

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 6166) for the relief of Rosa L. Yarbrough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 6167) granting an increase of pension to William Dotson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6168) granting a pension to Joseph Houser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6169) granting a pension to Joan O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6170) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Shank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6171) granting a pension to Francis S. Reedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 6172) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Weinhold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McNULTY: A bill (H. R. 6173) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Washington E. Hall, alias John Duffy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6174) granting a pension to Frances B. Eaton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 6175) granting a pension to J. H. Patterson, alias James Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 6176) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6177) granting an increase of pension to Anna R. McAdams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6178) granting an increase of pension to Belle Parker Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 6179) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Mooniehand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 6180) granting an increase of pension to Carrie M. Flandreau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6181) granting an increase of pension to Penina A. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 6182) authorizing the Secretary of Labor to permanently admit, under suitable regulations and requirements to be prescribed by him, Paula Patton, daughter of Hyman Patton, a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 6183) granting an increase of pension to Geneva Beha; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of George C. Mansfield Co. and George D. Mansfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 6185) granting a pension to Katherine Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 6186) authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a preliminary examination and survey of Oconto Harbor, in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENS: A bill (H. R. 6187) granting a pension to Mark T. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6188) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Waddell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6189) granting a pension to Mintie A. Ashton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6190) granting a pension to Evaline Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6191) granting a pension to Merrick L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 6192) granting a pension to Victor Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 6193) granting a pension to Annie E. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

728. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Wilmington Monthly Meeting of Friends, Wilmington, Del., urging Congress to put into effect the proposals embodied in the winning plan of the American peace award; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

729. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Lewiston, Me., asking for the repeal of all unfair war excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

730. By Mr. BURTON: Petition of 250 residents of the city of Cleveland, requesting support of the measure now pending

before Congress to amend the Volstead Act by permitting the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

731. By Mr. CORNING: Petition of New York State Association of Real Estate Boards, approving Secretary Mellon's tax reduction plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

732. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of H. B. Sibilla, president, and other employees of the J. A. Davidson Co., Port Huron, Mich.; Gus Hill, president, and other employees of the Moak Machine & Tool Co., Port Huron, Mich.; F. E. Beard and other citizens of Port Huron, Mich.; A. R. Ballentine and other residents of Port Huron, Mich.; C. C. Failing and other residents of Port Huron, Mich.; J. S. Reed and other residents of Port Huron, Mich.; John W. Stanley and other residents of Port Huron, Mich.; Geo. A. Ashpole and other residents of Port Huron, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

733. By Mr. HAWES: Petition of the Missouri State Dairy Council, favoring the Purnell bill providing for an increased appropriation for agricultural experimentation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

734. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of Highland Hereford Breeders' Association, indorsing Mellon tax reduction bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

735. By Mr. KIESS: Evidence in support of House bill 5994, granting a pension to John A. Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

736. Also, evidence in support of House bill 5289, granting a pension to Lydia E. Kohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

737. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Papers to accompany House bill 6108, granting a pension to Mary Ellen McClaren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 25, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Blessed Lord, come Thou to our waiting hearts and minds. Forgive us everything that is unworthy of the holy name which we have taken upon our lips. As Thou hast set before us high and patriotic tasks, may we fulfill them worthily. Bless our whole family of citizens and may they not be led along false ways. Oh, come to our country in its questions, in its problems, and in its fears. Dispel all earth-born clouds and be gracious unto every State and every citizen under the folds of our flag. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The bill H. R. 4319, authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes, was accidentally referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, when it very clearly belongs to the Committee on Public Lands. The chairmen of both these committees agree to the transfer. Without objection the Chair will change the reference from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to the Committee on Public Lands.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 152. An act to authorize the county of Multnomah, Oreg., to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Willamette River, in the city of Portland, Oreg., to replace the present Burnside Street Bridge, in said city of Portland; and also to authorize said county of Multnomah to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Willamette River, in said city of Portland, in the vicinity of Ross Island.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 3679. An act authorizing the building of a bridge across the Peedee River in South Carolina;

H. R. 3680. An act authorizing the building of a bridge across Kingston Lake at Conway, S. C.; and

H. R. 3770. An act for the examination and survey of Dog River, Ala., from the Louisville & Nashville Railroad bridge

to the mouth of said river, including a connection with the Mobile Bay ship channel.

The message also announced that the Senate had concurred in the following concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 24, 1924.

Whereas the sudden death of Warren G. Harding, late President of the United States, occurred during the recess of Congress, and the two Houses desire to give fitting expression to the general grief and to commemorate his most notable services to his country and the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on the day and hour fixed by the joint committee, to wit, Wednesday, February 27, 1924, at 12 o'clock m., and that in the presence of the two Houses there assembled an address upon the life and character of Warren G. Harding, late President of the United States, be pronounced by Hon. Charles E. Hughes, and that the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be requested to invite the President and the two ex-Presidents of the United States, the former Vice President, the heads of the several departments, the judges of the Supreme Court, the ambassadors and ministers of foreign governments, the governors of the several States, the General of the Armies, and the Chief of Naval Operations to be present on that occasion; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to Mrs. Harding and to assure her of the profound sympathy of the two Houses of Congress for her deep personal affliction and of their sincere condolence for the late national bereavement.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Enrolled Bills report that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill and joint resolution:

H. R. 185. An act providing for a per capita payment of \$100 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution extending the time during which certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries may be returned duty free.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF.

The SPEAKER. To-day by special order the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a number of measures have been introduced and are now pending before the committees proposing certain relief to the agricultural classes in America. When I obtained unanimous consent to address the House I had in mind a discussion of some of those measures. Since the President on Wednesday last sent to the House and Senate a message suggesting certain legislation along those lines I have changed my mind and have concluded not to discuss in detail those measures, but will take occasion to say now that such of those proposals as are sound economically and capable of being efficiently and effectively administered will receive my support. The President's message does not exaggerate conditions prevailing in practically every agricultural community in America, but, nevertheless, it is a confession that his party has done nothing to prevent or relieve this very grave situation. Such of his proposals as are sound and economically wholesome will receive my sympathetic and aggressive support, although obviously his suggestions relate to temporary or emergency measures and do not reach or remove the fundamental cause from which these conditions spring.

I hope I may not be considered a pessimist or an alarmist when I say with all the emphasis that I can command that the agricultural classes in America are in dire financial distress. For three years the American farmer has been compelled to market his commodities at prices far below the cost of production, a condition which prevails in no other gainful occupation.

I assert, and this will not be denied, that agriculture is the most important single industry, because an adequate supply of foodstuffs is absolutely essential to the physical and economic growth of the Nation, and when agriculture languishes all other occupations atrophy.

Back of transportation, back of manufactures, back of commerce, back of all other business activities stands the farmer, and when he is impoverished all other lines of industry are

sooner or later paralyzed. Undoubtedly the prime factor in our economic equation is a sufficient supply of foodstuffs, not only to meet the ever-increasing demands of our rapidly growing population but to feed hungry humanity beyond our borders, and in exchange for our surplus products to draw to our shores and to the coffers and purses of our farmers a part of the wealth and treasure of the outlying and remote regions of the world. [Applause.] Just as an engine can not properly function without steam or gas or electric current, neither can our diversified industries and our multitudinous business agencies be operated to a maximum capacity if the man power of the Nation is stunted because of lack of an adequate supply of foodstuffs. It follows, therefore, that not only the efficiency and virility of our economic life but the normal growth and development of the human race depend upon our food supply, and, therefore, upon the farmer. And because of this fundamental and outstanding necessity, the Government should at all times manifest an active interest in food production and food conservation. The merchant, the banker, the capitalist, the manufacturer, captains of industry, and the masters of finance should not continue to expect the farmer to furnish the necessary food supplies when their production means ever-increasing losses. How long would a manufacturer continue to make a commodity if compelled to sell it at a price far below the cost of production? Yet for the past three years the prudent American farmer, even by the exercise of tireless industry and watchful economy, has not been able to balance his budget, but is getting deeper and deeper into debt, and in the years of our Lord 1923 and 1924 the American farmer is living off the rapidly dwindling earnings and accumulations of former years.

A comparison of the income and earnings of the American farmer with the income and earnings of other laboring men will disclose very striking conditions. For instance, in the great centers of wealth and population, in an eight-hour day a bricklayer, a plumber, or a plasterer can earn a sum approximately equal to the gross sale value of an average acre of wheat, and there is as great a disparity between the income of the farmer and the incomes of those engaged in industrial, commercial, and other activities. Please do not misunderstand me. I believe in the dignity of labor, in a living wage, in the doctrine of collective bargaining, and in the right of the laboring men to organize and to speak and to act and to contract by and through their own chosen representatives, and I am not saying that under present conditions the laboring man is receiving too high a wage, taking into consideration the high cost of living and the reduced purchasing power of the dollar; but I do say, and the correctness of my deductions will not be challenged, that the American farmer is marketing his commodities at prices so ruinously low that he is rapidly drifting toward bankruptcy.

Mr. HERSEY rose.

Mr. LOZIER. When I get through I shall be glad to answer any questions of the gentleman from Maine or anybody else.

The economic handicap of the American farmer is apparent even to the most unsophisticated when we consider that his commodities are produced under artificially stimulated American standards which exact from him grossly inflated prices on everything that he buys and yet force him to sell his products at the lowest level of world prices in the last decade. In the signs of the times the most optimistic and resourceful student of agricultural conditions can see no well-founded hope for substantial improvement.

Between the upper millstone of ever falling prices on farm products and the nether millstone of ever-increasing cost of his supplies the farmer faces inevitable disaster. What voice, gentlemen, has the farmer in the fixation of the prices at which he will buy his supplies? What influence has the farmer in determining the prices at which he will sell the products of his toil? In the equation upon which his well-being depends he is not even considered an insignificant factor. He is a friendless orphan in a great selfish world of business, industry, and commerce. Between the farmer and the classes favored by paternalistic legislation there is a great gulf fixed. For the farmer no benevolent governmental provision is made. In the princely patrimony of the Nation the farmer has but little, if any, part. Forgotten by "Uncle Sam," disinherited by Congress, exploited by manufacture, inflated and deflated by capital, squeezed by the speculator, plundered by the profiteer, bled by the railroads, and fleeced by the middleman, the farmer is denied even an inconsequential part of the wealth that he produces. [Applause.] And he is refused a seat at the feast where the specially favored classes revel in the luxuries of governmental bounty and special privilege. The rap-

ldly diminishing value of the farmer's dollar and its reduced purchasing power forcibly illustrates his pathetic plight and ever-increasing helplessness as he battles against adverse conditions and seemingly insuperable difficulties.

But, gentlemen, the serious situation of the American farmer can not be cured by legislative legerdemain, political quackery, economic empiricism, or by noxious makeshift remedies so frequently proposed by political mountebanks masquerading under the guise of expert economic diagnosticians. The causes of this nation-wide agricultural anemia, while largely artificial and chiefly the result of legislative inequalities, are, nevertheless, both domestic and international. They are, to a large extent, the inevitable result of world-wide conditions aggravated and accentuated by discriminatory domestic policies which impose upon the farmer an unnecessary burden of taxation; limit, circumscribe, and render unstable his domestic markets; un-naturally manipulate and arbitrarily depress the prices of his commodities; and which in effect exclude his products from the markets of the world, and deny him a seat at the council table around which the business, commercial, and industrial activities of this Nation are determined. Capital, manufactures, transportation, and business of almost every other kind and character have received particular attention and special treatment at the hands of our Federal lawmaking body, and all of those classes have from time to time received legislative bounties and special-privilege favors. But strange as it may appear, our lawmaking bodies have isolated the agricultural classes, given to their welfare and interests no sympathetic consideration, withheld from them the governmental bounties so generously and so habitually extended to a few favored classes.

