April 30. Since it has been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House and reported favorably to the House by a unanimous vote of that committee.

The first of the week Chairman Stout of the House Committee on Indian Affairs and Congressman Theodore E. Burton called upon the Speaker and asked special recognition under suspension of the rules for the consideration of the San Carlos bill in the House. The Speaker granted, and I hope you will pardon the presumption on my part in making the personal request that, if consistent, you express your interest in this matter to the Speaker. I am sure, if this is done, special recognition will be given, and so, it would only require a few minutes to pass the bill, as a roll of the House discloses no opposition to it in either party. As this legislation has been favorably inquired by the Interior Department, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has been working diligently for it and its enactment at this session, there is no occasion for debate, so I feel I am not inconsistent in preferring this request.

My dear Mr. President, if these were merely a political measure affecting me or my district, I would not feel justified in trespassing upon your time in this way, but there is a deep moral issue involved, as is attested by the support that has been given to this legislation by the heads of the Protestant, Catholic, and Mormon Churches of this country from coast to coast. I venture there is not a Member of Congress who has not received appeals in behalf of this legislation. As the head of our Nation, I can appreciate your feeling of deep responsibility to the Indians who are the wards of the whole Nation, and it is on this ground that I now appeal to you, as this bill will right a wrong which the Pima Indians have suffered at the hands of the white people for the past half century or more. The Pimas have always been the outstanding friends of the white men among the Indians of the West, and have an unbroken record of never having shed the blood of a white man. But the white settlers have done them an almost irreparable injury. They have absolutely deprived these Indians of their water, and as a consequence the Indians have been for the past few years in destitute circumstances and are now facing starvation.

"Permit me to again call your attention to the fact that President McKinley sponsored in the main this same relief legislation, and had it not been for his untimely death this bill would have been righted during his administration."

"Inasmuch as I have exhausted every means of securing a vote in the House on this measure, I am appealing to you as a last hope, and I know you will not fail us."

I have the very earnest hope that you will find time to give this your personal attention.

Sincerely yours,

Dick Lat, Sacaton, Ariz.
have prosperity. There is no real prosperity amongst ninety-nine out of a hundred millions of American women. There is a state of uncertainty and anxiety and distress, and general dissatisfaction with economic conditions throughout the country.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] in his able and unanswerable speech has told you how the Republican Party literally destroyed the farmer, the feeder, and the stock raisers, and this criminally bad policy. That is the real cause of the farmer-labor movement which this Republic hasSenators...

$34,087,000,000. This is the annual cost of the universal credit system—one bank! Since last June 121 national banks have failed to this time and about 300 State banks. When this policy was put over the following year, ending June 30, 1921, 330 State banks and 28 national banks failed. The next year, ending June 30, 1922, 304 additional State banks and 33 national banks failed; and the year ending June 30, 1923, 237 State banks and 4 national banks failed. Since last June 121 national banks and over 300 State banks have failed.

Such wholesale financial, industrial, and commercial disaster has had no equal in our banking history.

Why did these Government loans, by courageous and intelligent self-sacrifice, give to the people of the country the hope and faith to make the dollar more difficult to get, a policy against which I protested with all my might in the spring of 1920, and I got no adequate support. I made four speeches against it in the Senate between January 1st and May 1920, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three letters of protest to the Reserve Board and one letter to the President of the United States. I called the attention of the country to the fact that this policy of raising the interest rates and discriminatingly contracting credit would be ruinous to the country. I pointed out with all the energy and the courage of my ability that it would produce a great industrial depression and ruin many of our cities. After it all happened, I wrote a letter to the Senator from Utah [Mr. OWEN], who has in his speech told you how the Republican Party...

On June 30, 1922, they were $28,483,000,000—a contraction of loans and discounts of over five and a half billion dollars. Mr. President, such a contraction of loans and discounts never has been known before in the history of this country. Is it any wonder that the sheepmen of Nevada and all of the western country, the stockmen of Texas and Oklahoma and Kansas and Nebraska and all of the agricultural areas of the country are bankrupt? This self-sacrifice of the conservative Republican Party comes with poor grace from the conservative, reactionary, stand-pat Republican leaders who have bankrupted millions of people by the cruel and harsh policy of deflating credit and currency in this country.

That I do not exaggerate the condition is known to all of those Senators who live west of the Mississippi River to all of those Senators east of the Mississippi River who have in their States farmers, stock raisers, and small producers who have been injured or ruined by this criminally bad policy. That is the real cause of the farmer-labor movement. The farmers and laborers and little people have been so ill-treated by this Government and its agencies under the reactionary leadership of the Republican Party that they have abandoned all parties in some States and are trying to organize a new party in order to find some relief, because they are in despair.

Do you know what has occurred? I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 4 the vital facts set forth in a letter from the Comptroller of the Currency. It appears on page 10717 of the Record. The loans and discounts of the banks as of June 30, 1920, were $14,087,000,000.

On June 30, 1922, they were $28,483,000,000—a contraction of loans and discounts of over five and a half billion dollars. Mr. President, such a contraction of loans and discounts never has been known before in the history of this country. Is it any wonder that the sheepmen of Nevada and of all the western country, the stockmen of Texas and Oklahoma and Kansas and Nebraska, and all of the agricultural areas of the country are bankrupt? This self-sacrifice of the conservative Republican Party is the answer to the question which I protested with all my might in the spring of 1920.

The great farming regions have shrunk to $3,117,000,000 from $10,517,000,000. The official records compiled by the Dun & Bradstreet Agency show that the cotton growing regions have received unusually low prices for what he had to sell, and largely as a result of the protective tariff has been forced to pay high prices for the things he had to buy, whether they were necessities or luxuries.

A little study of business and industrial conditions for the past three years under the Republican administration as compared with the last three years under President Wilson will show how truly the voters of the country were disillusioned by Republican leaders who consented to a change of administration in the autumn of 1920 and repudiated for a while the men and policies under whose direction and direction the great prosperity was maintained and the greatest good in all history but had established here the greatest prosperity that the country had ever seen.

The official records compiled by the Dun & Bradstreet Agency are illustrating in this connection. They tell us that in the year 1923 there were nearly twice as many bank failures in this country as there were during the whole of the last five years of the Wilson administration, or, say, for the calendar years 1910 to 1920, both inclusive.
Furthermore, the total liabilities of the failed banks in the one calendar year ended June 30, 1921, were $1,781,830,134. The following figures are compiled from reports of R. G. Dun & Co.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Liabilities of failed banks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1,781,830,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1,781,830,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,781,830,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1,781,830,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,728,300,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Money is the measure of value and is given in exchange for the things that the people have to buy and sell. Hence the necessity of having enough money in circulation to meet the business needs of the people.

Money is the lifeblood of business, and in order that the body of business may be kept healthy and strong it is necessary that there be in sufficient quantity kept constantly circulating in the body of business.

They who toil and produce and who use their skill with strength in legitimate activities of any kind are entitled to an amount of right to the medium of the purchasing power, be it money or supply, be sufficient to meet business needs in such a way as to enable them to make their business a success. In under President Wilson, if losses occur, it should be from other causes and not because the money supply was insufficient to fully meet the business needs of the community.

The Government, and rightly so, reserves to itself the right to print bills and coin metal into money. Then it is clear that it is the duty of the Government to see to it that the circulating medium, or the money supply, is large enough to meet the business needs of all the people all the time. No right-thinking person can deny the soundness of that proposition.

The failure to have in circulation money sufficient to meet the business needs of the people places their business at a disadvantage and leaves them helpless in the hands of those who are insufficiently protected in exchange for that which represents their toil, skill, and investment.

It is necessary to understand that if it requires a million dollars to handle the business of a certain community and you withdraw from that community a half million dollars, you have reduced the measure of value for the goods and products of that community to just half of what it was before, and you have reduced the purchasing power and debt-paying power of the products of that community to just half of what they were before. So it is a serious thing with the business of the masses of the people when the money which measures the value of their products is reduced in quantity and the instrument of exchange made too small to enable them to obtain a profit and make a success of their business.

In the early fall of 1915 certain conscienceless Wall Street financiers, who under Republican rule used to own and manipulate the old panic-breeding banking system in New York, realizing that the end of the war was near, commenced to do everything in their power to elect a Republican Congress. They saw in Republican success, in the election of a Republican Congress, an opportunity to so change and cripple the Federal reserve system as to enable them to use it in such a way as to produce a panic. They who used to produce a panic every few years and threaten to bring on under the old banking system whenever they wanted to beat down the price of cotton, grain, or stocks on the exchange had been deprived of that power for nearly six years under the Federal reserve banking system.

The Democratic Party had been in power during that time and Wall Street was keen and hungry for a financial feast, such as they used to enjoy in the old panic days when the Republicans were in power. To that gruesome gang the field was an inviting one. A panic would enable them to make millions on the falling prices of cotton, grain, and Liberty bonds. The first step to that end was to elect a Republican Congress. They succeeded in doing that. Then they commenced to set the trap for the public.

The first thing they did after electing a Republican Congress was to throw the Federal farm loan banking system into the Supreme Court and shut off loans from that source. The farmers of the South and West had borrowed from the farm-loan banks more than $300,000,000. They had lifted old mortgages, hoary with age, from the family roof trees and bought homes and farms for hundreds of young farmers. But the doors of the farm-loan banks were now closed and we could not get a dollar from that source.

The plot thickens, and the panic-producing machinery is being rapidly arranged for the deadly work that was done long ago.

The next move in the deep-laid plan to produce a panic was to foment on the Federal reserve banking system, by amendment of the Congressional Act of 1913, the provision that a mere $250,000,000 of the purchasing power may be required to be kept constantly circulating in the body of business.
cess of their business. The Republican Congress succeeded in passing legislation that would have enabled them to speculate on a certainty on the falling prices of cotton, grain, and Liberty bonds, and acting on their advice the big fellows made millions of dollars.

The Republicans had not criticized the Federal reserve banking system. I helped to create it. I have simply fought to hold it true to the purpose of its creation. I felt that it was my duty to the people that I represent, and to the whole people, to do my utmost to use the great bank of the United States to serve the business needs of the people everywhere, honestly and effectively, just as it was capable of doing and had done.

BANKERS, MERCHANTS, FARMERS, AND OTHERS WITH WHOSE I HAVE TAKEN THE PLEDGE TO DELIVER LEADERS THIRTEEN MEDIUM, OR VOLUME OF MONEY, UNDER WHICH THE YEAR'S BUSINESS IS COMMENCED should not be reduced or cut until the business commitments and contracts for that year have been settled. They agree with me that it is unfair and unjust to permit our people to commit or obligate themselves in business transactions at the beginning of the year when the supply of money and credit is sufficient and satisfactory, and then to change both before the year's business is closed so as to seriously affect the market value of their products and cripple their debt-paying power.

The doctors, lawyers, merchants, farmers, and others with whom I have taken the pledge to deliver leaders thirteen medium, or volume of money, under which the year's business is commenced in January should not be reduced or cut until the business commitments and contracts for that year have been settled. They agree with me that it is unfair and unjust to permit our people to commit or obligate themselves in business transactions at the beginning of the year when the supply of money and credit is sufficient and satisfactory, and then to change both before the year's business is closed so as to seriously affect the market value of their products and cripple their debt-paying power.