Friends, in the beginning of our Republic a few agents of the business, commercial, and industrial classes found a little path that led to our National Capital, and that at one time but little-traveled road has become a great highway over which predatory wealth and specially favored classes travel in state to our legislative halls. In the beginning of our Government only a few persons with itching palms appeared in the lobbies of our Federal Congress and asked for special favors in the form of class legislation, which would enable them to levy tribute upon the masses. But at every succeeding session of Congress these beneficiaries of special privilege in ever-increasing numbers have besieged our legislative assemblies, demanding additional favors and ever-increasing bounties until, gentlemen, for the last 30 years this flock of economic vultures and this horde of special-privilege freebooters have grown so tremendously in number and power that now nearly every important legislative act is to a greater or less extent colored and fashioned by a baneful and sinister influence. [Applause.] No thoughtful student of present economic conditions can escape the conviction that the most serious problems confronting the American people to-day are the ever-swelling demands of predatory wealth, the ever-expanding appetite of the special-privilege classes, the ever-growing cost of Government, and the ever-increasing burden of taxation.

So powerful and arrogant have these favored and subsidized classes become that they now presumptuously attempt to dictate the legislative policies of this Nation, control and at times thwart the administration of our laws, and determine for themselves the amount of bounty that shall be imposed upon an already overburdened public. And these predacious interests arrogantly unite their forces and make common cause against the purse of an unorganized and defenseless public. Gentlemen, if I have read the history of my country aright, and if I am familiar with the fundamental principles upon which our institutions are based, I assert it is not only the duty of the Government to protect its citizens in the enjoyment of their political rights, but at the same time it should prevent one favored class preying upon other classes less able to protect themselves. [Applause.] It is one of the functions of a just government to prevent one class of its citizens from exploiting or plundering, directly or indirectly, any other class. I assert that to grant unequal privilege is fundamentally wrong, socially unjust, politically inexpedient, ethically indefensible, and subversive of the doctrine of equal opportunity.

Mr. Jefferson, in a letter to George Flower in 1817, gave expression to what I conceive to be the correct principle, when he said he was generally opposed to special legislation lest a principle of favoritism creep in and pervert that of equal rights. And I say to you, gentlemen of this House, that this rule should never be relaxed except under extraordinary conditions, when a distinct and important national advantage results, of such a nature and character and of such magnitude as to justify a temporary departure from the general rule of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

John Adams realized that under our social and legislative system there would be a growing disposition on the part of one class to prey upon another class. But he declared that the essence of a free government consists in an effectual control of these class rivalries.

John C. Calhoun, than whom America produced few, if any, more logical and profound thinkers on domestic economic problems, in discussing the tremendous influence acquired by the United States Bank and other beneficiaries of special privilege, said that there had grown up in this country a power greater than the people themselves, consisting of many and varied and powerful interests, combined into one mass and held together by the cohesive power of special privilege.

I realize, gentlemen, that in the age-long struggle of mankind to establish just and stable government, in all lands and in all climes, and in all ages, resourceful, ambitious, powerful, and selfish men, and strong and well-organized classes, have always exercised more governmental powers than they were entitled to, and have always enjoyed an undue, unearned, and unjust proportion of public bounty. Governments were at first founded upon force and for the purpose of enabling one individual or a few individuals to exploit the masses. In all ages the governing and favored classes have established their power and enforced a recognition of their special privilege by cunning, by legislative legerdemain, by overreaching the people, by outstanding genius, or by military coercion; and every page of human history is crimson from the conflict of "the ideas of justice and humanity fighting their way, like a thunderstorm, against the organized selfishness of human nature." [Applause.]

I want to make it plain, gentlemen, that since the very beginning of time, since men began the struggle to organize society and to stabilize governments, the peasants and farmers, except to a very negligible degree, have never belonged to the governing classes or shared in the distribution of governmental bounty. Since the curtain went up on human history the farmer has been compelled to stand outside the charmed circle of special privilege, far removed from governmental bounties, and not permitted to even approach the twilight zone, behind which human greed and organized selfishness have ever been securely entrenched. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOZIER. I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion of my remarks.

I want to say I recognize that the impoverished condition of those who have tilled the soil in all the ages in the world's history has largely resulted from a lack of organization and because of their failure to demand a place in the economic sun and to exercise the great power they have always had, because their products have always been absolutely essential to satisfy the hunger of the world.

And, gentlemen, is it not strange, taking into consideration the fact that there is an ever-present demand for the products of the field and farm—supplies for which there are no substitutes—is it not strange that in all the history of the world there never has been a real trust or monopoly organized by the agrarian classes to control the prices of farm commodities?

I can not overemphasize the evil effect of class legislation, so far as the farmer is concerned. Hear me: I assert that class legislation is more largely responsible for the present economic plight of the American farmers than all other causes combined. [Applause.] It is the fundamental cause of all the causes, and the baneful influence of this cause will continue until the prime cause is removed. And, gentlemen, there can be no rehabilitation of agriculture until there is an abandonment of class legislation and a denial of special privilege [applause], and until we strike from the statute books of this Nation every legislative act whereby one class is taxed for the enrichment of another class or one section given special privileges at the expense of other sections.

The fundamental principle upon which class legislation is based, if I understand anything about political economy, is this, that one group of individuals should be taxed in order to enrich another group and that one section of the country should be exploited in order to build up another section; and the tribute, gentlemen, which in the last hundred years has enriched the beneficiaries of special privileges has been largely paid by the farmers and the farming classes in America. In the inequitably adjusted tariff schedules alone, and in the increased cost of supplies, hundreds of millions of dollars a year are extorted from American agriculture. And listen: Inevitably and ultimately the farmer is the victim of every legislative act by which special privilege is granted.

Let not the masters of the industrial and commercial classes in America minimize or fail to realize the gravity of this agricultural situation, and let not Congress withhold sympathetic consideration and effective remedial legislation!

It was Lord Brougham, I believe, the great stormy petrel of English parliamentary life, who caused an inquiry to be made "into the defects caused by time and otherwise in the laws of the British realm as administered by the courts of common law," and out of this inquiry came a reformation of the English judicial system. In 1828, in an historic address before the British Parliament, after having held the uninterrupted attention of his auditors for six hours, he closed with this language:

It was the boast of Augustus—it formed part of the glare in which the perfidies of his earlier years were lost—that he found Rome of brick and he left it of marble, a praise not unworthy of a great prince. But how much nobler will be the boast of a sovereign who may have it to say that he found the law dear and left it cheap; that he found it a sealed book and left it a living letter; that he found it the patrimony of the rich and left it the inheritance of the poor; that he found it a two-edged sword of craft and oppression and left it a staff of honesty and a shield of innocence.

So, gentlemen, in conclusion I would that the Sixty-eighth Congress and its work may stand out preeminently as constitutionally sound, comprehensive, ethically unobjectionable, and bottomed upon the fundamental principles which underlie our free Government—granting to all classes equal rights and equal opportunities and denying special privileges to any and all classes, so that when this Congress shall have adjourned we may truthfully say, we found our statutes cumbered with special privileges, all of which we annulled; we found hundreds of legislative inequalities, which we corrected; we found a strongly entrenched paternalistic system of government, which we destroyed; we found numerous grants of undeserved bounty, all of which we repealed; we found a few opulent and powerful classes dictating the legislative policy of this Nation, buttressed on every hand by special privilege, and we cast them down from the seat of power to the level of equal opportunity with all other classes and occupations; we found transportation, manufacturing, big business, and commerce arrogating to themselves the direction and control of our economic activities and dictating our legislative policies, and we curtailed the power of these great agencies until they exercise only equal rights but not special privilege; we found legislative and administrative policies based on class distinction and vocational alignment, and we abrogated them; we found agriculture depressed and we rehabilitated it; we found labor and capital arrayed in hostility against each other, and we composed their differences; we found one class of our citizens spurning our Constitution and defying our laws, and we commanded respect and enforced obedience; we found some of our legislative acts were two-edged swords of social injustice and economic oppression, and we left them, as a matter of fact, a staff of equal rights and a shield of equal opportunity.

And so, gentlemen, I trust the day may not be far distant when the equality of all men and all classes before the law may not be a mere idle formula or a lifeless constitutional phrase but that it may become and constitute the warp and woof of our social, industrial, and economic fabric. And when that time comes, gentlemen, it will mark the end of class legislation; it will mark the end of undeserved and unmerited special privileges, which have impoverished agriculture throughout all the years and impaired our economic healthfulness and stability and threatened our social order. [Applause.]

Now, I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. HERSEY. You and I have the same object, and I agree with you, as I represent an agricultural people. I want to know what remedy you have for my farmers in the East who have an overproduction of potatoes, and in Canada they also have an overproduction. We can not export them; there is not a sufficient market at home and we have an overproduction. Now, what remedy have you to offer to meet that situation?

Mr. LOZIER. I will say to the gentleman from Maine that I do not pretend to be an expert economic diagnostician, but when these measures are offered and come before the House or committee I think I shall have something to say in detail with reference to those matters. I want to say this, however, in so far as the President's recommendation as to the diversification of crops is concerned, and to those who talk about the diversification of crops, nine times out of ten they do not understand conditions. How can the western farmer, in the semiarid areas grow anything else but wheat? He can not grow a diversity of crops because those lands are suitable only for the growing of

wheat, and if they do not continue the growing of wheat the wilderness will return and the wheat fields and the farmers will disappear.

Mr. HERSEY. The wheat farmer of the West is in the same position in that he has an overproduction and the farmers of Canada have plenty of wheat which they could ship if it were not for the tariff. Now, my question is: What remedy have you to meet that situation?

Mr. LOZIER. I assert, economically speaking, that in all the history of the world there never has been an overproduction of wheat. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There may have been a breaking down of our transportation systems by which these products are carried to hungry humanity; but, as a matter of fact, practically every author of political economy in the last 100 years has argued very strongly that with adequate transportation facilities there can hardly be such a thing as an overproduction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The remedy lies, my friend, in improving and building up systems of transportation and distribution by which the so-called surplus of crops and production can be carried to the hungry millions in other lands. [Applause.]

Mr. HERSEY. You can not ship wheat abroad now because you can not get anything for it. What remedy have you for the present situation in the West?

Mr. LOZIER. I will discuss that matter when those measures come before the House. I will say this: I will favor any of these temporary measures that are economically sound and workable. They are only temporary measures. Not one of them goes to the vital issue; none of them seeks to remove the fundamental cause. They are only treatments of the symptoms, only treatments of the effects, and they do not go to or remove the real cause. I say to you, my friend, answering you in general terms and respectfully, that they can only afford a temporary relief for present-day conditions. What the American farmer is suffering from is not a temporary, so-called overproduction; he is suffering from an economic system which for 100 years has levied a tribute upon his toil [applause], because he is compelled on every article he produces to allow some one else to fix the price, and yet the price of everything he buys is fixed by the manufacturers in the East or by the middlemen.

Mr. HERSEY. Are you in favor of price fixing for the products of the farmer?

Mr. LOZIER. No, sir; I am not, as a general proposition. I favor class legislation only in so far as it may afford a temporary or emergency treatment, to undo the evil effects which your class legislation has brought upon the farmer. [Applause.]

Mr. HERSEY. What emergency legislation does the gentleman favor for the relief of the farmer?

Mr. LOZIER. If I had my way, if I controlled this House, I would introduce a bill, or by resolution would direct the Committee on Ways and Means to consider a revision of the tariff schedules which impose hundreds of millions of dollars of taxes on the American farmer. [Applause.] There are two classes of people in the United States—those who have taxable incomes and those who do not—and it seems to me that if the Congress of the United States and the administration and the public press want to reduce the burden of taxation and relieve the American people they would commence at the fountain-head and revise the tariff schedules which levy a tribute and a tax upon everything that a man uses from the time he falls out of the cradle until he is carted into the tomb. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. The gentleman from Maine has drawn out that which I desired to draw, and the answer has been so beautiful that it is not now necessary for me to ask the gentleman any questions. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield? Would the gentleman remove the tariff from the farmer's wheat?