The refusal to supply us with currency and credit necessary to prevent the loss of our property and the destruction of our business in 1920 and 1921 was a crime against our people and a crime against the country. It has been said truly by Lincoln, "That any change in the circulating medium under which a debt is contracted before the debt can be paid is a crime."

The Federal reserve banking system is the greatest system ever devised by the genius of man. If properly administered it is positively panic proof. For six years it held at bay the panic-breeding agencies of New York, and there was not the slightest financial trouble anywhere in the United States. As to its next best, it permitted us to prosper, and I hope our people were busy, prosperous, happy, and contented.

THE HOLY GRAIL

We are told in the beautiful lines of Tennyson that the Holy Grail, or silver cup from which Jesus drank wine at the last supper with the disciples, hung for a long time on the wall of the home of Joseph of Arimathaea. So long as it remained there all was well in the home; the inmates were happy and contented; the voice of song and laughter was heard. Birds perched merrily in the trees, and the flowers and roses flourished as they sweetened the air with their perfume.

But one day the hand of the invader came and plucked the silver cup away. So soon that evil cloud of gloom and despondency hovered over the home. The voice of song and laughter was hushed, the inmates were sad and sorrowful, birds ceased singing, and the flowers and roses dropped and died. Sir Galahad, a gallant knight, registered a vow that he would go out in search of the Holy Grail and would not return until he could restore it to its time-honored place upon the wall.

Prior to the Republican conspiracy to bring about deflation and produce a panic all was well with the Federal reserve banking system, and all was well with the country. A new day had dawned in the Nation. Everyone who wanted to work found work to do. Everyone who wanted money and credit with which to carry on his business found both responsive to his call. Labor was constantly and profitably employed. Capital was turning the wheels of human enterprise and industry and we enjoyed an era of national prosperity unparalleled in the history of the country. But in an evil hour the criminal forces of greed swooped down upon the people like some mighty hurricane. The panic was organized and the Federal reserve banks were driven from the land, while millions of people in the South and West were literally robbed, many of them stripped of their belongings.
The tariff barons and Wall Street financiers

The tariff barons of the United States in order to tax the people to enrich themselves used to say that the tariff tax was levied in the interest of the laboring man, done to protect him from competition with the cheap labor of Europe. The argument was that if they will only learn to lower the tariff while they were shutting out some of the products of cheap labor in Europe they were bringing cheap European labor here to compete with American labor while they were sending American workers back in large part because of the panic which the tariff barons had caused to the dangerous traffic, which is slipping into our country for so much per head thousands of foreigner who are prohibited from coming in by law.

So the tariff baron, as the big income-tax payer, has his way under Republican rule, law or no law. He wants the cheap European laborer to come in, and he has a crooked immigration official to suspend or set aside the law. He may be able to act destructively while tax officials are put back into circulation from this source more than $700,000,000. This forced a more liberal distribution of currency and credits by the Federal reserve banks, and conditions improved.

Mr. President, that situation showed that what was needed was more money in circulation and better credit facilities. The labor that returned to employment went back in large part before the tariff bill was enacted into law. The truth is, labor was more fully employed under the Underwood-Simmons tariff law than ever before its enactment or since its repeal. The lack of a protective tariff did not produce the Republican panic of 1929 and 1931. It was made to order by New York speculators and financiers, who made hundreds of millions out of it. It simply furnished a band of tariff supporters the opportunity to feather their nests while they impoverished additional millions upon an already overburdened people. They simply caught us going and coming.

The big speculators and big financiers of Wall Street caught the Federal reserve authorities with a destructive tariff tax millions through which they spread deflation on the road of prosperity, and the tariff barons caught the laboring man by engrafted upon already overburdened people. They simply caught us going and coming.

The following extracts from the expressed opinions of eminent authorities are merely examples of countless others:

Hon. Reginald McKenna, of England, formerly chancellor of the exchequer, now president of the London Joint City and Midland Bank, the largest bank in the world:

"I think I have said enough to show that an attempt at monetary deflation of this kind can only end in the stagnation of business and widespread distress."

"The consequences of a continuous fall in prices entailed by dear money and restriction of credit, and as a consequence by heavy taxation, must be complete stagnation of business." * * *

Edward Hutton, vice president of the London Discount and Midland Bank:

"The president of the British Banking Reform League in referring to an address delivered several years ago by Sir Edward Woodburn, the "Dependence of securities in relation to gold," said...

These dreadful conditions drove millions of laborers from employment and the tariff had nothing to do with it. The tariff penalties on the money lords of Wall Street and the Federal reserve banking system to the purposes for which it was created.

When the currency and credit Instrumentalities are permitted to be used for the purposes for which they should have been used under Democratic rule, then and not till then will there be genuine prosperity among the American people.

The trouble with Republican leadership is it does not know how to reintroduce the currency and credit facilities that business men generally in their fruits ye shall know them.

What the country needs is adequate currency and credit expansion. When business begins to pick up or improve and more money is required to meet the needs of business expansion Republican leaders have the word sent out to be careful not to bring about inflation. They keep the bankers and business men generally in a state of uneasiness and fear. What the country needs is adequate currency and credit facilities, honestly administered, so as to meet the business needs of all the people all the time.

** The American laboring man called attention to the fact that the number of unemployed in Great Britain is due to the lack of a protective tariff which returned to employment went back in large part because of the panic which the tariff barons had caused to the dangerous traffic, which is slipping into our country for so much per head thousands of foreigner who are prohibited from coming in by law.

The following extracts from the expressed opinions of eminent authorities are merely examples of countless others:

Hon. Reginald McKenna, of England, formerly chancellor of the exchequer, now president of the London Joint City and Midland Bank, the largest bank in the world:

"I think I have said enough to show that an attempt at monetary deflation of this kind can only end in the stagnation of business and widespread distress."

"The consequences of a continuous fall in prices entailed by dear money and restriction of credit, and as a consequence by heavy taxation, must be complete stagnation of business." * * *

Edward Hutton, vice president of the London Discount and Midland Bank:

"The president of the British Banking Reform League in referring to an address delivered several years ago by Sir Edward Woodburn, the "Dependence of securities in relation to gold," said...
"In that illuminating address Sir Edward showed conclusively that the maximum amount of trade which is possible depended upon the volume of bank loans allowed, and that the extent to which loans could be granted depended upon the demands of trade and upon policies adopted upon the amount of legal tender reserves controlled by the banks."

Lord Leverhulme, the probably greatest industrial leader in the British Empire:

"The process of too rapid deflation is undoubtedly the cause of the present unemployment and trade stagnation. The prices of commodities rose to the extreme limit during the war, and their reduction was a prime necessity, but the fall has been too sudden for adjustment. The Federal Reserve System, under the "false idea that they must get back to the so-called normal of pre-war." Continuing, the press dispatch, quoting Professor Fisher, says:

"The idea of suddenly wrenching back prices levels when they had reached the heights of 1929 to 1914 level, whilst it did bring about justice to contract parties who had entered into contracts before 1913, produced a frightful injustice to the much larger number who had contracted at these high prices."

Consequently," says the dispatch quoted, "Professor Fisher held it to have been a very great mistake of policy of the Federal Reserve Board to have raised the rates of discount so high and have produced this fall in prices."

The New York Herald Tribune, a leading financier of New York and former Comptroller of the Currency, upon his return last summer from a visit to the Far East was quoted by the Associated Press as follows:

"Japan is balking up the banks in lending funds at a low rate of interest to struggling farmers, who would otherwise go under, to the detriment of commercial life."

Contrast the intelligent policy of the banks of Japan with the Federal reserve, which, for example, in Colorado, Mississippi, and Alabama charged in some cases 22 per cent and 31 per cent, and in one instance as high as 87 per cent, to members' banks whose loans were mainly to farmers.

A newspaper published in Tokyo, Japan, in April, 1921, discussing trade between the United States and China referred to an instance of machine purchased by a Chinese firm on a four months' sight draft, and said significantly:

"When the Federal Reserve Board called in credits, the firm was told that they would have to pay cash on delivery. This almost threw them into bankruptcy."

The newspaper pertinently adds:

"The Chinese must learn a lesson one."

**VIEWS OF UNITED STATES SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES**

The Joint Commission on Agricultural Inquiry, composed of prominent Senators and Representatives of both political parties, says in its report recently submitted to Congress:

"The decline of prices in 1929 and 1921 reduced the farmer to a condition worse than he has suffered under for 30 years. Farmers are having the difficulty of paying the debts incurred in producing the crops of 1920 and in securing credit necessary for new production. The commission believes that these difficulties are due to the credit restrictions and limitations of the past 18 months and in fact the fact that the banking machinery of the country is not adequately adapted to the farmers' requirements."

"When the Federal Reserve Board was called in credits, the firm was told that they would have to pay cash on delivery. This almost threw them into bankruptcy."

Mr. President, in commend these enlightening and convincing statements to the leaders of the Republican Party.

**DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT**

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. I ask the question, Mr. NORBECK. Reserving the right to object, I desire to say that there is an agricultural matter which has been before the Chamber before, and have been asked to yield for this and to yield for that. Will the Senator ask us to take a vote on that question? We can dispose of it in three or four minutes. Senators on the other side of the Chamber have taken all of the time of the Senate and are keeping the farmers from receiving relief.

Mr. WARREN. I ask my friend to let the conference report be considered, because it involves a matter of $184,000,000.

NORBECK. The President pro tempore of the Senate, in the absence of the Senate, is acting as Chairman of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. NORBECK. When the test of actual payment is exacted, and in a time of fright collateral as well as goods fall in price. In such a situation liquidation needs time if disaster is to be prevented."

Thus the great need is some means—whether it may be—

which will enable a man to make loans upon the amount of legal tender reserves controlled by the banks.
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Mr. WARREN. I trust the Senator will permit us to proceed with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. NORBECK. I object if we can not proceed with the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lenoir in the chair). Objection is made. The Senator from Alabama will proceed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President.--

Mr. ASHURST. The conference report has not been received.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, the presentation of the conference report is a privileged matter.

Mr. ASHURST. But objection was made, and the report was not received. Am I correct as to that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the report was not received.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me to submit an inquiry?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not want to be taken off my feet.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to make an inquiry with the understanding that it will not take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think I had better proceed.

Mr. WARREN of Massachusetts. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President,

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not yield now to any other Senator. Mr. WALSIE of Massachusetts. But I desire now to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry,

Mr. WALSIE of Massachusetts. I should like to know if the clerks of the Senate, who were instructed several hours ago to enter upon the Journal the President's report, have not entered it? Mr. WARREN. Yes, Mr. President, before that question is put I wish to discuss the report.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the question is not debatable.

Mr. WARREN. The matter will be decided simply by a vote as to whether the report be adopted. Mr. FITTMAN. Mr. President, before that question is put I object. Mr. HEFLIN. I object to the presentation of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The submission of a conference report is a matter of privilege. Whether or not it shall be considered is a matter for the Senate to determine. The report will be presented, unanimous consent having been given for that purpose.

Mr. ASHURST. What is the report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the report.

Mr. ASHURST. We want to identify the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read.

The Rezaee Creek Reservoir Committee report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 32, 35, and 36. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$375,000" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$315,000" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$375,000" and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 29, 54, and 59.

F. E. WARREN, CHARLES CURTIS, W. L. JONES, LEO S. O'CONNOR, WM. J. HARRIS, Managers on the part of the Senate.

MARTIN B. MADSEN, D. R. ANTHONY, JR., Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the report.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, let us have the report read. Nobody will want the report is unless it may be read.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am not going to keep the floor very much longer. I am not going to try to hold the Senator from Wyoming back. I shall finish in just a moment.

Mr. FITTMAN. I object.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will allow me just a moment, I desire to say that this is the conference report on the last appropriation bill. It covers every department of the Government and carries an appropriation of about $194,000,000. If the conference report is not adopted within the next half hour, of course the bill will be lost. The bill carries the appropriation for the Veterans' Bureau; it carries the appropriation to the bureaus and for various other governmental activities—indeed, for nearly every interest of the Government. It is one of those bills as to which a joint resolution passed by Congress will not continue during another year the appropriations to which it provides.

In order to supply the necessities of the different agencies of the Government this bill must either pass and go into operation, so that the money which it provides may be used, or it is entirely lost to all, and a number of activities will have to suspend.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President.

Mr. FITTMAN. Will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HEFLIN. I, Mr. President, there is going to be opposition to the conference report, and I cannot yield for its consideration just now.

Mr. FITTMAN. I ask the Senator from Alabama to yield to me in order that I may make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must hold that unanimous consent has been given for the presentation of the conference report. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Pittman] now objects to the presentation of the report. Under the rule the question of consideration must be determined by the Senate immediately without debate, but that does not apply to the question of the adoption of the report. That question will be taken to debate if the Senator so desires to consider the report.

Mr. KING. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KING. In order to proceed to the consideration of the conference report let it be taken from the floor.

Mr. FITTMAN. I objected to the presentation of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The presentation of a conference report is always privileged. The report has been presented. The question now is, Shall the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report? Mr. FITTMAN. To that I object. Now, then, with the consent of the Senator from Alabama—

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report.
Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to explain the reason why I object to the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question of proceeding with the consideration of the conference report is not debatable.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand that I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator from Alabama yielded the floor for the presentation of the conference report. The present occupant of the chair will yield to the Senator from Alabama that he will immediately recognize him if there is any question about it when the pending motion is disposed of.

Mr. PITTMAN. I wish to say this: If an amendment which the conferees have knocked out of this bill—and I say wrongly knocked out while they have left other amendments in—is not put back into the bill, the bill will not pass at this session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report? [Putting the question.] The "aye" have it. The motion prevails. The question now is upon agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to be heard on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is open to debate.

Mr. ASHURST. I think that is debatable.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President.

Mr. ASHURST. I want to discuss the conference report.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I want to know who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I do not yield to anybody for any purpose.
The Chair only may properly take me off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will read the rule in reference to conference reports:

1. The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the House is engaged in the consideration of a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is divided; and when received the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put and shall be determined without debate.

The Senator from Alabama yielded the floor for the presentation of the conference report, and the report is now before the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Chair was going to recognize me immediately after that was done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair promised to recognize the Senator from Alabama after this question was disposed of.

Mr. HEFLIN. That was not my understanding. Had I so understood, I would not have yielded for a discussion of the subject at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it is useless to enfilade over the question as to who was recognized by the Chair. The Chair recognized me, and the question as to who should be recognized is not appealable, for that question is wholly for the Chair and is for the Chair only.

Such as I desire to see any own amendment and the amendment of my colleague retained in this conference report, I decline to assume the responsibility of killing this deficiency bill, as such action would starve many of the great energies of the Government. I have conferred with my colleague [Mr. Cameron], but neither he nor I will assume the heavy responsibility of killing this vital bill, as such action would paralyze too many agencies of the Government, although the conferees have abandoned and thus defeated the legislation that we seek.

Let me now remind the Senate that these amendments, which the conferees have abandoned, were of vast importance to the water users and landowners on the Yuma Mesa auxiliary irrigation project in the Yuma project.

On that Mesa project 48 settlers who have made three-fourths of their payments to the Government and 55 other settlers who have made one-half of their payments and many other landowners who have made one-quarter of their payments will be now subjected to great distress, and I doubt not that a large number of them will be ruined, by the abandonment of this amendment.

Our Government should not drive hard bargains with farmers. Agriculture is the noblest of all occupations, the most dignified of all occupations; it nourishes our race. The multitudes of the earth must subsist upon what agriculture produces. In Yuma County, Ariz., the citizens, with a valor never showy nor vociferous, have fought as good a fight to reclaim a desert as is recorded in all history; how well they have succeeded let the farms, ranches, and greenery there testify. Consider a valley where the soil is of the richest and where the sun in summer comes down like a merciless flail; a valley that is one of earth's wonders, asking for justice, and denied justice by wanton petulancy of conferences.

As to the amendment I offered to this bill, and which the Senate adopted, I told the Senate on Thursday evening in simple, plain language that the Government of the United States built the Yuma project about a hundred miles above where the flashy and temperamental Colorado River debouches into the Gulf of California, but that the Government reared a reservoir bank on the side of that river a levee at Government expense costing $800,000, and that the construction of this levee threw these settling waters, with a cutting edge like the claws of a steel catfish, into the farm lands of the Yuma project and caused the settlers to be ruined and lose all their property, as the levee was destroying, as they have been destroying for 10 years, the farms of these industrious and worthy people who are landowners on the east side of this river.

On the other hand, any man fit to represent his people, could not be otherwise than indignant at the treatment these landowners have received. Senator Root, of New York, said 10 years ago in the United States Senate, when the proposition had no more been stated to him, that he would use every endeavor to correct this injustice. The Secretary of the Interior, who has taken a broad view of this question, told me no longer ago than this morning at the White House that he had in mind the advisability of the Secretary of the Interior being in the east claimants of the landowners of the Yuma project, and in effect and spirit but not in exact text save voicing his view.

To say that these poor farmers of the Yuma project should be encouraged to hold unto that fixed claim on these mighty floods of the Colorado River is a statement that would make a chancellor vomit. My amendment was as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $300,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to the credit of the United States Department of the Interior, for the purpose of paying the operation and maintenance costs of said Colorado River front work and levee system on said project, Arizona-California, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and thereafter there is hereby authorized to be expended not to exceed $35,000 annually, or so much thereof as may be necessary, as the share of the Government of the United States in the cost of the operations and maintenance of said Colorado River front work and levee system: Provided, That the said sum of $35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall only be available if and when double such said amount of $35,000 shall have been provided for the State of Arizona, the county of Yuma, Ariz., and the Yuma project, or any of them, in being hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to assume one-third the obligation of caring for said river-front work and levee system on said Yuma project, Arizona-California.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Idaho for a question.

Mr. BORAH. Well—

Mr. ASHURST. I do not wish to lose the floor, but I am going to conclude in one minute.

Mr. BORAH. I will not interrupt the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the Senator would yield the floor if he yielded other than for a question.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have concluded. If these facts for which the Secretary of the Interior vouches, for which the Bureau of Reclamation vouches, for which the Federal Power Commission vouches, and for every man who has the impulse of integrity and fairness vouches, do not move the conferences to do justice, peace be with them.

THE CONSPIRACY INVOLVING THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT IN LAND FRAUDS AND THE FATER OF THE NAVAL OIL RESERVES

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in the fall of 1920 when we had the Democratic Postmaster General complaint was made to the Post Office Department that certain land companies doing business in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas were,
Creager, Republican national committeeman for the Republican Postmaster General came into togetherness with the Association, and pose, and they succeeded in doing what they came to do. Donaldson removed observer put in charge of the investigation. They had just the same investigation, that he never called upon a single victim of the investigation. They had questioned in regard to the matter. Creager had started the investigation, and was put in charge of the work and the investigation. After the investigation of the lower Rio Grande Valley land companies, nearly a thousand American citizens who stated that they had been defrauded by the crooked land companies give testimony as to how they had been treated by the landmen who had violated the laws of the Government that Williamson was supposed to represent and protect.

Nearly three years have come and gone since Creager and Hays and Daugherty conferred together about the investigation of the land frauds in the lower Rio Grande Valley. For nearly three years no attention has been paid to the Postmaster General to the petition of the unfortunate land victims abandoned nearly three years ago. This investigation was abandoned and the fraud crooks permitted to continue their fraudulent practices to the shame of the Postmaster General and the Republican administration, and to the hurt and injury of hundreds and thousands of once prosperous American farmers. It was stifled and abandoned in the face of the fact that Donaldson when removed to make way for Williamson stated in his report to the Post Office Department that—

From the evidence obtained through circularization of persons dealing with the companies in question, conditions have come to light, which the inspector described as "most outrageous, outlandish, and shameful methods that can be conceived, which were used by these land companies in disposing of this land and swindling the victims whom they were employed to harass or murder such informant.

Mr. President, think of a great department of the Government being maladministered so as to suppress the truth, shield crooks and criminals and brazenly used to defraud the citizen. Such reprehensible and despicable conduct on the part of those in control of our Government breaks down and destroys respect, not only for those in authority but for the Government itself.
The effect of the failure to proceed with the investigation is mentioned in Donaldson’s report, when he said that the farmers in the Rio Grande Valley who have been defrauded believe that the attitude of the Government is too great to fight and that the Government would not go through with the investigation.

Senators, have we reached the time when the American people are willing to remain silent and permit the Government not to go through with the investigation, being indifferent and unresponsive to the cry of distress and injustice on the part of the humblest citizen in the country? Are we ready to accept the dangerous doctrine that Republican influences, corrupt and powerful, are strong enough to prevent the Government from bringing down the law on the head of any company in the country involving American citizens in the valley. In my opinion the attitude of the Government is too great to fight and that the Government would not go through with the investigation.

That is not all. They find that the conference in Washington has accomplished the result desired by those who have grown rich through frauds practiced upon American citizens and in their disgust and despair they tell Donaldson that they fear the Government will not go through with the investigation. That presents a dreadful situation for our serious consideration. Senators, we owe it to ourselves and to those who sent us here to see to it that such conditions shall not continue.

Farmers who had been defrauded held mass meetings at several places in the valley for the purpose of bringing about unification and organization to secure action and prosecution of land crooks by the Government. James R. Page, an attorney of Kansas City, was invited to address them, and he vigorously denounced those who had deceived and defrauded American citizens in the sales of lands in the valley. Immediately steps were taken by men in the employ of the defrauding land companies to intimidate and drive Page out of the valley. He was dismissed at meetings of the Land Men’s Association. It was strongly intimated that if the mass meetings and Page’s speaking should continue and those accused convicted “everyone would be headed for the penitentiary.”

At one of those meetings Mr. Zumbrunn stated that the telegram he had received from Creager indicated that he was alarmed. Then one of the men present at the meeting said: “If you, as an association, send me down there as your representative with Mr. Creager, I will muzzle him (Page) or put myself in his way. They didn’t want any man to stand up to them and use their power to frighten Page. They filed disbarment proceedings against him. They had him indicted in a lower Rio Grande Valley court, and he was told if he didn’t leave the valley he would be killed.