Mr. LOZIER. Yes; I am glad the gentleman asked that question, and I will answer it. Listen, the price of wheat under an unalterable and inevitable law is determined in the open markets of the world. The American farmer must send his wheat, ultimately, to Liverpool and the other open markets, and the price in those open markets determines the price he receives at his home market.

Mr. HERSEY. Then why is wheat worth 30 cents more on the American side than it is on the Canadian side?

Mr. LOZIER. I deny the statement, and in my remarks, when this matter comes before Congress, I will be able to show a reason and an explanation of the specious argument and suggestion of the gentleman from Maine. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I ask that the gentleman be given two minutes more.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Give him all day if he wants it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I shall not object to two minutes, but I shall have to object to a further extension.

Mr. LOZIER. I am through unless the gentleman wants to ask me some questions.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman know what the price of wheat was on the Chicago market on the day the emergency tariff on wheat went into effect?

Mr. LOZIER. I have those figures in my office over the signature of the secretary of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago, and also the price of wheat on the 7th day of January, 1924. I did not think that question would be injected into my remarks or I would have brought them with me, but it is something like 10 or 15 cents less now than it was when the emergency tariff bill went into effect.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that it has never been as high?

Mr. CLAGUE. If the gentleman will yield, I happen to be interested in growing wheat on both sides of the line, and about the 25th of August of this year I went to Winnipeg and back to where I am interested in farming, where the lands run close to the Canadian border and the American border. There are two elevators a mile apart, one on the Canadian side and one on the United States side, and the same quality of wheat in the United States was selling for 27 cents a bushel more on this side than on the Canadian side. How do you explain that?

Mr. LOZIER. There may be instances where as a result of local conditions [laughter]—I will explain it. There may be instances where as a result of local conditions and environment there may be a small difference in prices, but after all that difference is not traceable to the tariff, but it is traceable to difference in transportation charges which ultimately fix and determine the price of the commodity in the open markets of the world.

Mr. CLAGUE. Just one more question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

OPIMUM TRAFFIC.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am fortunately entirely detached from any of those influences that may unconsciously influence those distinguished and conscientious gentlemen who come from the congressional districts where there are Indians who may have acquired very unfortunate narcotic tastes even for sacramental purposes. If I have any useful function here, it is to try to state the facts within the professional lines in which I have been trained.

As to the scientific facts as to peyote, I may say, first, there are very few medical reports and very little medical investigation as to this particular drug, but what medical investigation there has been by such authorities as Dr. Harvey Wiley, who, as we know, filled a responsible position in this Government as chief chemist in the Agricultural Department, and the authority of Dr. Henry Lloyd, one of the most useful of the physicians in the Indian medical service, goes to prove undoubtedly that peyote is distinctly and specifically a narcotic drug. Their conclusions are verified by the symptoms of the drug as they have been described even by those who defend its use. The symptoms of the drug are very much the symptoms of the derivatives of opium, which are, first, mental exhilaration and a somewhat happy, subjective feeling, grandiose ideas, motor excitement to a certain extent, which has been brought out in this discussion, and gradual stupor with certain physical effects to be observed, which are like the symptoms of more or less large doses of opium, or the derivatives of opium. In the later stages of narcosis, which I will refer to later, there may be, first, chilling and pallor of the skin and an absolute stupor and unconsciousness preceded by stimulation of the sexual and baser instincts. For proof of this I have the authority of Dr. Henry Lloyd, who says that peyote has been more injurious to Indians than alcohol or any other vice to which they may have been addicted. I also have the authority of Mr. W. E. Johnson, the chief special officer for the enforcement of prohibition, as we would call it now, among certain Indian tribes, who states that there are more vicious effects and more extensive effects from peyote than from alcohol and all other vices of the Indian.

It has been stated here by the distinguished and clear-thinking gentleman, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, that he did not believe the active principle of this particular form of cactus was narcotic. Well, that is because the gentleman, fortunately for himself and for those whom he observed, did not take enough of it.

It is a well-known fact—and I want to bear testimony here to the fact that my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] at least is an authority on what is bad liquor—because the fact is that mescal, of which he has just spoken, is one of the most vicious intoxicating liquors that ever went down the throat of anybody, and it is made from a variety of cactus coming from the same family of cacti as the variety from which peyote comes.

The best method of preventing the peyote habit and orgies during religious celebrations, which have been referred to in this discussion, is to prohibit the importation of peyote from Mexico and its use among our dependent Indians by retaining the provisions of the pending bill, which absolutely prohibits its use.

Mr. TILLMAN. The gentleman himself, I believe, is a medical practitioner of many years' standing.

Mr. KINDRED. Yes; for thirty-odd years I have made a specialty of the study of narcotic drugs and the treatment of drug addiction in the city of New York.

THE GROWTH OF THE POPPY PLANT AND OPIMUM TRADE.

The history of the commercialized trade in the products of the plant called the "white poppy" is a long and disgraceful one.

While the growth of the poppy plant, particularly the white poppy, which grows chiefly in Turkey, Persia, India, and China, extends back in the early days, antedating so-called civilization, international traffic in opium and other products of this plant did not assume a really serious international aspect until the period from 1856 to 1907, during which period China was deluged with opium and its people cursed with the opium habit.

In 1907, however, public opinion of the leading nations, particularly public opinion in the United States, exerted such pressure that China and Great Britain entered into an agreement covering a period of 10 years by which China agreed to reduce the area under poppy cultivation 10 per cent each year. Contrary to general belief, both China—drug-sodden as she was—and Great Britain faithfully lived up to this agreement until its expiration, April, 1917, when China was again officially free.

The entering into and carrying out of this agreement by China proved an honest desire on the part of the Chinese to rid themselves of the opium curse, but it did not mean a moral change on the part of the British-India Government, which, while it was by public opinion compelled for a time at least to give up the opium trade in China, did not fail to seek other outlets and markets for the dwindling opium trade.

About the year 1917 the opium business suddenly underwent a change by reason of the greater facility with which morphine, one of the chief alkaloids of opium, could be handled and shipped by methods prohibited in the case of the transportation of the more bulky opium itself.

Great Britain, through the British-Indian Government, has been responsible for the production and distribution annually, as shown by official reports for 1918-19, of 721 tons of provision opium—the sales taking place at Calcutta monthly at public auction—which is the form of opium sent out of India, to pass into the hands of private firms and corporations to be shipped to Europe, America, or elsewhere and made into morphine, codeine, heroin, or other alkaloids of opium and distributed legally or illegally throughout the world. This enormous quantity of provision opium does not take into consideration the 532 tons of excise opium produced in India for consumption in India, the Straits Settlements, Hongkong, and the British Crown colonies and dependencies where the opium trade is established by law.

Official reports of the British-Indian Government show that during the past two years the acreage devoted to the cultivation of the white poppy has increased by 20,000 acres.

Persia produces hundreds of tons of opium from a white poppy very rich in opium, and China, since the termination of the agreement already referred to with Great Britain in 1917, has, in self-defense, to protect herself against smuggled opium, greatly increased the acreage under cultivation in the white poppy and is now producing annually many hundreds of tons of opium.

The Indian Government has a system of selling off to the highest bidder the privilege once a year of establishing as many

opium-taking shops and smoking rooms as the traffic will bear, this privilege or monopoly being known as the opium farm.

Once a month, at public auction at Ghazipur in India, the excise opium, already referred to, is sold at public auction to supply the wants of drug users, where it is purchased as freely as cigarettes. The British Indian Government also increased opium-smoking rooms where it may be smoked on the premises to the number of 17,000. These, because fees and the excise tax on the public sales of opium and similar excise fees imposed by the British-Indian Government in its control of the production and sale of opium and the control of opium shops, form a considerable part of Indian revenue.

During the years 1918-19, according to official reports, the receipts of opium—consumed in India and not exported—increased 63 per cent.

In the Straits Settlements and in British North Borneo and Saranak, and in some of the unfederated Malay States and in Mesopotamia, all under British control, the revenue from such licensing forms from 45 to 50 per cent of the total revenue.

TRAFFIC IN AND SMUGGLING OF OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUGS.

The age-long traffic, legal and illegal, in opium and narcotic drugs has been the means of millions of dollars in profits to the traffickers, and of untold suffering and misery to millions of people all over the world, who have in many cases, through no fault of their own, been the victims of this traffic.

During the latter part of the period 1907-1917, covered by the agreement between Great Britain and China, for the reduction and final suppression of the British opium trade with China, when Great Britain's opium trade with China had so dwindled that she needed to find other outlets for her hellish traffic and other markets had to be found—there being no intention to abolish it—and when the official or legal shipment to China had to be stopped, the superior possibilities of morphine and the chief alkaloid or active principle of opium were shipped to China and other oriental countries from Great Britain and also from the United States and from certain South American and other countries, whose wholesale drug firms found it profitable to engage in this nefarious smuggling trade to Japan and other countries who act as go-betweens in this business.

It is also true that a large quantity of this same morphine finds its way back to the United States. It is claimed on good authority that the enormous quantity of 28 tons of morphine was in this way smuggled into China over the protests and earnest efforts on the part of the governing and responsible Chinese people who have so long and honestly opposed the opium curse among coolie and other classes of these people. If, as is the fact, China is now cultivating the white poppy and manufacturing it into opium, they are not producing it in competition with the Tientsin treaty terms but in competition with this smuggling.

The British-India Government, being alive to pocketing every possible penny from the monopoly of the opium trade, has seen the possibility of the manufacture of morphine in a remote country, free from the operation of any law or pressure of healthy public sentiment, and is now making not only provision for opium export but is also manufacturing morphine, and, according to the Blue Book issued in 1922, the manufacture of morphine and other alkaloids which was carried on with "skill and enterprise," according to the report mentioned, with the importation of modern ice-making machines into India. However, it is in fairness admitted that since, under orders from the Government of India, all shipments of alkaloids have been stopped and the manufacturers told that it would be necessary to find other markets.

In 1919-20 the Blue Book (Appendix IX) shows that at the Government opium factory at Ghazipur, India, large quantities of morphine and other alkaloids of opium were manufactured and sold both in and outside of India.

This gigantic, systematized smuggling has been the means of sending into China and the United States 28 tons of morphine and other habit-forming drugs annually for the past several years. With this spirit of evading that moral law that should constitute the policy of a nation in all matters relating to the health and well-being of its citizens, it would be easy for the morphine manufacturers and traffickers of Great Britain and the United States and the other countries interested in this traffic—even if these countries accepted the laws and treaties now proposed to stop the manufacture and shipments out of these countries—to invest their capital in some remote country for the purpose of manufacturing the alkaloids of opium in a country which refused to be bound by treaties now being negotiated to suppress this traffic as long as the white poppy is grown in any country beyond reasonable medical and scientific needs. An American or British firm could, for instance,

establish a morphine factory in Mexico or Brazil, or in some other convenient and complaisant country, and thus carry on the trade, and this will probably happen if necessary to the success of the enormous capital invested in this trade as long as there shall be an enormous output of opium to be disposed of.

I, as a physician and Member of the House of Representatives, will earnestly endeavor to cooperate with those who, during the present—Sixty-eighth—Congress, are working to secure the enactment of a law that will more strictly prohibit the bringing of cocaine and opium into the United States for illegal purposes and the manufacturing of the latter into morphine and other alkaloids for reshipment into other countries. But, as stated, even if such a law is enacted, and even if we can secure the more efficient enforcement of the existing Harrison narcotic drug law and other existing Federal and State laws, we can not stop or lessen the activities at the national and international syndicates and monopolies engaged in the illicit manufacture and sale of opium and narcotic drugs, with unbelievable facilities for increasing their output and its distribution at enormous profits through monopolies and smuggling, unless there can be speedily brought about an international cooperation embracing all the leading commercial nations, and particularly all the white-poppy-producing nations—India, Persia, and China—in order to limit the cultivation of the poppy and the consequent production of opium. This suggestion is made here in full realization of the difficulties in the way of the only effectual method to rid the world of the opium curse. It is made, however, with confidence in its practicability and that the proposal, not by any means new, will be finally accepted, especially if the enlightened public opinion of the United States and of Great Britain, so sensitive to such great reforms as are here involved, can be sufficiently impressed and stirred.