Page advised the victims of the land frauds to mail their petitions asking the Post Office Department to continue the investigation. And then what do you suppose happened? Why, the Creager crowd got the local judge of a district State court to issue a warrant for the arrest of American citizens mailing a petition to Federal officials in Washington. Was there ever before anything like that brazen conduct in our country?

Here is a telegram which shows that there was an understanding between Creager and his companies and the Post Office Department that he was to escape investigation and prosecution. The Stewart mentioned in this telegram was indicted and convicted on Donaldson’s report and I believe that Creager and others were accused. If Donaldson had been displaced to accommodate Creager and his crowd, here is the telegram that tells the story of a nasty conspiracy and a helinous crime in high Republican circles at Washington. It was from the Post Office Department here to the post-office inspector in charge at Kansas City, and reads:

Take no steps to present any evidence to grand jury in case of Alamo Land and Sugar Company, C. H. Swallow & Company, or in any company in which R. K. Creager is interested, or involving R. K. Creager in any way pending completion of investigation by Inspector Williamson, who is covering all these companies including Creager, and we want no action taken at this time. So far as Stewart Land Company is concerned, you are at liberty to act provided it does not involve Creager or Creager’s company; and if it does, we want no action.

Williamson completes his investigation and has submitted his report. Show this wire to Inspector Donaldson and answer by wire at once if presentation of evidence in Stewart Land Company case will in any way involve Creager or Creager’s company.

Mr. Page, Now, you did not send that telegram, did you?

Mr. SMOKE, No, sir.

Mr. Page, Who did?

Mr. SMOKE, Williamson sent that, dictated it to Robinson, the chief inspector’s private secretary.

Mr. President, the Williamson who sent that telegram preparing the way for Creager’s escape from a real investigation and conviction, and who aligned his name to it is the same Williamson who was sent down to take Donaldson’s place and who by his suspicious and reprehensible conduct in the matter has branded himself as one of the conspirators in this terrible thing.

Mr. President, I have not been permitted to proceed as we should have with the investigation of the fraud practiced upon American citizens in the sale of lands in the lower Rio Grande Valley. The chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Moses, can not be said to be very sympathetic or in any way enthusiastic over the investigation. He has not impressed me that he possessed any considerable amount of zeal for a prompt and real investigation. Just the other day he arbitrarily ruled that no testimony touching transactions that took place in the valley could be taken by the Post Office Department, and in a telegram to an official, after the rank and file of Government and business officials had been swindled and protected crooks and criminals in their robbery of hundreds and thousands of American citizens, God speed the day of deliverance from the shameful, disgusting, and disgraceful rule of those who misuse, abuse, and barter the instrumentalities of Government which in an evil hour were committed to their care.

Mr. President, we have not been permitted to proceed as we should have with the investigation of the fraud practiced upon American citizens in the sale of lands in the lower Rio Grande Valley. The chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Moses, can not be said to be very sympathetic or in any way enthusiastic over the investigation. He has not impressed me that he possessed any considerable amount of zeal for a prompt and real investigation. Just the other day he arbitrarily ruled that no testimony touching transactions that took place in the valley could be taken by the Post Office Department, and in a telegram to an official, after the rank and file of Government and business officials had been swindled and protected crooks and criminals in their robbery of hundreds and thousands of American citizens, God speed the day of deliverance from the shameful, disgusting, and disgraceful rule of those who misuse, abuse, and barter the instrumentalities of Government which in an evil hour were committed to their care.
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to proceed with the investigation here. I have been trying since that time to get Senator Moses to call a meeting of the committee to formulate plans for the continuance of the investi-
gation in Washington. So far, I have not succeeded. All
of those who have attended the hearings know that we are
seriously handicapped in conducting this investigation. I do
not want to charge Mr. Coolidge and those in the White
House with the cry of the West for relief for millions of
farmers in distress, dead on his ears, and President Coolidge
publicly to divulge information which the Congress
would be called to consider any measure looking to their
relief. The three big groups were much pleased with his action
in this matter, and after they had seen him give many other
prominences to his friends and service they had the newspapers
that they own, or control, to start a concerted move for Coolidge
for President.

Several modest Republicans and some of the leaders knowing
Mr. Coolidge's limitations, and some prominent Republican
Senators, also leaders, who had had the opportunity to
observe him very closely when he presided over the Senate
for more than two years, and who did not in any way regard
him as being in any way fitted for the nomination for President.
But while they were quietly discussing the situation and laying their plans, the man in the White
House was strongly familiar with the Murray Crane
way of doing things in politics, commenced to intrigue him-
self so strongly in the confidence and esteem of the "special
privilege crowd" that before these other gentlemen knew what
they were doing, certain big Republican newspapers were de-
claring editorially that Coolidge should be nominated for
President.

The only safe and wholesome remedy is to situate them hip
and thigh and get rid of them. Washington realized that.
He knew about some of them in his day. In 1776 he said in a
letter to James Warren regarding the conduct of a few
curious officials:

In the palace of Washington, a little dirty pool of muck, a
place to be placed in connection with the necessary rights and liberties of the
present generation, and of millions yet unborn? Shall a few
designing men, for their own aggrandizement and to gratify their own
vanity, overate the goodly fabric we have reared at the
expense of so much time, blood, and treasure? And shall we at last
become the victims of our own almoinable lust of gain?

What a battle cry of the Father of His Country against
corruption in office. The New York Times, commenting upon
Washington's statement said, February 22, 1824:

His plan of action was to retain the confidence of the people by
driving every exposed wound out of public life with white of
scour, and these he was not afraid to be present to
illustrate the virtues which should clothe men in official
positions. This aspect of Washington's spirit and public service
might well be meditated upon by those who are now in power in
the cities that bear his name.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on another
matter. I want to talk about Republican politics for a few
minutes.

Mr. President, Penrose was a high priest in the councils of
the old stand-pat Republican Party, and Mr. Coolidge is no
much a disciple of that system as was Penrose. Matthew
Quay trained Penrose and Murray Crane trained Coolidge.
Penrose and Coolidge moving in the same direction and
having the same views, it is only natural that the party would
bring about the results desired. Penrose believed that the
big interests back of him should control the Government and
he did not hesitate to say so, while Mr. Coolidge, not so bold
and open-spoken, much more cautious, did not always feel as
satisfactory now to those who backed Penrose as was the big
Pennsylvania boss in the heyday of his political power.
Penrose conferred with the "money lords," the "tariff barons," and
trusted to them the three measures that for the benefit of the
people, for the aggrandizement of the party, and for the political
favor of the politicians, all for the sake of party.

Mr. Coolidge carried the State and two days thereafter his representatives were not at the Capitol
trying to get the Senate and House conferences to strike from the bill the Japanese exclusion
provision.

Mr. President, on the evening of the last. June 8, had pictures
giving different views of Congressman Buxton, of Ohio, temporary
chairman and keynoter of the Republican National
Convention, as he was preparing his speech. One shows him with
his head thrown back, looking up, with these words underneath the picture:
"He searches the clouds for inspiration. How
appropriate! There is nothing that so resembles the record of
this Republican administration as a dark cloud. The key-
word for the Republican convention does well to look up
to dark clouds for inspiration rather than to look into the
dark record of this Republican administration.

If Lincoln could come back and find the forces of greed and
arbitration and corruption encamped in the Capitol, as they are
today under the Republican rule, he would join the
Buxton. He would rebuke them for daring to call this modern
agglomeration of muckrakers "The party of Lincoln."

Mr. President, I regret to say it but the big criminal with a
pocket full of money has no fear of this administration.
stead of fleeing from it terror stricken he comes to it confident that he can arrange things in his way unchallenged and without fear. If this Republic is to live these things must cease. The sense of civic duty and moral obligation and patriotic responsibility was never so low in the history of the Republic as it is today. That is the crisis. The moment is to be to-day. No man in the administration from the President down has shown any real interest or manifested any serious concern in the matter of exposing crooked and corrupt officials and setting the people free from their servitude. No man has taken the charge of corruption and scandal on the part of Republican Cabinet officers printed in newspapers in Washington and all over the country, no word of encouragement or cooperation came from the President to those who have made the most courageous and self-sacrificing attempts to put their names to the Republican Convention at Cleveland. The same gang that nominated Harding at Chicago in 1920, nominated Coolidge at Cleveland in 1924. Verily the trail of the serpent is over it all.

Seven years of vigorous, nothing short of a complete change in the conduct of this Government at Washington will suffice. Four years more of what we have had and of what we are certain to have if the present régime is continued in office will go a long way toward destroying men and women the country over and destroying respect for constituted authority and endangering our free institutions. Predatory Interests feel and act with fear and with increasing ruthlessness. Nothing less than the removal of the predatory Interests, get mad and sulk in their tents? The corruption of the present régime will go a long way toward disgusting patriotic men and women the country over.

Mr. President, the situation is appalling and alarming. I believe that Senator Froman from a committee of the Senate to-day trying to prevent a vote on the committee's report on the Teapot Dome scandal. He does not want the Senate to vote on it. Republican leaders do not want the people to see how certain Republican Senators voted on this question and that is why you want to postpone the vote until after the election.

Doehy and Sigelair are for Mr. Coolidge; Denby, Daughtery, Fall, and Foraker are against him. Mr. Coolidge, speaking three hours here to-day trying to prevent a vote on the committee's report on the Teapot Dome scandal. He does not want the Senate to vote on it.
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The Democratic Party controlled the Senate and the House of Representatives during the first six years of President Wilson's administration, and the Republicans have controlled both Houses since that time.

When the Senate was reconvened by the Democratic Party in 1913, it was assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Commerce Committee, Committees on Education and Labor, Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals, and later upon the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Immigration Committee, and smaller committees be resigned from all of them except the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Foreign Relations, and Committee on Immigration in order that he might devote his time to the consideration of the important matters of the House, which have always been of great importance and far-reaching in their bearing upon the domestic and foreign relations of the Government.

Senator Shields is also a member of the Democratic steering committee, a political committee having control of the assignment of Democratic Senators upon the various committees and directing the policy of the party in the Senate.

Senator Sherman has always attended the conferences of the Democratic Senators and abided their action. While not attempting to make a record of formal quorum calls, preferring to remain in his committee and office at work, he regularly attends sessions of the Senate when Important bills were considered and voted upon.

There were more than 2,000 laws, public and private, important and otherwise, enacted during President Wilson's administration. Every important measure passed by Congress has been the result of the action of this committee, and the influence of these committees has been very great.

Among those of outstanding importance which the record discloses he supported are the following:

**Simmons-Underwood Tariff Act:** This was the most equitable and just tariff law ever passed by the American Congress. It curbed monopolies and special interests in their control of production, distribution, and prices; produced ample revenue, and brought about the greatest period of prosperity the people have ever enjoyed.

**Federal Reserve Bank Law:** This provided the greatest financial system ever established. The Government was given control of finance and disastrous money panics made impossible.

**Clayton Antitrust Act:** This supplemented and provided for the more efficient enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law for the purpose of prohibiting the formation of unbreakable monopolies and preventing competition in commerce. This bill also allowed the organization of farmers and labor for the purpose of cooperation to better their conditions, exempting such organizations from the prohibitions of the antitrust act, and curtailing the power of the courts to enjoin peaceful strikes.

**Farmers' Loan Bank—Rural Credits:** This act furnishes facilities for farmers to procure loans at reasonable rates of interest upon long term, and has been of great benefit to them.

**Federal Trade Commission:** A commission created with power to investigate and prohibit unfair methods of competition and trade, and advising what business arrangements and agreements can be legally made.

**The Tariff Commission:** This commission has rendered great service to the manufacturers of the country in procuring and furnishing information in regard to all commodities of export and import.

**Agricultural Extension Law—Smith-Lever Bill:** This law provides for cooperation of agricultural extension work between agricultural colleges in the several States, the appointment of county agents, and experimental work in agriculture, and other important matters for the benefit of the farmers of the country.

**United States Grain Standards Law:** This act provides for Federal inspection and publication of standards for grain, which greatly facilitates profitable marketing.

**United States Warehouse Law:** This act provides for warehouse receipts which may be used as collateral for loans on agricultural products.

**United States Cotton Futures Law:** This act regulates the purchase and sale of cotton for future delivery, and prevents abuses prejudicial to the planters.

**Market Service News:** Provides for collecting and disseminating daily information concerning supply and demand, quality and conditions and prices of agricultural products to the producers, aiding them to determine when to market and the prices to be obtained for their products. Senator Shields has pending in his office this summer the Tennessee and adjoining States.

**The Nitrate Plants:** Provided for the construction of plants for the manufacture of anhydrous nitrate for the national defense and to be used in the composition of fertilizers for farmers and miners. With the plants at the Muscle Shoals, the Tennessee River were constructed and the construction of the Wilson Dam begun.

**Conservation of Natural Resources:** Laws to preserve the great natural resources of our country for the benefit of the people and to prevent their exploitation by special private interests.

**Imperial Marine and Ship Purchase Law:** Providing for the development of the merchant marine and favoring our shipping interests.

**Good Roads Legislation:** These laws provided for the construction of good roads throughout the United States by division of the cost of same between the States and the Federal Government and under which thousands of miles of splendid roads have been constructed and other thousands are in contemplation for the future.

**Labor Bill of Rights:** Preventing the abuse of the writ of injunction in labor disputes and declaring the principle that labor of human beings is not a commodity of barter and sale but human things.

**Workmen's Compensation Laws:** For the protection and benefit of the employees of the Federal Government.

**Industrial Employees' Arbitration Law:** This act established a Board of Mediation and Conciliation and afforded the Government better facilities for preventing or settling railway and industrial strikes.

**Protection of Women and Children Workers in the District of Columbia:** This act provided for the protection of the health, morals, and wages of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia.

**Child Labor Law:** An act to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor and affording protection to the youth of the land.

**Eight-Hour Law—Adamson Bill:** An act to establish eight-hour day for employees of the carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce.

**Hours of Labor for Female Employees:** This law regulates hours of employment and provides safeguards of the health of female employees in the District of Columbia.

**Safety of Railway Employees:** This law provides for the installation of improved safety appliances and affords better protection for railway employees.

**Vocational Education Commission Act:** This law created a commission to study plans for promoting vocational education of youth of the country.

**Vocational Education Act:** This law provides for the creation of a board to study and investigate the promotion of vocational education and to provide for the training of teachers in vocational subjects.

**Immigration Restriction Acts:** These are laws to provide in certain restrictions relative to their entry.

**Edison Bill:** This law carried appropriation for experiments in extending the paper post for marketing farm products.

**Armor Plate Act:** This provided for the improvement of the Navy of the United States for the fiscal year 1917.

**Seamen's Act:** This provided for the improvement of conditions of American seamen, adequate life-saving equipment, and crews to meet emergencies.

**Improvements of Rivers and Harbors:** There were several resolutions, all of which included provisions for the Mississippi, Tennessee, and Cumberland Rivers and their tributaries. Senator Shields took a deep interest and actively supported all of them.

**Mississippi River Flood Control Bill:** This was a great measure, carrying appropriation of $45,000,000 for the improvement of the Mississippi River and protection against floods. Senator Shields in the Commerce Committee in the Senate advocated the bill and was largely responsible for its passage and becoming a law.

**War Risk Insurance Act:** This act created a bureau of marine insurance to provide insurance at reasonable rates, to encourage the importation of shipping, and to provide markets for American products.

**Revenue for Preparedness:** These were acts to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appro-
plications for the Army and Navy and the extensions of the fortifications, and for other purposes, one law passed in the first session of the thirty-eighth Congress authorized the President to use the resources of the Nation in defense of our people and our country.

German war resolution: Resolution declaring that Germany was belligerent, and was therefore at war with the United States, and that the President should authorize the President to use the resources of the Nation in defense of our people and our country.

Austrian war resolution: Resolution declaring that the im- positional empire of Austria-Hungary had made war against the United States and authorizing the President to use the resources of the Nation in the national defense.

The selective draft or conscript laws: These were laws passed under the war powers of Congress: Prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating beverages in and near cantonments, shipyards, and other places where sailors and soldiers were quartered and war activities were progressing.

The Volstead law: The Volstead bill for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment was passed before the amendment took effect by its own provisions—one year after its enactment. Senator Shields agreed with the President that Congress had no right to pass such a law until the amendment was effective and voted to sustain the President's veto. The law was passed over the President's veto. Senator Shields announced in a speech in the Senate in February, 1923, that it is the law of the land and that he favors its vigorous enforcement and is opposed to its repeal or amendment.

Immigration laws: Senator Shields has consistently supported all measures coming before the Senate for the restriction of immigration. He took an active part in the Senate for that purpose in the Committee on Immigration and upon the floor of the Senate, making one of the leading arguments in favor of the bill.

Laws for Spanish-American War veterans: The Senator has supported measures for the relief of the Spanish-American War veterans, believing that they have been more neglected than any of the country's soldiers.

Laws for the benefits of soldiers and sailors in the World War: The laws for these purposes are too numerous to be set out, but it appears from the record that Senator Shields supported practically all the laws necessary to arm, equip, clothe, house, and pay our soldiers and sailors during the war and for taking care of them after the war.

Provisions for disabled veterans: The numerous laws which have been enacted creating Veterans' Bureau, providing for the disabled ex-service men have all had the support of Senator Shields. He supported the Reed bill, passed at the present session to codify the laws for the benefit of disabled veterans, offering an amendment to the bill for the benefit of those afflicted with tuberculosis, which was modified by the conference committee, but furnishes a basis for further legislation in behalf of these veterans.

Senator Shields' proposal to establish Muscle Shoals and nitrate plant: Senator Shields has advocated on frequent occasions improvement of the Tennessee River for navigation and the development of the water power resources. Senator Shields for the Senate was instrumental to the passage of the Muscle Shoals bill, providing for the disabled ex-service men to have all the support of Senator Shields. He supported the Reed bill, passed at the present session to codify the laws for the benefit of disabled veterans, offering an amendment to the bill for the benefit of those afflicted with tuberculosis, which was modified by the conference committee, but furnishes a basis for further legislation in behalf of these veterans.

Senator Shields' proposal to establish Muscle Shoals and nitrate plant: Senator Shields has advocated on frequent occasions improvement of the Tennessee River for navigation and the development of the water power resources. Senator Shields for the Senate was instrumental to the passage of the Muscle Shoals bill, providing for the disabled ex-service men to have all the support of Senator Shields. He supported the Reed bill, passed at the present session to codify the laws for the benefit of disabled veterans, offering an amendment to the bill for the benefit of those afflicted with tuberculosis, which was modified by the conference committee, but furnishes a basis for further legislation in behalf of these veterans.

The Panama Canal tolls bill: The Congress passed a bill exempting ships trading between the Atlantic and Pacific coast from canal tolls for the purpose of furnishing competition in transportation with transcontinental railroads. The Demo-
The judges' bill: This was a bill, as originally drafted, creating 18 United States district judges unassigned to any special district, but to be sent in his discretion by the Chief Justice to any district in the United States. Senator Shields opposed the bill in the Committee on the Judiciary and as amended in the Senate, charging that it was a political measure creating un- necessary offices through the device of an ob- servant and destructive of an independent and untrammeled judiciary. His speech upon the bill was exhaustive and out- standing in the defense of the independence and integrity of the judges and courts. The bill was defeated.

Censorship of the press: Senator Shields voted against the bill to give the President the right to practically control the newspaper press of the country by determining what should appear in it. He was the best judge of the un- constitutional provisions of free speech and free press. The bill was defeated.

The covenant of the League of Nations: This was a treaty of practically all of the nations of the world providing for the protection of the independence and territorial integrity of those nations, by force if necessary. Senator Shields, stand- ing for the traditional policy of the United States against intervention in foreign affairs and entangling alliances likely to embroil this country in war, opposed and voted against the United States becoming a member of the league. His position was that it was not a political or partisan measure and, there being no pronouncement of the Democratic Party and no campaign pledges upon his part, it was his duty as a Senator under the Constitution to determine the questions in- volved. His best judgment was that it was not a political measure passed by the Republican administration in order to entangle the United States with proper safeguards, for the promotion of peace and the prevention of war, and now favors the United States adhering to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The Cimeter-Fordeny protective tariff law: This is a protective measure passed by the Republican administration and the direct cause for the low prices for products and high cost of all supplies now oppressing the farmers of the country. Senator Shields opposed it, as it is then probable, and subsequent events have shown, that the army would have to be increased to 250,000 men, at the cost of more than a billion dollars, with a doubtful result.

The four-power pact: This is a treaty negotiated by Presi- dent Harding with Great Britain, France, and Japan, practi- cally obligating these powers and the United States to protect the possessions and interests of each other in the Pacific Ocean. Senator Shields opposed it, although the Senate adopted a reservation in favor of the United States, believing it to be an entangling alliance likely to embroil the United States in a foreign war for the interest of other nations, and voted against it.

The McGumber-Fordeny protective tariff law: This is a political measure passed by the Republican administration and the direct cause for the low prices for products and high cost of all supplies now oppressing the farmers of the country. Senator Shields opposed it, as it is then probable, and subsequent events have shown, that the army would have to be increased to 250,000 men, at the cost of more than a billion dollars, with a doubtful result.

The adjusted compensation legislation: Senator Shields op- posed this legislation upon the ground that it would increase the public indebtedness four to five billion dollars, and thus greatly increase the war taxes under which the American people are now staggering, providing a drain on the business and agricultural interests of the country.

The ease of Senator Newberry: Senator Newberry's right to a seat in the Senate was challenged in the question of the purchase of money in obtaining the nomination in the Republi- can primary. The expenditures amounted to about $200,000, chiefly used in purchasing and subsidizing newspapers, which tended to defeat free elections and the untrammeled choice of the people. Mr. Newberry ratified the sale and used the money to purchase the New York Commercial Advertiser. Senator Shields, an opponent, voted against it, as it was then probable, and subsequent events have shown, that the army would have to be increased to 250,000 men, at the cost of more than a billion dollars, with a doubtful result.