This awakened public opinion, however, came from the United States, or at least started here. We are in position now to make our opinions and desires felt more than ever before, as all Europe is looking to us for guidance and help. If that great class of British opinion which always responds to such a cause could only have the facts forced upon their attention, not in a sporadic way but by consistent and active propaganda from this country in a spirit of good will and cooperation, we should certainly promptly get results.

The British governing classes and certain capitalistic classes interested in the trade constitute the powerful influences which keep up this monopoly traffic, although probably more than 90 per cent of the British citizens are unaware of what their Government is doing in this respect and would instantly oppose the traffic and aid us in a successful crusade, if they and the English newspapers could be stirred to a full sense of their duty in such a world movement. But if certain countries, or practically all the countries, making or receiving opium shipments are not included in this arrangement, or fail to make and carry out adequate laws, the whole plan must fail. If any small South American country, for instance, refused to limit imports and its government falsely certified that it required a hundred more tons "for medical and scientific purposes," this would provide the necessary loophole that would cause failure of the whole plan, as the entire output of India or other opium-producing countries could go to that country to be manufactured into morphine and other alkaloids and smuggled out again into each or all the countries which had accepted the proposed treaty and passed appropriate laws prohibiting or regulating the sale of opium preparations.

The United States has in the past, and will in the future, most certainly stand in the front ranks of the countries favoring such effective action and control as will, by concerted world action, abolish or limit the drug traffic. Under an agreement proposed, each country will agree to import only so much opium as would meet its own medical requirements, to be disposed of wholly within its own boundaries, and subject to proper legal safeguards. Reshipments, exportation in bond, and other subterfuges that are not now illegal and make possible morphine traffic with China and other countries, chiefly Japan, would by such concert of action be stopped and the demand for the products of the white poppy of India, Persia, and other fields lessened. A large public sentiment in this country and a smaller sentiment in Great Britain and other countries have initiated movements to bring about this proposed abolition or lessening of this widespread evil, as is illustrated in the effects of the opium section of the League of Nations, their efforts being chiefly a reiteration of the principles of The Hague opium convention of 1914, by which most of the great countries of the world agree to restrict the importation, sale, and distribution of narcotic drugs by uniform and comprehensive national and international legislation.

America advocated and signed The Hague Convention of 1914. Even if the opium section of the League of Nations and the different conferences that have been held, both with and without the sanction of the league, and particularly including The Hague conference, those at the more recent conferences at Geneva, and the later conferences this summer at Lausanne, should lead to a satisfactory agreement, the Crown colonies and dependencies of Great Britain not coming under the jurisdiction of the league could continue, as in the case of India and the Straits Settlements, where the opium trade is legally established, to produce the poppies, opium, and morphine, and with bases like the Straits Settlements and Hongkong and certain ports in Africa, utilisable either as markets or points of departure for smugglers, thus nullify all international effort and intelligent world opinion. Here again the home Government of Great Britain could easily and absolutely dominate the situation by keeping them outside the league on the ground that the opium question is a domestic one, and she will probably succeed in this effort unless public opinion is strongly and promptly aroused. The most effective way in which this could be brought to bear is for all leaders of public opinion, both in the United States and in Great Britain, who are aware of the situation to commence at once and continue, in season and out of season, to start intelligent propaganda in both these countries and continue our efforts until the responsibility is squarely placed where it belongs—up to the British home Government.

All these and many other facts bearing on the absolute commercialization of opium to these helpless subjects of the British Empire, who have little voice in the management of themselves or their public affairs, constitute a terrible indictment of Great Britain and its administration of the sacred trusts imposed upon an imperial government. In this connection I quote from Ellen La Motte's excellent article in the Atlantic Monthly for June, 1922:

This makes us pause and wonder what is happening in those rather inundated territories in the great German colonies in Africa, acquired by Great Britain since the war. Is the opium trade being established there likewise? It is not a pleasant reflection to think that by our assistance in winning the war we have placed something like 1,000,000 square miles at the disposal of the British Empire, consisting largely of British people, unfit for self-government yet fit to become customers of the British opium monopoly. Unfortunately, there is nothing in Great Britain's past or present history to make such an assumption unlikely.

China, realizing how unspeakably she and her people were injured by it, has for decades protested against this curse of the importation of British opium and fought and lost two wars in an unsuccessful effort to protect herself. After she was defeated in the second war, she was compelled to sign the treaty of Tientsin in 1856, by the terms of which she was compelled to purchase as much opium as British traders might wish to bring in.

It was subsequent to 1856 that China began to raise poppies on a large scale in order to protect herself against Indian opium forced upon her by the British Government, and to prevent her money from thus being drained out of the country.

Notwithstanding this system of victimizing these helpless peoples for the sake of revenue by the British-Indian Government, for which the British home Government is directly responsible, the home Government takes, very successfully, great precautions to prevent the illicit use of opium and narcotic drugs at home. In Great Britain's self-governing Dominions—Canada, Australia, and New Zealand—the opium trade is not only established by law, but is prohibited effectively.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the consumption of opium per capita in the United States is 36 grains as compared with 1 grain in Italy, 2 grains in Germany, and 3 for France.

Why this enormous consumption of opium and narcotic drugs in the United States? Reasons for this and the medical legislative and sociological remedies will be considered later in connection with the discussion of the gigantic systematized national and international bootlegging and smuggling of opium and narcotic drugs into the United States and other countries.

It is estimated that the full requirements of physicians' prescriptions (medical opium and its preparations) for all legitimate purposes in the United States and all the Americas would not be more than 1 ton of opium. Allowing 1 ton for all Europe and 1 ton for Asia for all legitimate medical purposes, it will be readily seen how enormously out of proportion is the present opium production already referred to, including 741 tons of provisional opium and 532 tons of excise opium produced in British India alone, in addition to large quantities produced in Persia, China, and other countries.

In other words, it is a conservative statement to say that 1,270 tons of opium are produced in India alone, by consent of the British Government, over and above what is required for medical and scientific purposes, for the sake of commercial gain and human destruction. How widespread this human destruction is because of opium and narcotic drugs has been graphically told during the late years by not only imaginative writers but by the cold, prosaic records in the criminal courts and hospitals and insane asylums of our country, in the North, East, South, and West, as well as in the unwritten tragedies of many private homes of rich and poor alike.

NECESSITY OF AN ORGANIZED FIGHT AGAINST NARCOTICS.

We, as physicians and humanitarians and citizens, are not only deeply concerned as to this big and serious problem as it affects 1,000,000 persons in the United States addicted to the use of opium and habit-forming narcotic drugs but we are vitally interested also in stirring up public opinion against the unspeakable crime of the Governments responsible for directly encouraging and licensing, for purely commercial purposes, the growth of the white poppy and the sale and distribution of these drugs to the enormous extent mentioned, not only among the Chinese, Hindoos, and other orientals but among our own citizens.

We should earnestly, in an organized way, give expression to opposition to this traffic at home and in the Orient, where it has been excused on many absurd grounds, such as "the oriental is not hurt by opium." Any trained physician or intelligent layman who has seen the baleful effects of opium and drug addiction among the natives of India and China and the Chinese in New York City, San Francisco, and some other large cities, knows how preposterous and unfounded such an excuse is.

It is this growing knowledge of this whole subject on the part of the American intelligent public that has guided the splendid record of the United States in its long and consistent opposition to this traffic, both in the past and the more recent crusades against this monstrous national and international evil. Because of this aroused American public sentiment of protest at the cold facts relative to this increasing traffic and the consequent increasing number of opium and drug addicts in this country, approximating 1,000,000 addicted to opium or its derivatives, morphine, codeine, and heroin, and also to cocaine (the active alkaloid of erythoxylon coca) and other habit-forming drugs, including cases addicted to certain of the so-called synthetic or coal-tar group of drugs in such common use, the Senate and House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution No. 453 during the last session, Sixty-seventh Congress, which joint resolution requested the President to urge upon the Governments of certain nations the immediate necessity of limiting the production of habit-forming narcotic drugs and the raw materials from which they are made to the amount actually required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes. In conformity with this congressional resolution, a commission was appointed by the President to represent the United States in a consultative capacity at a meeting of the advisory committee on traffic in opium of the League of Nations, held May 24, 1923, at Geneva, Switzerland.

HON. STEPHEN G. PORTER, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and a member and spokesman of this commission, stated in part at this meeting, as to the attitude of this country:

The United States trusts that the principles set forth in the foregoing congressional resolution will commend themselves to the powers who are parties to The Hague opium convention.

The United States suggests, therefore, that the committee adopt the principles set forth and embody them in its report and recommendations as the basis upon which effective international cooperation can be expected.

As a concrete expression of these principles, so far as concerns opium and its derivatives, the following propositions are submitted to the opium advisory committee in the earnest hope that they will be agreed to and their adoption recommended to the council and assembly of the League of Nations, in order that the doubts, if any, which now exist as to the true intent and meaning of The Hague opium convention shall be permanently removed.

1. If the purpose of The Hague opium convention is to be achieved according to its spirit and true intent it must be recognized that the use of opium products for other than medicinal and scientific purposes is an abuse and not legitimate.

2. In order to prevent the abuse of these products it is necessary to exercise control of the production of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for nonmedicinal and nonscientific purposes.

Right Rev. Charles H. Brent, bishop of western New York, another member and able spokesman for this commission, said in part:

The United States states for its own part, and without any attempt at self-justification, that for the period between 1915 and 1921 much was left to be desired in the character and administration of her legislation in restraint of narcotics, especially as touching export. The Harrison Narcotic Act of December 14, 1914, inadequate by itself, was reinforced by the Jones-Miller Act of 1922. To-day our house is in order legislatively, and progressively so administratively.

President Roosevelt on October 14, 1907, called an international commission, which met in Shanghai, China, in 1909, to make a similar investigation of the opium traffic and to suggest means for its prevention or limitation; President Wilson in his message to Congress on April 21, 1913, said that this action on the part of President Roosevelt "initiated the world-wide movement toward" the abolition of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

President Taft on September 1, 1909, proposed an international conference at The Hague to give international effect and sanction to the resolutions of the Shanghai opium commission, which resulted in the adoption of The Hague opium convention of 1912 by the powers assembled, which is in full force and effect between the nations which have ratified it.

The original convention delegated certain administrative functions to the Netherlands Government (thereby constituting that Government an agent for the execution of the treaty). That Government called two conferences in 1913 and 1914 to consider problems growing out of the execution of the convention.

Certain powers who had participated in these conventions vested in the League of Nations the agency or duty of executing the convention by treaty, dated June 28, 1923, article 23 of which provided as follows:

That in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the league will intrust the league with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in opiums and other dangerous drugs.

Inasmuch as the United States did not enter the League of Nations, it is only by international cooperation that the suppression of the world-wide traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs can be accomplished and that the United States Government can be bound; and it follows that the United States in its present status with relation to the League of Nations can only participate in the proceedings of the League of Nations in this matter in a consultative capacity.

The United States, of course, is bound by The Hague convention equally with other Governments to work toward this end, and therefore accepted an invitation from the committee of the League of Nations charged with limiting the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs to cooperate with it in the execution of the proposed treaty between all the nations producing or trafficking in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

In this capacity the United States, through the commission appointed by President Harding, already referred to, agreed that the United States construction of The Hague Opium Convention was that expressed in Public Resolution No. 96. Sixty-seventh Congress, already referred to, and that any other construction would render the treaty ineffective and of no practical value. In other words, if the purpose of The Hague convention is to be achieved according to its spirit and true intent it must be recognized that the use of opium products for other than scientific and legitimate purposes is an abuse and not legitimate.

In order to prevent the abuse of these products, it is necessary to exercise the control of the production of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for non-medical and non-scientific purposes.