The Cimeter-Fordeny protective tariff law: This is a protective measure passed by the Republican administration and the direct cause for the low prices for products and high cost of all supplies now oppressing the farmers of the country. Senator Shields opposed it, as it is then probable, and subsequent events have shown, that the army would have to be increased to 250,000 men, at the cost of more than a billion dollars, with a doubtful result.

The adjusted compensation legislation: Senator Shields op- posed this legislation upon the ground that it would increase the public indebtedness four to five billion dollars, and thus greatly increase the war taxes under which the American people are now staggering, providing a drain on the business and agricultural interests of the country.

The ease of Senator Newberry: Senator Newberry's right to a seat in the Senate was challenged in the question of the purchase of money in obtaining the nomination in the Republi- can primary. The expenditures amounted to about $200,000, chiefly used in purchasing and subsidizing newspapers, which tended to defeat free elections and the untrammeled choice of the people. Mr. Newberry ratified the sale and used the money to purchase the New York Commercial Advertiser. Senator Shields, an opponent, voted against it, as it is then probable, and subsequent events have shown, that the army would have to be increased to 250,000 men, at the cost of more than a billion dollars, with a doubtful result.
S. 2704. An act to amend paragraph (3), section 10, of the interstate commerce act; 
S. 2705. To authorize the withdrawal of lands for the protection of antelope and other game animals and birds; 
S. 2707. An act to authorize the payment of claims under the provisions of the so-called war minerals relief act; 
S. 2709. To provide for the States, fuel, and light for employees of the Indian field service; 
S. 2804. An act relating to the American Academy in Rome; 
S. 2867. An act authorizing transfer of certain abandoned or unneeded lighthouse reservation lands by the United States to the State of New York for park purposes; 
S. 2902. An act to quiet the title to lands within Pueblo Indian land grants, and for other purposes; 
S. 3066. An act to designate the State of New Mexico as a judicial district, fixing the time and place for holding terms of court therein, and for other purposes; 
S. 3924. An act providing for the acquisition by the United States of privately owned lands within Rio Arriba and Taos Counties, N. Mex., known as the Las Trampas grant, by exchanging therefor timber within the exterior boundaries of any national forest situated within the State of New Mexico; 
S. 3003. An act granting certain public lands to the city of Phoenix, Ariz., for municipal, park, and other purposes; 
S. 3111. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims, adjunctions, and enter judgment upon any claim which the Stockbridge Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; 
S. 3116. An act to authorize the Chetcut, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the White River, near the city of De Valls Bluff, Ark.; 
S. 3158. An act for the abandonment of a portion of the present channel of the south branch of the Chicago River; 
S. 3220. An act authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the removal of the remains of the late George Mauger Burkill and the remains of the late Arthur Glenwood Burk, from the Glenwood Cemetery, District of Columbia, to Fort Lincoln, Prince George's County, Md.; 
S. 3244. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Hinds County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi; 
S. 3253. An act to provide for the inspection of the battlefields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Court House, Va.; 
S. 3259. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910; 
S. 3324. An act to amend section 5 of the trade-mark act of 1905, as amended, relative to the unauthorized use of portraits; 
S. 3355. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Marion and Florence, in the State of South Carolina, to construct a bridge across the Pee Dee River at or near Savage Landing, S. C.; 
S. 3390. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co. to construct, maintain, operate a bridge across the Cumberland River, in the county of Pulaski, State of Kentucky, near the town of Burnside; 
S. 3420. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, of a line of railroad across the southwesterly portion of the Fort Logan Military Reservation in the State of Colorado; 
S. 3434. An act for the protection of the northern Pacific halibut fishery; 
H. R. 7079. An act prohibiting the importation of crude opium for the purpose of manufacturing heroin; 
H. R. 7731. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to sell a portion of the Carlisle Barracks Reservation; 
S. J. Res. 46. An act 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; 
S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a commission for the purpose of erecting in Potomac Park, in the District of Columbia, a memorial to those members of the armed forces of the United States from the District of Columbia killed in the Great War; 
S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution authorizing expenditure of the Fort Peck 4 per cent fund now standing to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians, of Montana, in the Treasury of the United States; 
S. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of an equestrian statue of General San Martin, which the people of Argentina have presented to the United States; 
S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing an investigation of the proposed Casper-Alcova irrigation project, Natrona County, Wyo.; the Deschutes project in the State of Oregon; and the Southern Lassen Irrigation project, in Lassen County, Calif.; 
S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to provide for the free transmission through the mails of certain publications for the blind; 
S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to provide that the powers and duties of designating the Aladine Harbor under existing law for the protection of wild game animals and wild birds in Alaska be transferred to and be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture; 
S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution in respect of salaries of original appointees to the Board of Tax Appeals; 
S. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and the field service"; and 
H. J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States in certain cases aliens fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 7, 1924, that committee presented to the President of the United States enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 71. An act changing the name of Keokuk Street, in the county of Washington, D. C., to Military Road; 
S. 683. An act for the relief of Daniel A. Spaight and others; 
S. 697. An act to establish the Utah National Park in the State of Utah; 
S. 737. An act providing for the disposal of certain lands on Crooked and Pickered Lakes, Mich., and for other purposes; 
S. 790. An act authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. of a drainage system of Prince Georges County, Md., and for other purposes; 
S. 905. An act for the establishment of a Federal industrial institution for women, and for other purposes; 
S. 1192. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district court, northern district of California, to adjudicate the estate of American citizens who died in the Philippine Islands; 
S. 1203. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing an appropriation to meet proportionate expenses of providing a drainage system for Oneida Indian lands in the State of Nebraska," approved February 14, 1923; 
S. 1298. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Interior to purchase a tract of land, with sufficient right attached, for the use and occupancy of the Tsimshian Band of homeless Indians, located at Ruby Valley, Nev.; 
S. 1300. An act for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; 
S. 1376. An act to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia; 
S. 1388. An act to repeal an act authorizing the construction of bridges across the Great Kanawha River; 
S. 1575. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practices of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof; 
S. 1618. An act to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States; 
S. 1767. An act accepting certain tracts of land in the city of Modesto, Jackson County, Cal.; 
S. 2175. An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of the Meadship—Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation and providing reimbursement therefor; 
S. 2236. An act to designate the time and place of holding terms of the United States district court in the first division of the district of Kansas; 
S. 2572. An act to purchase grounds, erect, and repair buildings for customshouses, offices, and warehouses in Porto Rico;
S. 2573. An act to amend and reenact sections 20, 22, and 50 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for the city of Bloomington, and for other purposes"; and
S. 2984. An act to enable the trustees of Howard University to develop an athletic field and gymnasium project, and for other purposes;
S. 2393. An act to amend an act creating theuster State Park game sanctuary in the State of South Dakota;
S. 2704. An act to amend paragraph (3), section 15, of the Interstate Commerce Act.
S. 2761. An act to authorize the withdrawal of lands for the protection of antelope and other game animals and birds;
S. 2767. An act to authorize the payment of claims under the so-called wild and lumber relief act;
S. 2769. An act to provide for quarters, fuel, and light for employees of the Indian field service;
S. 2834. An act relating to the American Academy in Rome;
S. 2987. An act authorizing transfer of certain abandoned or unused lighthouse reservation lands by the United States to the State of New York for park purposes;
S. 2832. An act to quiet the title to lands within Pueblo Indian land grants, and for other purposes;
S. 3023. An act designating the State of New Mexico as a judicial district, fixing the time and place for holding terms of court therein, and for other purposes;
S. 3023. An act providing for the acquisition by the United States of privately owned lands within Rio Arriba and Taos Counties, N. Mex., known as the Las Trampas grant, by exchanging therefor timber, within the exterior boundaries of any Indian reservation situated within the State of New Mexico;
S. 3063. An act granting certain public lands to the city of Phoenix, Ariz., for municipal, park, and other purposes;
S. 3111. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims as an agency, examining and settling claims of Indians for any lands which the Stockbridge Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes;
S. 3113. An act to authorize the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the White River near the city of De Valls Bluff, Ark.;
S. 3189. An act for the abandonment of a portion of the present channel of the south branch of the Chicago River;
S. 3229. An act authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the removal of the remains of the late Anton Lorch Burklin from Glenwood Cemetery, District of Columbia, to Fort Lincoln, Prince George County, Md.;
S. 3244. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Big Horn, Fort Washakie, and Sweetwater supervisors of Indians in Wyoming, to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;
S. 3293. An act to provide for the inspection of the battle fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Court House, Va.;
S. 3299. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1919;
S. 3324. An act declared unconstitutional on June 24, 1915, as amended, relative to the unauthorized use of portraits;
S. 3355. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Marion and Florence, in the State of South Carolina, to construct a bridge across the Pee Dee River at or near Savage Landing, S. C.;
S. 3380. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River, in the county of Pulaski, State of Kentucky, near the town of Burndale;
S. 3420. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. of its successors and assigns, of a line of railroad across the southwestern portion of the State of Colorado;
S. 3434. An act for the protection of the northern Pacific rail-Iroad fisheries;
S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution 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;
S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of certain persons in connection with the administration of the armed forces of the United States under the direction of the Secretary of War; and
S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for payment by entrants of lands on the Fort Assiniboine abandoned military reservation in the State of Montana;
S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution authorizing expenditure of the Fort Peck 4 per cent fund now standing to the credit of the Upper Missouri Indians of Montana in the Treasury of the United States;
S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of an equestrian statue of George Washington, the people of Arg­entina having presented to the United States;
S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing an investigation of the proposed Casper-Alcova irrigation project, Natrona County, Wyo.; the Deschutes Project in the State of Oregon; and the Southern Lassen irrigation project in Lassen County, Calif.;
S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to provide for the free trans­mission through the mails of certain publications for the blind;
S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to provide that the powers and duties conferred upon the Governor of Alaska under existing law for the protection of wild game animals and wild birds in Alaska be transferred to and be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture;
S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution in respect of salaries of original appointees to the Board of Tax Appeals; and
S. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and the field service."
SPANISH SPRINGS IRRIGATION PROJECT, NEVADA
Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I realize the seriousness of dov­ing down a matter of this kind while there is pending a motion to adopt a conference report. I think you have a good ground of loss of legislation for my State. The only thing that urges me to do it is because, in my opinion, a great wrong has been done by legislation.
When this matter of reclamation first came up, it came up in the Interior Department matters several months ago. At that time there were these items for which we were seeking to obtain appropriations—the Spanish Springs project, part of the Newlands project, the Strawberry Valley project, now called the Salt Basin; the Owyhee project, the Warm Springs project, the Yakima irrigation district project, and so on; but they were postponed, mind you, until the fact finding commission which had been appointed by the Secretary of the Interior could make their recommendations on the matter.
They made their recommendations, and what were their recommendations? Their recommendations were that the department should go on with the Newlands project, and that they should investigate the other projects before they went on with the latter.
What happened? The Budget makes an estimate for the Newlands project, and it does not make an estimate for the other projects; and then what happens in Congress? What a strange situation! The Newlands project is wiped out, and yet it is the only project in the group recommended by the fact finding commission and the only one estimated by the Budget; and what happens in Utah?
Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken about that. There were other items that the Budget recommended.
Mr. PITTMAN. Oh, well, I am talking about these things. What happened in Utah? Here is the Salt Lake Basin irriga­tion project. They changed the name of it. It used to be called the Strawberry Valley project. That is marked out in the bill. I think they ought to change the name of it.
For continued investigations, commencement of construction, and incidental operations, $1,800,000.
And yet the fact finding commission refused to recommend it, and the Budget would not estimate it. Oh, that is in there—why, of course.
How about Oregon?
Owyhee irrigation project, Oregon: For continued investigations, commencement of construction, and incidental operations, $1,250,000.
The fact finding commission appointed by a Republican Secre­tary of the Interior would not recommend continuation of that project, and yet it is in there. The Budget did not estimate for it.
Further, how about Oregon?
Warm Springs (Yak) irrigation project, Oregon: For continued inves­tigations and for first payment toward purchase of an interest in the Warm Springs reservation.
Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say just a word? All of those amounts are cut down to a quarter, and Warm Springs, just spoken of, was cut out altogether.
Mr. PITTMAN. If they were cut down to the estimate, there would not be anything there.

Mr. WARREN. I say, that one was cut out entirely.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understand; but why did you cut out Spanish Springs?

Mr. WARREN. Washington State:

Yakima irrigation project, Washington: For continued investigations, commencement of construction of the Kittitas unit, and incidental operations, $1,500,000.

The fact finding commission would not recommend it, and they do not recommend it for the reasons given. It is not a project which was estimated for it, and yet it is in this bill.

Oh, they know; the managers on the part of the Senate understand. This is not a surprise to them. The Members of the Senate understood it. Now that it is in here, and it is late, and it threatens me, I may say: "There is important legislation in this bill, and you will have to swallow it." I told you I would not swallow it, and I will not. Call your extra session if you want to. I will vote for it at any time. I will vote to keep you here if you want to stay. Suppose you put in a concurrent resolution to stay another week and fight this thing out, and see how it goes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada yields the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I am not going to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield for a question. May I yield for a question and not lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may yield for a question and not lose the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield only for a question.

Mr. BORAH. I am not afraid I can not put it.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am very sorry.

Now, let us read what the fact finding commission has to say about these things. I remember when I went before the Committee on Appropriations in January in regard to the Newlands project. We had an estimate for the Newlands project in January, and they did not have any for theirs in January, and they delayed that and they said to us: "Well; let us see if the fact finding commission do not help us out. It is composed of able men, experts, the present commissioner of irrigation, and others." Then the commission came back, and they turned down these projects. What happened over in the House? You get everything you ask, in spite of not having an estimate, in spite of not having a recommendation, and turn down the only thing that was recommended and the only thing that was estimated for. Then they come over here at the last minute and talk to me about how I am going to defeat a big bill. Well, I tell you I am going to defeat it unless you put back the Spanish Springs appropriation, and while I am getting ready to go I want you to get all the information that is here that you did not have before.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am sure the Senate does not want it.

Mr. PITTMAN. I can not yield to the Senator for a speech. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. WARREN. But the Senator's statement is not true.

Mr. PITTMAN. Well, the record contains me. The Senator can answer it later on. I will read something to him, and see how correct that is.

I am going to read from the statement of H. M. Lord, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and see what he has to say about these projects. He quotes from the fact finding commission, as follows:

"As to the proposed new projects, Owyhee, Vale, Salt Lake Basin, and Kittitas, the committee has not sufficient information upon which to recommend. Attention is called to the fact that the estimated costs of construction are nearly all in excess of $120 an acre. The committee is of the opinion, based upon the reports of annual production from lands now under irrigation, that projects requiring such acre cost as above suggested should be constructed only after it is clearly shown that the lands, when irrigated, can produce annual crop values sufficient to enable the settlers to repay costs from production, and within a reasonable time.

"It is understood that the above projects are those which offer the most favorable conditions for present investigation, and hence the committee is of the opinion that the appropriations therefor should be authorized as provided for in the investigation and that the investigation be made of their feasibility, and that, if finally selected, they should be constructed and developed in accordance with the general resolutions of this committee."

The above estimate specifically provides for the investigation of these projects, together with the Casper-Alcova project in Wyoming. Under the provisions of the estimate the cost of the investigation will be reimbursed from the reclamation fund in the case of any project being adopted for construction by the United States.

And then what do they do? The Budget recommends $125,000 to investigate these several projects, and the House appropriates two or three million dollars for them. That is what happens.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I can not yield for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. My question is, will there be opportunity before 7 o'clock to present a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not know; it all depends upon the action of the Senate as to whether there will be any opportunity. I do not desire to lose the floor; that is the only thing.

As a matter of fact, the whole proposition is surrounded with justifiable suspicion. I do not wish to point my finger at any particular Senator or Congressman or individual, nor do I like to look at them even; but it is a strange situation here that a party that brags of enacting a budget system for the direct use of names should find the Budget recommending $125,000 to investigate projects that the fact finding commission says are doubtful as to whether they will pay, and yet appropriate three or four million dollars for them outright for a project that they recommended should be developed, and estimated at $125,000 with which to commence it. That kind of thing will not go. You can not legislate in that way. You had better find out that you can not have legislation by committees in this body. I have said that once before. I had to kill a naval bill at the last session, and it becomes my unfortunate lot now, for the purpose of making committees do their duty, to kill this bill. I hate to kill it. It has in it a great many things of great merit for my State of Idaho, and for the whole West—in fact, for the whole country. It is not my fault. You can not lay it to my door. For the purpose of cutting out an appropriation of $200,000 that was recommended by your fact finding commission, for the purpose of cutting out $200,000 for one of the oldest projects in this country, estimated for and recommended by the Budget Bureau, you are willing to take a chance on sacrificing this bill. You know well enough when you did it that you would sacrifice this bill. It is simply a question of whether you desire to kill this bill or not.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this matter is still in discussion. The Senate and the House are using the time to prevent us from coming to any further agreement.

Mr. PITTMAN. What do you want to do with it? Do you want to take it back?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WARREN. I simply say that it is entirely useless, but I am willing that that should be done if that is the way in which the Senator desires to kill the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is an unanimous consent that I ask.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President. The Senator from Nevada evidently referred to me as one of the committees on this bill. I judge that by the direct use of names but by inference, and from the statement he made I have not any doubt about it.

Mr. PITTMAN. I did not mean the Senator at all as a con­

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, is it impossible to get this bill through?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This question is not de­

Mr. SWANSON. I am making an inquiry in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement that is proposed. Is it impossible to get this bill through? Is it impossible to get it through if it goes back?
Mr. WARREN. We will undertake it, but—

Mr. SWANSON. If it is impossible, I am going to object to any unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WARREN. Not if it goes back, but we will have to make it here to get an agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears no objection, and the conference report is recommitted to the committee.

Mr. STANFIELD. The President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. STANFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of December 11, 1924, at 2 o'clock p.m., the civil service retirement bill be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. PITTMAN. What is the request? I make the point of order that I can not hear what is going on.

Mr. STANFIELD. To make the civil service retirement bill the unfinished business.

Mr. PHIPPS. Has the Senator from Colorado made a request?

Mr. PHIPPS. I am trying to get recognition for the purpose of presenting the war minerals relief bill, to get an agreement to an amendment made by the House.

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator for that purpose; but I still have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada, the Chair understands, yielded the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. This is the third time I have asked for this unanimous consent, and now I have the permission of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Nevada yielded the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Let us have order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Nothing will be done until Senators come to order.

Mr. PHIPPS. Is it the ruling of the Chair that a request for unanimous consent takes a Senator from the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair observed the Senator from Nevada, and after the unanimous consent had been granted, determined that he had yielded the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is perfectly agreeable to me, if the Chair has so ruled.

Mr. PHIPPS. The Chair then recognized the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon has made a request for unanimous consent. Is there objection to his request?

Mr. KING. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. Now the Senator from Colorado is recognized.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PHIPPS, his Secretary, announced that the President had approved and signed acts and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On June 6, 1924:
S. 769. An act for the relief of the Commercial Pacific Cable Co.;
S. 2163. An act to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 8, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes;
S. 2529. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Georgia and Florida, through their respective highway departments, to construct a bridge across the St. Marys river at or near Wilds Landing, Fla.; and
S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution providing for the United States Government to have representation at the celebration of the centennial of the first meeting of the Legislative Council of the Territory of Florida.

On June 7, 1924:
S. 730. An act for the establishment of a Federal Industrial Institution for Women, and for other purposes;
S. 966. An act for the continuance of construction work on the calendar day of the general irrigation project in Arizona, and for other purposes, and
S. 1174. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress the facts in regard to the claims of certain members of the Sioux Nation of Indians for damages occasioned by the destruction of their horses.

On June 7, 1924 (at the Capitol):
S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution in relation to a monument to commemorate the service of the colored troops in the maintenance of the United States of America, its insular possessions, and the District of Columbia in the World War;
S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a commission for the purpose of erecting in Potomac Park, in the District of Columbia, a memorial to those members of the armed forces of the United States from the District of Columbia who served in the Great War;
S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for payment by entrants of lands on the Fort Assiniboine abandoned military reservation, in the State of Montana;
S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing expenditure of the Fort Peck fund now standing to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians of Montana in the Treasury of the United States;
S. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D.C., of an equestrian statue of General San Martin, which the people of Argentina have presented to the United States;
S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing an investigation of the proposed Casper-Alcova irrigation project, Natrona County, Wyo.; the Deschutes project in the State of Oregon; and the Southern Lassen irrigation project in Lassen County, Calif.; and
S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to provide for the free transmission through the mails of certain publications for the blind;
S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to provide that the powers and duties conferred upon the Governor of Alaska under existing law for the protection of wild game animals and wild birds in Alaska be transferred to and be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture;
S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution in respect of salaries of original appointees to the Board of Tax Appeals;
S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to amend section 33 of the act entitled “An act to provide for the classification of civil service positions within the District of Columbia and the field service,” approved May 16, 1913. An act changing the name of Keokuk Street, in the city of Washington, D.C., to Military Road;
S. J. Res. 142. An act to establish the town of Peabody, and for other purposes;
S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Interior to purchase a tract of land, sufficient water right attached, for the use and occupancy of the Tenenau Band of homeless Indians, located at Ruby Valley, Nev.;
S. J. Res. 150. An act for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.;
S. J. Res. 153. An act to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia;
S. J. Res. 161. An act to repeal an act authorizing the construction of bridges across the Great Kanawha River;
S. J. Res. 183. An act to authorize the classification of civilian employees of the United States, and for other purposes;
S. J. Res. 189. An act providing for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation and providing reimbursement thereof;
S. 2290. An act to designate the time and place of holding terms of the United States district court in the first division of the district at Kansas City;