It was further decided at the conferences mentioned that two international conferences should be called in the latter part of the year 1924 to agree upon a plan to enforce the proposed treaty in accordance with said construction and interpretation, bearing in mind that the gradual suppression of the traffic in and use of prepared opium is not yet accomplished, particularly because of reservations that have been noted by certain powers—Great Britain, France, Germany, Netherlands, Japan, British India, and Siam—in regard to prepared opium.

To the end that these further conferences may be held and to meet the expenses incident to the participation of the United States in them, a joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives by the Committee on Foreign Affairs February 20, 1924, asking that \$40,000 be appropriated and authorized for this purpose.

THE MODERN MEDICAL TREATMENT OF DRUG ADDICTS—THE PROBLEM OF THE MANAGEMENT AND CURE OF THE 1,000,000 DRUG ADDICTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is estimated that there are in this country 1,000,000 persons addicted to the use of opium or its active principles, chiefly morphine, cocaine, or heroin, or other habit-forming drugs, most of whom sorely need intelligent, humane, and scientific treatment for this habit, which physicians understand to be a disease very difficult to cure permanently in most cases.

A recent United States Treasury report on this subject is authority for the statement that—

Addiction to the habit-forming drugs is not restricted to any particular race or class of people. Anyone repeatedly taking a narcotic drug over a period of 30 days—in the case of a very susceptible individual, for 10 days—is in grave danger of becoming an addict. And when addiction has been established it is impossible for the individual to discontinue the use of the drug without outside assistance.

Narcotic drugs really mean any of the several habit-forming drugs—particularly the types known as the chief alkaloids derived from opium—morphine, cocaine, and heroin—and also the alkaloids from the *Erythroxylum coca*, known as cocaine—and also chloral and hasheesh and even, in a broader sense, alcoholic drinks, the caffeine in coffee, theine in tea, and nicotine in tobacco smoked in any form. But morphine, cocaine, heroin, and other derivatives of opium—laudanum, paregoric, and so forth—and cocaine are usually referred to as habit-forming drugs.

Certainly strong alcoholic drinks and certain synthetic drugs and coal-tar derivatives and even tobacco and coffee and tea are habit-forming drugs, if taken to any great excess; but the effect of these, while often causing functional and other diseases requiring medical treatment, are not included in our consideration of addiction to narcotic drugs here discussed.

In order to more fully appreciate the several elements involved in the modern medical treatment and management of drug addicts we must take into consideration the nature of drug addiction with respect to its constituting both a habit and disease.

IS DRUG ADDICTION A HABIT OR DISEASE?

The nature of habit as distinguished from disease:

Much has been written during recent years emphasizing the disease element existing in those addicted to drugs.

During nearly 35 years of professional specializing in the study and treatment of drug addiction in its manifold forms, with opportunities of studying and treating many hundreds of cases, I have found that drug addiction is in most cases both a disease and a habit. Both the predisposition to more or less easily formed injurious habits and a susceptibility to the narcotic effects, pleasant or otherwise, in different persons, of the drug taken are both present in most persons who can not voluntarily throw off the habit; and there are very few who can of their own volition throw off drug or other habits after they are well established.

A scientific study of the general nature and effect of habit as such will show the accuracy of this statement. There is, of course, no doubt as to the effects of the drug in addicts who have been addicted to a drug for a long period, constituting disease in the strictest definition of the term.

LABORATORY INVESTIGATIONS FOR UNDERLYING CAUSES.

Very recently extensive scientific laboratory blood and other investigations have been made with a view to finding in the blood elements of drug addicts proof of the absence or presence of certain blood elements that would account for the return of the irresistible craving of addicts for narcotic drugs long after they had been seemingly cured of all symptoms and effects of drug addiction. The theory of these investigations is that a serum or a similar method of treatment will be found that will remove the abnormal conditions in the addict's blood elements or system, or that which accounts for the craving, and that thus the definite or specific diseased condition of the potential or actual addict can be cured.

WITHDRAWAL SYMPTOMS.

It is conclusively shown that not only do the direct effects of narcotic drugs constitute disease while the drug is being taken but that also effects of withdrawing the drug (withdrawal symptoms) constitute not only disease but, in addition, one of the worst problems involved in the successful treatment of addicts.

A few hours after an opium addict has taken his last dose—either by mouth or hypodermically—he begins to develop more or less restlessness, and later pains, often very severe, vomiting, or even in some cases convulsions, and finally collapses, followed in rare cases by actual heart failure and death. These withdrawal symptoms, even if severe, and provided the patient has not been too long without the drug, are almost instantly re-

ieved by the administration of one of the opiate drugs and by no other drug.

Addicts of the opiate drugs, as well as of other drugs, seem to have created within their own bodies by the continued regular use of the drug a sort of mechanism of protection against the action of the narcotic poisons; an antitoxin, so to speak, which counteracts the poisonous effects of the opiates themselves while they are being taken, even in large doses, keeping the addict's body in a sort of balance, but which substance or antitoxin itself becomes a violent poison when the narcotic is suddenly withdrawn and producing symptoms which are promptly relieved by the administration of the drug of addiction.

There is a constant sequence of symptoms with the "dying out" of the drug, such symptoms being relieved in constant reverse sequence by the administration of the drug and in exact proportion to the amount so administered. A small amount of morphine will relieve the symptoms last appearing, another insufficient amount will relieve another proportion of the withdrawal symptoms, and another amount another proportion until the amount so administered balances the degree or the quantity of which the addict has been deprived.

This relief is so complete and certain and the suffering resulting from sudden or even gradual withdrawal is so great that one suffering agonies will go to any length to get the required drug or drugs.

The addiction to more than one drug frequently happens, as in the rather frequent case of addiction to both morphine and cocaine.

Because their definite diseased condition is not more generally recognized and understood these unfortunates to the number of hundreds of thousands are compelled to lie, steal, and even to commit murder to obtain sufficient drugs on which their lives seem to depend during their addiction.

Every intelligent physician knows that not every drug addict is a vile creature, sunk in depravity and vice, lost to all sense of decency, but that he may, on the contrary, be an honorable person except in circumstances involving his disease.

A recent report of the United States Treasury Department says:

He will usually lie as to the drug necessary to sustain a moderately comfortable existence, and he will stoop to any subterfuge and even to theft to achieve relief from bodily agonies experienced as a result of the withdrawal of the drug.

There are many instances of cases where victims of this disease are among people of the highest qualities morally and intellectually and of the greatest value to their communities who, when driven by sudden deprivation of their drug, have been led to commit felony or violence to relieve their misery.

This serious situation to society and to the individual addict suggests a modification of our Federal and State laws regulating the prescribing of opium and narcotic drugs, which would prevent this misfortune both to society and to the addict by reasonable regulations which would permit, under the guidance of regularly licensed physicians of the highest standing, the addict to receive legally under proper safeguards and at legally established clinics a barely sufficient amount to make his existence comfortable, while he should be encouraged to support himself and his family until such time as he could seek scientific treatment at reputable public or private hospitals.

In connection with the important matter of proper environment during and after the medical treatment of drug addicts, experience has shown that in the case of far the greater proportion of the whole number (who belong to the so-called underworld class in our large cities) that physical restraint is absolutely necessary in order to effect even a temporary cure in this class of patients.

The city of New York and other large cities in this country have wisely established for the treatment of this class of addicts hospitals in connection with farm colonies which have been given under State laws authority to legally detain and restrain this class, if necessary, in connection with humane medical and scientific treatment.

As stated, about one-half of the drug addicts in the United States are recruited from the so-called underworld classes of our large cities.

About 25 per cent of the whole army of addicts in the United States, and who do not belong to the underworld class, have become addicts as a result of bad associations or bad habits, and the remaining 25 per cent have become addicts, unfortunately, from the administration of morphine or habit-forming drugs administered by general practitioners of medicine who, unfortunately, seem to be grossly ignorant of the possible dan-

gers of the unrestricted use in medical practice of the opiates and narcotic habit-forming drugs.

Contrary to the statements made in sensational newspaper and magazine articles to the effect that addicts prefer to stick to their habit and reject all efforts toward their reform, it is a fact that many of them earnestly desire to be cured, as is shown by the experience of physicians and the special committee appointed in 1917 by the New York State Legislature to investigate the narcotic-drug situation, and which reported in part as follows:

The testimony of physicians coming in contact with addicts and statements of addicts themselves show that those afflicted with this disease express every desire to secure humane and competent treatment and care, and that most narcotic drug users are willing to undergo physical tortures in an effort to be rid of their so-called habit.

While this does not apply so much to the underworld habitués, there are many of these even who earnestly try to shake off the shackles of both disease and habit, and who, after being "cured," as thousands are, as the result of scientific treatment in institutions specially provided for them in a few of our larger cities would gladly keep away from the drug and their old evil associates, but who find on their return from these institutions that they are actually watched and haunted by drug sellers, either representing themselves in drug smuggling or more probably representing one of many powerfully organized national or international syndicates who make millions of dollars of profits in retailing and wholesaling narcotic drugs chiefly, but not entirely, in the larger cities through highly organized smuggling methods that baffle the Federal and State laws. These "dope peddlers" obtain their supplies by smuggling from Canada, Mexico, and along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, while other illegal sources are unprincipled physicians and pharmacists, who supply but an infinitesimal quantity of the enormous whole, as neither the physician nor the pharmacist can divert to illegal use more than a few hundred grains in the course of a year, because of the strict regulation.

The appalling situation here described naturally suggests those reasonable amendments and changes in the provisions and administration of the Harrison antinarcotic law already suggested—that is, this law should be so changed by Congress that reputable physicians and particularly reputable clinics in our large cities and populous districts would be enabled to administer sufficient narcotic drugs to addicts so as to save them from the cruel intrigues of the national and international dope peddlers.

I propose to introduce in the House of Representatives these needed amendments to the Harrison antinarcotic law.

The painful and complicated withdrawal symptoms incident to the withdrawal of the drug, as has been stated, constitutes one of the greatest difficulties both to the patient and to the physician in the treatment of this troublesome class of patients. These withdrawal symptoms, heretofore referred to, suggest many severe physiological disturbances both of a bodily and psychic nature, and these must be seriously taken into consideration in the medical treatment of the patient both from the psychic and drug-treatment viewpoints.

There are practically three methods of medical treatment for drug addiction employed by physicians who have given special attention to this important branch of medical science. One method that is employed very extensively is the substitution of the drug to which the addict is habituated by another drug. This treatment of substituting one narcotic drug for another requires a much shorter period for successful medical treatment in the hands of those physicians who know how to administer it than any other method.

Another method of treatment is known as the gradual reduction treatment, meaning the gradual reduction of the drug of addiction each day over a period of, say, 20 days, until the drug has been completely withdrawn by very small reductions each day until all of the drug has been entirely withdrawn. These two are the more humane and successful methods of treatment.

No permanent results can be obtained by any method of treatment unless the treatment and the convalescence (recovery of nervous tone and physical and will power) extend over a period of from 4 to 12 weeks, or even longer in some cases.

Another method of treatment which, unfortunately, has been employed in many of the prisons and reformatories of this country, and also generally employed in some foreign countries, particularly in Germany, is the inhuman method of simply throwing the drug addict into prison without any particular medical or psychic or other treatment, leaving him to untold and unnecessary suffering and misery in the depressing sur-

roundings of a padded cell or a prison cell. Because of the indescribably painful withdrawal symptoms already mentioned, this last-named method is, of course, both inhuman and unscientific. Hydrotherapy (water cure) and other drugs are also frequently found to be useful, together with proper diet, and so forth.

In my own long experience in the treatment of drug addicts I have come to the conclusion that while the method of substituting another drug for the drug of addiction may be best suited to certain cases, and the so-called gradual withdrawal method may be best suited to certain other cases, the quick withdrawal (in opium addiction) by substituting hyosine hydrobromate for the drug of addiction is far the best and most painless method in the hands of the thoroughly skilled medical specialist, particularly because it involves no suffering whatever, which can not be said of any other method of treatment.

However, the dangers of too large doses of hyosine must be seriously considered, particularly in cases where there is renal or cardiac insufficiency.

ADDENDA.

PRODUCTION OF RAW OPIUM IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES.

The difficulty of obtaining accurate, or even approximately accurate, figures upon the production of opium and poppy acreage in China is practically insurmountable, as will be seen from the following excerpt from the report upon the "Cultivation of the poppy in China" made to the second session of the advisory committee on the traffic in opium of the League of Nations held at Geneva April 19-29, 1922:

"According to these reports (of the Chinese commissioners to the committee) there has been no revival of opium cultivation except on a very small scale, and in isolated cases, where there has been some revival, it has immediately been suppressed. The tenor of the Chinese Government's reply to the questionnaire which was received early this year was to the same effect. Toward the close of last year the British Government issued a blue book (correspondence respecting the cultivation of opium in China. China No. 1 (1921). In continuation of 'China No. 2 (1913),' Cd. 6876, Cmd. 1531, 1921) containing correspondence respecting the cultivation of opium in China, the last dispatch in which is dated June 30, 1921. This blue book contains a mass of evidence as to the revival of cultivation in many Provinces. Evidence to the same effect will be found in the report of the Chinese Maritime Customs for 1920, and the information in these publications is also confirmed by the information on Szechwan and Yunnan in the possession of the French Government, which was supplied to us by the French representative on the committee. The committee feel it is impossible to reconcile the extremely favorable reports presented by the Chinese commissioners with the state of things disclosed in these publications." (League of Nations. Advisory committee on traffic in opium. Report on work of committee during its second session at Geneva, April 19-29, 1922. Aug. 15, 1922; C. 233 (1), 1922. XI (dated Aug. 8, 1922), p. 6.)

The principal factors in obscuring accurate data on poppy cultivation in China are the illegality of the drug trade and the uncertain state of political affairs in southern China.

"In the answers to the questionnaire, after referring to the successful suppression of the cultivation of the poppy, completed in 1917, the report (of the Chinese commissioners) goes on to say that—

"In consequence of China's participation in the Great War there was some illicit planting of poppy in areas where military operations were in progress, north and south, either through laxity of control or failure to investigate; but as soon as these cases were discovered capable officials were sent to make inquiries and the crops were at once eradicated." (League of Nations. Traffic in opium. Summary of answers to the opium questionnaire, 1921, supplemented by other relevant information at the disposal of the advisory committee on traffic in opium during its second session, Apr. 19-29, 1922. C. 171 (1). M. 68 (1), 1922. XI (dated June 1, 1922), p. 10.)

These declarations of the Chinese commissioners as to the successful eradication of the poppy have naturally been brought into question by the advisory committee (as indicated supra) for they are supported neither by the evidence of the diplomatic correspondence of the British Government nor by the inspectorate general of customs of Shanghai. Mr. J. W. H. Ferguson, statistical secretary of the inspectorate, makes the following statement in his report on the China trade, April 16, 1923:

"It will be seen from the following table that over a period of, roughly, six years as much as 410,750 pounds of opium were confiscated. It is to be feared also that the quantities taken, although enormous, must needs be only a small part of the total

amount of opium that is transported clandestinely each year. Indeed, when one reflects that opium is grown openly in several Provinces throughout China, so that ample opportunity is afforded to anyone who desires to do so to procure the drug ad libitum, it is not surprising that doubt is entertained regarding the sagacity and efficacy of prohibition of importation which is not accompanied by rigid suppression of cultivation of the poppy in China." (China. The Maritime Customs. I. Statistical Series, Nos. 2-5. Foreign Trade of China, 1922, part I. Report and Abstract of Statistics. Shanghai, 1923, p. 14.)

This table shows an amount of opium confiscated by customs officers in China in 1921 of 150,104 pounds and in 1922 of 68,500 pounds. Opium is, of course, legally imported into the leased territories of Dairen and Kiowchow, the total gross importation in 1922 amounting to 19.80 piculs (picul equals 133½ English pounds) in 1922. In addition 24.40 piculs of Persian opium were reexported from Dairen to Persia during the year. (China. Maritime Customs, op. cit., p. 13.) These figures throw little light on the actual production of opium in China. The advisory committee at its second session, as noted, supra, had little information on this aspect of the trade. In the summary of answers to the opium questionnaire of 1921 (op. cit. supra) only this appears in Appendix I. Production of raw opium, "China: Large illegal cultivation in several Provinces, including Kweichow, Yunnan, Szechwan, and Turkestan."

Persia was slow to adhere to The Hague convention of 1912 for the suppression of the opium trade (incorporated in the treaty of Versailles), but has now signed the convention, without ratification. In signing the convention she made a reservation in regard to article 3(a), which requires the contracting powers to "take measures to prevent the export of raw opium to countries which shall have prohibited its entry." (League of Nations. Advisory committee on opium. Report on work of second session, p. 3.)

Persia made no reply to the opium questionnaire of the advisory committee. (League of Nations. Traffic in opium. Summary of answers. Appendix I.)

The only reliable data, therefore, available which are likely to illumine the question of Persian opium production must be sought in the Persian export trade. In 1915 Persia exported 134,641½ batmans of opium. This amount equated in terms of kilograms is about 403,923, which in turn becomes approximately 888,630 English pounds. (Statistique Commerciale de la Perse. Tableau Général du Commerce avec les Pays étrangers, 21 Mar., 1914-20 Mar., 1915. Teheran, 1915, p. 115.)

In 1920, 73,000 kilograms (approximately 160,600 pounds) of Persian opium were transhipped at Bombay. (League of Nations. Advisory committee: Summary, etc., cit. supra, Appendix 2.)

[Mangum Weeks, 10 January, 1924.]

LIST OF COUNTRIES THAT COULD ENGAGE IN THE OPIUM TRAFFIC WITH CHINA UNDER TREATIES CONTAINING PROVISIONS SIMILAR TO THE BRITISH TREATY OF TIENTSIN OF 1858.

United States treaty of 1858 practically adopted the trade regulations and tariff of the British treaty of same date. This remained in force until treaty of 1880.

Austria-Hungary treaty of 1869 adopted rules, etc., of British treaty of Tientsin.

Belgium treaty of 1865 adopted rules, etc., of British treaty of Tientsin.

Denmark treaty of 1863 adopted rules, etc., of British treaty of Tientsin.

France treaty of 1858 adopted rules, etc., of British treaty of Tientsin, modified at various times.

Great Britain treaty of Tientsin, 1858.

Italy treaty of 1866 adopted British provisions.

Peru treaty of 1875 adopted British provisions.

Portugal treaty of 1862 adopted British provisions.

Russia treaty of 1858 adopted British provisions.

Spain treaty of 1867 adopted British provisions.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the following-named majority members of the new Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, which I send to the Clerk's desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation: ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of South Dakota, chairman; HOMER P. SNYDER, of New York; ROBERT LUCE, of Massachusetts; WILLIAM N. VALLE, of Colorado; RANDOLPH PERKINS, of New Jersey; R. G. FITZGERALD, of Ohio; JAMES H. MACLAFFERTY, of California; BIRD J. VINCENT, of Michigan; ERNEST W. GIBSON, of Vermont; GEORGE A. WELSH, of Pennsylvania; ROBERT G. SIMMONS, of Nebraska; and T. J. B. ROBINSON, of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio that the gentlemen named be elected to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table, the Delegate from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes and to present a resolution from the Congress of Porto Rico.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the Delegate from Porto Rico be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes to-morrow on the subject indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5078) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the committee rose the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] had offered two amendments, which had been read for the information of the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto may close in 35 minutes; 10 minutes to be assigned to the gentleman from Oklahoma Mr. McKEOWN, 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma Mr. HASTINGS, 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio Mr. BEGG, and 5 minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, to be controlled as indicated in the request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 19, after the word "Choctaw," strike out the word "Chickasaw."

Mr. McKEOWN. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the other amendment be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that the other amendment be read for information. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 22, after the word "officials," insert "other than the governor of the Chickasaw Nation."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes under the agreement.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this proposition involves not an appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States, but it involves an appropriation out of the funds of the Chickasaw Nation. I make the assertion that the bill presented by this committee does not represent any suggestion on the part of the bureau, nor does it represent any suggestion on the part of the Indians themselves. This question may not be of great importance to the House or the people of the United States, but it is of vital importance as to whether or not the Committee on Appropriations can assume not only to repeal the present law, but to repeal the Indian laws that have been approved by the President of the United States. This is the money of the Chickasaw Nation, and it is not the money of the United States. This committee says that the expenses of the governor of the Chickasaw Nation shall be reduced, without any request from the department or any showing in the record or the hearings that justified the reduction. The governor of the Chickasaws was elected by the Chickasaws themselves; his salary was provided for by the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation, and his expenses are provided for. What do you propose to do? You say that this nation, although it has \$12,000,000 in the custody of the United States, will not permit its governor to come to Washington to represent his people before Congress, to represent his people in the courts of the country where there are over \$2,000,000 worth of claims involved against them now. Instead of having one attorney for the Chickasaws, one for the Choctaws, and one for the Creeks they want to have one attorney to represent the three tribes when the Chickasaw Nation has a claim against the Choctaw Nation for \$2,000,000. How is that attorney going to represent both nations with conflicting interests? Now, it does not make any difference to me personally.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will.

Mr. CARTER. Has any action been brought by any attorney against the Choctaw Nation in favor of the Chickasaws—is there any action pending in the court for any claims of one tribe against the other?

Mr. McKEOWN. No action at this time, but the gentleman knows that there is a claim on what is called the Arkansas line claim of the Chickasaws against the Choctaws of over \$400,000. You are going to say that the Chickasaws have to pay one-third of the attorney's fees, and the Chickasaws say that if you can not give them an attorney they do not want to be charged with the one-third of the fees of an attorney to represent the three tribes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman any understanding as to how much these attorney fees will amount to?

Mr. McKEOWN. The attorney fees are all fixed—about \$5,000. I say strike out the Chickasaws, because we do not want to pay one-third of the salary of a lawyer to represent the three tribes. Strike it out, and we will do without it, but give us the expense account which is provided for in the amendment of mine to the effect that in traveling away from home the law shall remain as it is now. What right has the committee to come in here and change the law without recommendation or any hearing? The committee wants to change not only the written laws as they exist but it goes out of its way to try and change the Indian law. I think Congress has enough to do in changing its own laws without fooling with the Indian law. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, this is a serious proposition from our standpoint as to the encroachment of jurisdiction. If you are going to allow them to change the existing law which does not involve any money of the Government in the United States Treasury but only the money of the Chickasaw Indians which is being held in trust—

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the gentleman think that the United States Government ought to handle the trust funds of these Indians with as strict accountability and fidelity as it would its own funds?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will agree with the gentleman, and I say furthermore that you have put these Indians in fine shape. You have a law on the statute books that they can not make a contract with any lawyer, and now you are going to cut off the attorney who represents them, and you have them in fine shape. They can not present any kind of a claim against the United States. If you think that is just, if you think it is right to treat these Indians in that way in the management of their own funds, very well; but to me it seems like saying to a fellow, "I am your guardian over your funds, and I will give you no money to go to school, and you can not make a contract to get any money with which to go to school, and you must get your education in the best way you can." I say it is wrong in principle, and that is the fight here. It is immaterial to me personally whether you do it or you do not do it, but I am raising my voice of protest to the action of the committee in changing this amount. It is a very little amount that is involved, but it is a great principle.

It is not a question of amount. We spend more money in discussing it here. It will cost more money in discussing this than it would to pay the sum, if it came out of the Treasury of the United States. It is not that, however; it is the question of the right of this committee to change the written law of the Congress; and not only that, but to change the Indian law and to do it without a hearing, upon their own initiative, without any request from the Interior Department anywhere. They have a few letters from some Indians down there. You can always get letters of protest to the expenditure of any fund. I am not going to take up any more of your time.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. In what way does the bill change the Indian law?