S. 2291. To consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the laws affecting the establishment of the United States Veterans' Bureau and the administration of the war risk insurance act as amended, and the vocational rehabilitation act as amended;

S. 2572. An act to purchase grounds, erect and repair buildings for customhouses, offices, and warehouses in Porto Rico;

S. 2573. An act to amend and reenact sections 20, 22, and 50, and to repeal section 19 of the act entitled "An act to provide for a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes";

S. 2834. An act to enable the trustees of Howard University to develop an athletic field and gymnasium project, and for other purposes;

S. 2930. An act to amend an act creating the Custer State Park game sanctuary in the State of South Dakota;

S. 2784. An act to amend paragraph (3), section 16, of the interstate commerce act;

S. 2785. An act to authorize the withdrawal of lands for the protection of antelope and other game animals and birds;

S. 2797. An act to authorize the payment of claims under the provisions of the so-called war minerals relief act;

S. 2799. An act to provide for quarters, fuel, and light for employees of the Indian field service;

S. 2804. An act relating to the American Academy in Rome;

S. 2810. An act authorizing the disposal of certain abandoned or unused lighthouse reservation lands by the United States to the State of New York for park purposes;

S. 2812. An act to quiet the title to lands within Pueblo Indian lands for public or other purposes;

S. 3023. An act designating the State of New Mexico as a judicial district, fixing the time and place for holding terms of court therein, and for other purposes;

S. 3024. An act providing for the acquisition by the United States of privately owned lands within Rio Arriba and Taos Counties, N. Mex., known as the Las Trampas grant, by exchange therefor timber within the exterior boundaries of any national forest situated within the States of New Mexico and Arizona;

S. 3093. An act granting certain public lands to the city of Phoenix, Ariz., for municipal, park, and other purposes;

S. 3111. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Stockbridge Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3113. An act to authorize the Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Co. and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the White River near the city of De Valls Bluff, Ark.;

S. 3118. An act authorizing the abandonment of a portion of the present channel of the south branch of the Chicago River;

S. 3229. An act authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the removal of the remains of the late Antion Burcklin from Glenwood Cemetery, District of Columbia, to Fort Lincoln, Prince Georges County, Md.;

S. 3244. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Hills County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

S. 3263. An act to provide for the inspection of the battle fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Court House, Va.;

S. 3283. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910;

S. 3284. An act to amend section 3 of the trade-mark act of 1905 so as to provide for the registration and use of trade-marks relative to the unauthorized use of portraits;

S. 3355. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Marion and Florence, in the State of South Carolina, to construct a bridge across the Pee Dee River at or near Savage Landing, S. C.;

S. 3380. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co. to construct, make, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River in the county of Pulaski, State of Kentucky, near the town of Burns;en;

S. 3423. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction, and operation by the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. of its successors and assigns, of a line of railroad across the southwesterly portion of the Fort Logan Military Reservation in the State of Colorado; and

S. 3429. An act for the protection of the northern Pacific halibut fishery.

WAR MINERALS RELIEF ACT

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the bill (S. 2797) to authorize payments of claims under the so-called war minerals relief act.

Mr. PHIPPS. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope that will be done, Mr. President.

The amendments were concurred in.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Page, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 295) making appropriations for the compensation of the World War adjusted compensation act, fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report on the second deficiency bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. On what bill? I desire to be heard.

Mr. WARREN. Wait a moment. It is an effort to carry out the Senator's idea.

Mr. CURTIS. Let us have order.

Mr. PITTMAN. What is the motion of the Senator?

Mr. WARREN. My motion was that we reconcile the two amendments still in disagreement, one of which is as to whether or not we shall give the House amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada asked unanimous consent that this conference report be recommitted to the committee of conference, and there was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. WARREN. It cannot be done until the motion is made, so that the report may be liberated and I can take it back. In order to bring it to a question I move that one of the two amendments in disagreement the Senate shall recede. Those amendments are No. 29 and No. 34. That brings the matter before the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there is a unanimous consent which has been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the unanimous-consent agreement involved a reference to the committee in the present condition of the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. What is the motion of the Senator?

Mr. WARREN. My motion was that we reconcile on the two amendments still in disagreement, one of which is as to Spanish Springs and the other of which is as to the employment of a director of reclamation.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is, to recede or insist?

Mr. WARREN. I was moving to recede.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to be heard on that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. PITTMAN. This is a violation, apparently.

Mr. WARREN. The Senate has the right now to move the other thing.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am not moving anything. I have asked for a unanimous-consent agreement, and I do not consider it has been carried out in the spirit in which it was given.

Mr. WARREN. I have not the papers in my hands, and I am trying to get them.

Mr. PITTMAN. I want to say this, that I tried to treat this matter in all fairness, and at 15 minutes of 7 o'clock I was informed on the floor by the chairman of the committee that they would have time to go back with it, so I asked unanimous consent that the conference report be referred back to the conference committee with instructions that they insist upon this amendment to which I have referred. That was agreed to. Now, the chairman comes back and desires to put it in another phase, and he moves that it be referred back with instructions that the Senate recede from the two Senate amendments, which means that they would do just what they have done, give them up. That is what it means.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. PITTMAN. I still have the floor, and I cannot yield it under a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not intend to allow this matter to come to a vote by any subterfuge whatever. This motion that
is offered by the Senator is nothing more nor less than a subterfuge to carry a vote here instructing the conference to do just what they have already done. That is what it is to instruct them to recede when they have already receded. It is just another method of getting at the same thing, and it is a subterfuge and a violation of the unanimous-consent agree­ment we entered into just awhile ago. You could not set that unanimous-consent agreement aside by any motion whatever, if the Senate stands by its rules. You could not set it aside except by another unanimous-consent agreement. The Chair has declared that the agreement is in effect; and if it is in effect, then the conference report is not before the Senate, but I am told by the last 10 instructions of the Senate committee, the instructions of the Senate as to what to do with it. If they are willing to go and do that with it, let them go. If they are not, let them stay. I will put in a vote to read some of the fact finding commission’s report, which I think Senators should hear in this matter.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President.

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not yield to the Senator.

Mr. BURSUM. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will not yield.

Mr. BURSUM. To make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will not yield to the Senator for any purpose. That might settle that.

Let me see just exactly how violent is the effect of these legislators to get three or four million dollars for their pet projects which are disapproved by the fact finding commission, and not authorized by the Budget.

I read from the recommendations of the fact finding commission:

The Newlands project was among those first selected and authorized after the passage of the reclamation law. The engineering features were carefully considered, the water supply based upon the use of storage in Lake Tahoe, and the agricultural study of soils made in accordance with then known scientific methods. It was designed to offer, climatically, agriculturally, and physically, an opportunity for a successful project. The original area that was thought to be about 450,000 acres that was early reduced to 297,994 acres and later to 206,069; and there was found, as a result of years of legal controversy, that the expected use of the water of Lake Tahoe was not available.

There is still some misunderstanding about the unanimous-consent agreement. The unanimous-consent agreement binds but one amendment, and that is the amendment providing an appropriation for the Spanish Springs project, a division of the Yuma project. The committee is at liberty to do anything they want to do with regard to any other project under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WARREN. We have seven items there in disagreement. I am perfectly willing to move, if the Senator will permit, that that be adopted with instructions on the two amendments in disagreement that it shall be taken back.

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I will not stand for any substitute like that. This report shall not be acted on in any way until that amendment is included.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, does the Senator yield? I sympathize with the Senator.

Mr. PITTMAN. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. ASHURST. I appeal to the Senator to let the bill pass. I am hurt more than he is.

Mr. PITTMAN. I can not yield. Mr. President, it is be­lieved that the

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (rapping for order). There must be order in the Chamber. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to request persons in the rear of the Chamber to be seated. The business of the Senate will be suspended until that order is enforced. [After a pause.] The Senator from Nevada will proceed.

Mr. PITTMAN. I can say to the conference committee that they have full power under the unanimous-consent agreement and the instructions of the Senate to work out a bill that is acceptable, and do what they please with the conference report except with regard to the one amendment. If they did not have their minds made up, they would do that. I say that they have not been that long as they have got their minds made up to kill that amendment the whole thing will go with it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable us to make an unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; if I do not lose the floor by doing so.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which just came over from the House of Representatives, providing an appropriation for the payment of the adjusted compensation. It is one of the features, as I take it, in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and I am sure no Senator would want to defeat that appropriation.

Mr. SMITH. It simply provides—

Mr. PITTMAN. If it is unanimously agreed that I do not lose the floor or the right to discuss this motion, I will be happy to yield, and I suppose no one will object to that.

Mr. KING. I should like to hear the resolution read.

Mr. ROBINSON. It would be 7 o’clock before it could be read.

Mr. KING. What is it about?

Mr. REED of Missouri. It provides for the payment of the adjusted compensation. It is one item in this bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. The joint resolution appropriates for the Newland Bureau the funds necessary for the immediate use of the Government under the adjusted compensation act.

Mr. BORAH. That, as I understand it, is included in this bill already.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is.

Mr. BORAH. I object to the consideration of it. If it goes through, it will have to go through on this bill. This bill pro­ects the home builders of the West; and if the home builders of the West are not going to have the protection of the Congress, we are not going to vote any more taxes until they have an opportunity to produce so they can pay them. For six months Congress has devoted its time to appropriating money, and raising heavier obligations for the taxpayer. Not another dollar, if I can prevent it, until some consideration is given to the producer, the man who must pay these taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 295) making appropriations for the administration of the World War adjusted compensation act, fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, was read twice by its title.

Mr. PITTMAN. A parliamentary inquiry. What is this?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. BORAH. I object. We will all go down together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho objects.

Mr. PITTMAN. Now, Mr. President, I want to say this; I have not had an opportunity to go entirely into this subject, but, nevertheless, I have stated enough of it to show the char­acter of the legislation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House resolution just presented.

Mr. BORAH. Upon that I want to be heard. I do not propose that the man who is struggling to save his home shall be discriminated against longer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS). It is now 7 o’clock, and under the concurrent resolution adopted by the House and the Senate of the United States, the Senate of the Eightieth Congress stands adjourned without day.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1924

The House met at 11 o’clock a. m.

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

Our blessed Heavenly Father, only through the continuance of Thy mercy are we able to stand in Thy presence. We praise Thee, O God, for Thy marvelous goodness that pours from Thy infinite heart. All the days of our lives Thou hast been with us; we therefore thank Thee. Truly Thou art our Father, only through the continuance of Thy love and mercy that pours from Thy infinite heart. All the days of our lives Thou hast been with us; we therefore thank Thee. Truly Thou art our God, and we are the people of His pasture. We bless Thee, O God, that we are living, that we are living on such broad skies and in a land so abundant in resources that the people can live. Through love of virtue, zeal for knowledge, by policy and legis­lation may we pursue the things that make for national right­eouess and a prosperous life; may we be the people great and merciful unto our President and the Speaker of this Congress. Bless and direct all Members, all officers, all employees, and pages of this House while the intervening months pass by. May no peril or disappointment befall us; may all good megaphone befall us in the shadow of Thy presence. With hearts of gladness and with wills to serve help us to lighten life’s burden, lift life’s load, and brighten life’s way, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.