Mr. McKEOWN. It changes the Indian law in this particular. This particular governor of the Chickasaw Nation is not an officer of the United States. He was elected by the people of Chickasaw Nation, and the statute under which his salary is fixed and his per diem is fixed was passed by the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation and approved by the President of the United States. These gentlemen now assume to change that on their own initiative and on their own ideas of economy,

It is all right for them to go to the committee and pass this legislation. I did not raise any point or order, because I wanted to thrash the thing out on the floor and have it settled whether or not they can do that.

Mr. STENGLER. I understand from the gentleman's claim that no representative of the Chickasaw Tribe appeared before this committee on this matter.

Mr. McKEOWN. Nobody appeared in the hearings before the committee asking for this reduction, and nobody from the department asked for this reduction. The committee has done it on its own initiative.

Mr. STENGLER. Without any request from anybody?

Mr. McKEOWN. There is no request in the hearings and no testimony in the hearings. I read all of it. There is no testimony that anybody has asked the department to stop this appropriation out of the Indian funds. Of course, my colleagues may have some very strong personal reasons why it should be done, but I say that does not justify the committee in assuming jurisdiction which they have not got and do not possess.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I think the consideration of this paragraph and this amendment affords an opportunity in a fitting manner for my protest against the delays in winding up the affairs of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians.

This bill continues the principal chief of the Chickasaws and the governor of the Choctaws for another year, one mining trustee for both tribes, one tribal attorney for the Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Creeks, and also the principal chief of the Creek Nation at a salary of not to exceed \$600 per annum. The expenses are limited to \$1,500.

The continuation of the terms of these tribal officers is subject to a point of order. I am not making it at this time but want to indicate now that in my judgment the tribal officers representing the several tribes should actively cooperate with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the other Indian officials to the end that the affairs of these tribes should be speedily wound up and the funds belonging to the enrolled members and their heirs distributed at the earliest possible date.

The Choctaws and Chickasaws made an agreement with the commission representing the Government of the United States, on April 23, 1897, providing for the enrollment of their citizens, the allotment of their lands, and the distribution of their money. This has been almost 27 years ago. This agreement was ratified by Congress June 28, 1898, almost 26 years ago. Since that time the rolls have been completed, the lands have all been allotted, and yet the winding up of the affairs of these tribes has been dragged along over more than a quarter of a century. By section 2 of the act of April 26, 1906, Congress became weary of the delays in closing the rolls of the Five Tribes and provided that these rolls should be closed March 4, 1907, almost 17 years ago. Prior to that time practically all of the lands had been allotted, because allotments were being made to the members as their final enrollments were approved on schedules forwarded to the Interior Department.

Seventeen years since the closing of the rolls have dragged along, and yet the tribal affairs of the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Seminoles have not been closed up. If such a delay were encountered in the administration of any estate it would bankrupt it. I have no patience with this delay, and as long as I am permitted to serve the second congressional district in the House I am going to continue to protest on the floor of the House and in the departments and everywhere against any further delay. Let me say that the lands have all been allotted, their surplus lands sold, the lands reserved as timberlands have been sold, the surface of the segregated mineral lands have been sold, and the money all collected. There remains in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations the sale of the coal and asphalt deposits. Congress passed an act for the sale of these coal deposits. It is now a question of administration and not one of legislation. My colleague upon this committee, Mr. CARTER, who has been a valuable Member of this House since 1907, and myself labored together for a number of years—before I became a Member of the House—in securing legislation looking to the winding up of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes. The other members of the Oklahoma delegation have consistently supported all legislation looking to the winding up of the affairs of these tribes. The fault does not lie with any member of the Oklahoma delegation. It must be elsewhere. I do not believe anyone would accuse me of being unreasonable when I invite the attention of the House to the fact that the first agreements with the Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Creeks were made in 1897, and the rolls completed in 1907, 17 years ago. Surely these estates should be administered and the lands allotted and their funds distributed long before this time.

Permit me to contrast the management of the Cherokee affairs with the other tribes. The Cherokees are the largest in point of numbers, there being 41,824 enrolled members. The Choctaws have 20,799 and the Chickasaws 6,304. As above stated, the Choctaws and Chickasaws made an agreement in 1897. The Cherokees five years thereafter, in 1902, ratified the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, proposing a plan looking to the allotment of their lands and the distribution of their money. Their rolls were made and completed March 4, 1907, just when the rolls of the other tribes were completed, almost 17 years ago. For years I was tribal attorney for the Cherokees.

I assisted in trying their lawsuits. I insisted upon their cases being advanced on the dockets for trial, and they had a number of important lawsuits before the Court of Claims and the Supreme Court. Their cases were all advanced and tried and the contract of their last tribal attorney terminated June 30, 1914, almost 10 years ago; yet tribal attorneys are yet in existence for the Choctaws, Chickasaws, and the Creeks. The Choctaws and the Chickasaws have a right, I repeat, to complain of these delays. During my service in this House, and while a member of the Indian Committee, in conjunction with my colleague [Mr. CARTER] and the other members of the Oklahoma delegation, who have always taken an active interest in all affairs pertaining to our State, succeeded in having all legislation enacted necessary to wind up the affairs of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes. A number of years ago we passed an act providing for the sale of the coal deposits. This act expired because of a limitation in the bill. We reenacted this measure subsequent to that time in an amended form, so that the department now has authority to dispose of the coal deposits. I want the Choctaws and Chickasaws to get every dollar that this coal land is worth. I want the coal deposits sold upon the most advantageous terms, but I must insist that those charged with the responsibility of administering this law should actively set themselves about the task of intelligently administering this act and in finding out the best and surest means of disposing of the coal deposits so that the proceeds may be distributed among the enrolled members of these tribes. I have stated there are 20,799 Choctaws and 6,304 Chickasaws. It is estimated that one-half of this number are now dead—a sad commentary upon our delay in doing things. No Member of Congress would stand for this delay a minute if it applied to winding up an estate in which he had an individual interest. No member of the Indian Office would stand for it a minute. The people of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes are impatient with this delay. True, they want the greatest amount they can get, and I want them to have it; but as the members of the tribes die it becomes difficult to determine the question of heirship, and I know I speak the sentiment of the two tribes when I say that while they want the greatest amount of money that can be secured for their coal deposits, they do insist on having these coal deposits disposed of within a reasonable time and their affairs wound up and all money paid to them. I know of cases among the Cherokees where the cost of determining the heirs far exceeded the estate. I know of a few cases where the notary fees in taking the deeds to fractional parts of land, together with the expense of going from one place to another to secure the deeds, was in excess of the value of the land conveyed. In 1910 the Court of Claims changed the method of making the emigrant Cherokee payment from a per stirpes to a per capita payment because of the difficulty in determining the heirs. If this matter of winding up the affairs of the tribes is delayed much longer the Choctaws and Chickasaws will have the same state of affairs to contend with.

During my previous service in this House I cooperated with the Oklahoma delegation in securing per capita payments to the Choctaws and Chickasaws in amounts to the aggregate of \$800, and finally my colleague [Mr. CARTER] and myself secured an amendment to the Indian appropriation bill, approved February 14, 1920, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to disburse all available Choctaw and Chickasaw funds per capita, which provision is as follows:

Provided further, That until further provided by Congress the Secretary of the Interior, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, is authorized to make per capita payments of not to exceed \$200 annually hereafter to the enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribes, or to their lawful heirs, of all the available money held by the Government of the United States for the benefit of said tribes in excess of that required for expenditures authorized by annual appropriations made therefrom or by existing law.

An inquiry of the Indian Office disclosed the Choctaws have \$881,707.84 to their credit and the Chickasaws have \$207,487.86

to their credit. Other money will be collected between now and June 30. There has been a period of depression throughout Oklahoma because of bad crop conditions, the boll weevil, and in the oil districts, and I sincerely hope the department will distribute whatever funds the Choctaws and Chickasaws have to their credit available for distribution under the above authorization immediately after June 30 of this year.

I know it may be said that the Choctaws and Chickasaws have some litigation pending—a suit by J. F. McMurray against the two tribes—but that suit has been pending for more than five years. I know it was pending three years ago when I was on the Indian Committee. If this case had been actively pressed, the testimony should have been closed, the case advanced on the docket, and it could have been disposed of. With this case disposed of, and with the coal deposits sold, and perhaps a few remaining town lots sold, and collections made of the balances due upon the tracts of land sold, the affairs of these tribes could be wound up.

It will be remembered that under existing law the restrictions against alienation expire on April 26, 1931. The sale of these coal deposits must be speedily pressed in order that the proceeds may be collected and distributed prior to that date. Surely no Member of Congress will consider me impatient when I voice the unanimous protest of the entire citizenship of these tribes against these delays; and may I express the hope that what I say here will burn itself upon the minds of the tribal officials who are continued by the provisions of this act, and upon the officials of the Government as well, to the end that they will at least give some thought and action to the winding up of the affairs of these tribes.

The Indians are entitled to have their money now, and the State of Oklahoma is entitled to some consideration, and is entitled to have these coal deposits developed and made taxable, and the cities and towns of eastern Oklahoma are deeply interested, because the development of these coal deposits would add materially to the growth and prosperity of these cities and towns. We should not be afraid to accept responsibility. The officials charged with administering the act for the sale of coal deposits should so administer the law to get the largest possible amount of money for these Indians, but I submit that it was contemplated when the act was passed that the sale should be made within a reasonable time.

I know that during the war there was some excuse for delay and some excuse since the war, but I insist now that some steps should be taken looking to the disposition of these coal deposits; and while there should be an honest effort to get every dollar possible for the enrolled members of the tribe, I want to insist again that these lands should be sold and the proceeds distributed to the enrolled members entitled to it and not to their grandchildren.

The hearings contain the following information as to the expenditures for the year 1923 for tribal officers:

Statement of expenditures of tribal officers of the Five Civilized Tribes for the fiscal year 1923.

Name.	Location.	Office.	Salary.	Expenses.
Chickasaw:				
Douglas H. Johnston.	Milburn, Okla.	Governor.	\$3,000	\$1,985.82
G. G. McVay.	Ardmore, Okla.	Attorney.	5,000	2,518.00
Walter Colbert.	do.	Mining trustee.	4,000	
Eastman Johnston.	Tishomingo, Okla.	Interpreter.	300	
Ludie Johnston.	Milburn, Okla.	Secretary.	1,000	
W. T. Ward.	Tishomingo, Okla.	Representative land sales.	95	
Total.			13,395	4,501.82
Choctaw:				
William Semple.	Durant, Okla.	Principal chief.	2,000	216.64
William Harrison.	Poteau, Okla.	do.	2,000	2,176.19
E. O. Clark.	Stigler, Okla.	Attorney.	5,000	2,196.48
W. E. L. Durant.	Durant, Okla.	Mining trustee.	4,000	
Miss John Rogers.	Stigler, Okla.	Stenographer.	1,500	
Mrs. J. F. McCurtain.	Tuskahoma, Okla.	Custodian.	225	
Miss Shirley Gourley.	Poteau, Okla.	Stenographer.	1,000	
Louisa Reed.	Durant, Okla.	do.	1,000	
Miss Miriam Hoge.	Poteau, Okla.	do.	1,800	
John G. Farr.	Antlers, Okla.	Representative land sales.	95	
Total.			17,820	4,578.31
Creek:				
Washington, Grayson.	Eufaula, Okla.	Principal chief.	2,000	714.01
A. J. Ward.	Muskogee, Okla.	Attorney.	5,000	1,536.91
Sarah Tyler.	do.	Stenographer.	1,500	
Mrs. Gladys Whitten.	do.	do.	27	
Mrs. Curtis Locke.	do.	do.	21	
Total.			8,548	2,250.92
Seminole:				
Davis, Mrs. Alice B.	Wewoka, Okla.	Principal chief.	85	4.14

School representatives.

Choctaw, Samuel B. Spring	\$1,200
Chickasaw, Joe Newberry	600
Seminole, Stanton E. Brown	450
Cherokee, vacant	1,400
Creek	None

And the following is a statement taken from the hearings, of the funds belonging to the various tribes:

Mr. MERITT. I have here a statement of the amount of funds to the credit of each tribe there, which are as follows:

	Balances in Treasury.	Balances to the credit of disbursing officer Five Civilized Tribes Oct. 31, 1923.
CHOCTAW.		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor:		
Choctaw royalties, etc.	\$11,150.59	
Choctaw royalties, etc. (Ed., 1924)	5,630.00	
Choctaw royalties, etc. (inclusive of C., 1924)	90.00	
Choctaw town lots.	1,328.91	
Choctaw unallotted lands.	109,955.85	\$99,971.92
Choctaw unallotted lands (advertising and sale, 1924)	1,000.00	2,205.69
Choctaw unallotted lands (Ed., 1924)	73,761.51	596.66
Choctaw unallotted lands (inclusive of C., 1924)	3,534.00	515.00
Choctaw unallotted lands (sale of coal and asphalt lands)	3,089.54	967.74
Interest on Choctaw 3 per cent fund.	1.03	
Interest on Choctaw moneys on deposit in banks, act of Mar. 3, 1911.	101,037.97	2,261.40
Fulfilling treaties with Choctaws, Oklahoma.	21,090.00	
Total.	332,269.40	
Tribal funds on deposit in Oklahoma banks.	442,950.03	
Grand total.	775,219.43	106,488.41
CHICKASAW.		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor:		
Chickasaw royalties, etc.	1,172.54	
Chickasaw royalties, etc. (Ed., 1924)	1,905.00	
Chickasaw royalties, etc. (inclusive of C., 1924)	30.00	
Chickasaw town lots.	1,665.70	
Chickasaw unallotted lands.	16,698.75	13,695.78
Chickasaw unallotted lands (advertising and sale, 1924)	300.00	768.56
Chickasaw unallotted lands (Ed., 1924)	71,267.35	661.72
Chickasaw unallotted lands (inclusive of C., 1924)	1,680.00	340.33
Chickasaw unallotted lands (sale of coal and asphalt lands)	1,245.86	316.05
Interest on Chickasaw moneys on deposit in banks, act of Mar. 3, 1911.	6,335.03	1,103.12
Total.	102,238.23	
Tribal funds on deposit in Oklahoma banks.	88,804.07	
Grand total.	190,542.30	16,945.56
CREEK.		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor:		
Creek royalties, etc.	100.29	
Creek town lots.	22,661.60	
Creek town lots (Ed., 1924)	11,776.98	166.68
Creek town lots (inclusive of C., 1924)	1,500.00	16.00
Creek unallotted lands.	15,133.47	6,704.87
Creek unallotted lands (Ed., 1924)	3,744.30	
Creek unallotted lands (tribal salaries and expenses)	0,680.22	
Compromise settlements, United States v. Individual Creek Indians.	2,400.00	
Compromise settlement, suit of United States v. Yabe Gano et al., Creek Nation.	1,860.00	
Compromise settlement, suit of United States v. Yabe Gano et al., Creek Nation (Ed., 1924).	35,110.00	
Compromise settlement, suit of United States v. Yabe Gano et al., Creek Nation (inclusive of C., 1924).	1,240.00	
Creek general fund.	12,878.88	
Creek general fund, equalization expenses.	8,841.77	
Interest on Creek general fund.	7,055.74	
Fulfilling treaties with Creeks.	551.45	
Interest on Creek moneys on deposit in banks, act of Mar. 3, 1911.	7,909.55	
Total.	141,947.25	6,887.55
SEMINOLE.		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor:		
Seminole Nation.	11,457.23	
Seminole Nation (Ed., 1924)	8,842.94	
Seminole Nation (inclusive of C., 1924)	1,820.32	
Seminole Nation, unallotted lands.	298.00	
Interest on Seminole general fund.	104.11	
Interest on Seminole in Oklahoma fund.	92.46	
Seminole school fund.	137,036.18	
Interest on Seminole school fund.	2,364.51	
Interest on Seminole school fund (Ed., 1924)	3,724.65	266.66
Interest on Seminole moneys on deposit in banks, act of Mar. 3, 1911.	655.26	
Total.	160,404.66	266.66

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I would like to have reported, so that the gentlemen in the committee may know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment now pending. The amendment of the gentleman may be now read for information.

Mr. BEGG. That is the purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BEGG: In line 18, page 21, after the word "attorney," insert the word "each."

Mr. BEGG. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if my amendment should prevail, that leaves the question of the attorneys for these various tribes—three tribes—just exactly as the law now is. I shall not stand up here and pose to you as an expert on Indian affairs, but here is the situation that seems to me apparent to the intelligence of a man if he had never seen an Indian. What is the situation? Here are three Indian tribes, separate and distinct, each possessing quite a lot of money, and suits pending against each of the individual tribes by individuals against the tribes, and also suits pending against the tribes jointly. Now, the purpose of this amendment—and I will say the committee has exceeded their authority, in my judgment, when they brought in this provision changing the original law—but the only argument I can conceive of why the committee wanted to do this was to save the salary of two attorneys, in the amount approximately of \$10,000.

I am in entire sympathy with the idea of saving money every chance you can, both for the Government and for the Indians and for yourselves; but let me submit that when cases are involved and pending before courts—cases that involve nearly \$2,000,000 in an individual case—would you submit your cause before the court to the hands of an attorney when his interests require that he shall look after the defendant in the case as well as the prosecution? And if this provision of the committee is carried and becomes a part of the law Commissioner Burke, if he is looking after the interests of all the tribes, will be forced to go on the outside and hire an attorney for either the plaintiff or the defendant, and the chances are that he will pay a little more than the little \$5,000 salary for the one case involved.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BEGG. I will yield for a brief question. My time is short.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman think it unfair for one nation to pay part of the compensation of an attorney representing another nation?

Mr. BEGG. Certainly. All my amendment does is to restore the law.

Here is another thing: If the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] is absolutely accurate—I do not question his intention to be accurate—but if he is accurate and my amendment carries, no doubt it will be done, because these attorneys can not be appointed without the approval of the President of the United States, and the President is not noted for extravagance and waste, and if they are not needed he will not appoint them.

Let me give you a little fact. There is one case, No. 33996, that involves a total amount of money of \$615,506.31. That is a case where the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes are jointly interested.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is that in the Court of Claims?

Mr. BEGG. Yes; that is in the Court of Claims.

Mr. HASTINGS. How long has it been pending?

Mr. BEGG. That does not make any difference, whether it has been pending one hour or a hundred years. The tribe of Indians should not be blamed, neither should the present attorney, if the attorney appointed in the past has not been up to his job. In that case it would be the duty of the department to remove him, because the President makes the appointment. So that argument, to me, falls flat, and I am not interested a nickel's worth. It is merely a matter of equity and justice to the people for whom we are responsible.

Now, here is a case pending against the Choctaw Nation. It is not a joint case. How can the man who represents the Choctaw Nation defend an individual suit with absolute equity and fairness and a joint suit the next day?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, in order that I may finish this statement, I am going to ask unanimous consent that I be granted two minutes additional outside of the time allotted.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not in accordance with the rule.

Mr. BEGG. That is in accordance with the rule. I beg leave to differ with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that when the time has been fixed by the committee it can not be extended by unanimous consent.

Mr. CRAMTON. Just one word. It may save time. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield two minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio. I have five minutes under the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that he may yield two minutes of his time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. Here is another case filed against the Choctaw Nation. The amount involved is \$1,002,013.76, and the amount in dispute in those tribes, individually and jointly, is over \$1,935,933.27. Now I submit, my friends, is it good policy to say that one attorney shall represent all three when these suits are jointly and individually filed against the tribe, when we are going to save only \$10,000, and we may be called upon to expend of the tribe's fund \$10,000 to defend a single suit if we have to go out in the open market and hire another lawyer?

In whatever time I have remaining I want to read and insert a letter from Mr. William H. Harrison, from Poteau, Okla., who is, I am advised, a reputable and high-class attorney, and he thinks in exactly the opposite way from our good friends CARTER and HASTINGS. He thinks this would be a mistake from the standpoint of economy as well as a mistake from the standpoint of protecting the interests of all the litigants in the suit. He says:

I further protest against the combining of the office of the Choctaw tribal attorney with any other tribe for the reason that there is a large amount of important litigation involving the Choctaw Nation that is not yet settled; suits in which persons are attempting to recover several million dollars from the Choctaw Tribe are still pending. I have in mind one suit in particular with its great mass of evidence, and has questions involved which require the whole time of one lawyer until it is settled; hence if one attorney is appointed for any two or three of the tribes mentioned, he will have to neglect some of this litigation, to the great financial loss of the tribe concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert the balance of the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to insert the balance of the letter. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. This is the remainder of the letter:

Further, many persons are also seeking to bring suits against the Choctaw Nation for many and various claims and for large sums of money. The attorneys for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations have already saved the tribe large sums of money by their good legal services rendered. For the reasons I have above set forth, the tribal attorneys for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations should be retained, at least, until the litigation against the tribe has been settled.

It is my opinion that all of the officers and employees of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations should be retained as they have been, and at the same compensation, until some disposition has been made of the property and litigation affecting such tribes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] has just read you a letter which some of you may think is from a disinterested party. My friend took cautious care to refrain from telling you who that letter was from; he carefully guarded that. That letter is from one of the best Indians in the United States, a high-class, cultured lawyer, and chief of the Choctaw Tribe, one whose expense account is being cut by this very amendment. Among his other virtues Chief Harrison is a truthful man, and I only call attention to these facts to show that he is not wholly a disinterested witness.

The gentleman's amendment ought not to prevail. The gentleman is mistaken as to how much saving this is to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes. He told you it would save only \$10,000. Under this appropriation last year there was expended for the tribal attorneys for the Choctaws, Creeks, and Chickasaws \$15,000 in salary and \$6,228 in expenses, to say nothing of three or four thousand dollars extra expenses for stenographers and secretaries.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. In a moment. Making a grand total of \$21,228 expended last year out of tribal funds for attorneys alone. Our amendment proposes that not more than \$6,000 shall be expended, so that it saves \$15,000—almost 75 per cent of the total.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. Let the gentleman's question be brief.

Mr. BEGG. The question is brief. I concede the right to regulate the expenditure of the tribal fund, but I think it is an error of judgment to deprive them of the tribal attorney.

Mr. CARTER. I only want to call the gentleman's attention to the statement of Mr. Meritt, the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs. When questioned as to whether there was any necessity for a Choctaw and Chickasaw attorney, both of them, Mr. Meritt replied:

It is my judgment that one attorney will be sufficient to handle the work of the three nations at an early date.

This bill does not take effect until July 1 next; that must be conceded to be an early date, so that these attorneys ought to be able to take care of all the business of these tribes.

Now, just a word in reference to what my friend said as to the conflict between these tribes.

There is some small conflict between the Choctaws and Chickasaws. I am a member of the Chickasaw Tribe and have been familiar with their affairs since I was a baby. I have been a member of their tribal council before we had statehood; I have held several tribal positions; and I am now very greatly delighted to have our new Great White Father from Ada tell us how to run our affairs.

As I say, there are some conflicts, but they would not be likely to occur during the next fiscal year, because no authorization has been made for the adjudication of those matters by any court. When that conflict arises you will find no stronger advocate of adequate counsel for both those tribes than I myself will be at that time; but until that time comes why have three attorneys? Why make an appropriation to apply during the year 1925 for a contingency not likely to arise before the fiscal year 1926?

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I did not interfere with the gentleman, and he had more time than I have. But I will yield for a short question.

Mr. BEGG. I simply want to ask the gentleman whether the cost to the Government and the tribes will not be greater under his plan than under this plan?

Mr. CARTER. Why, certainly not; I am as positive as I am of anything on earth that it will be less. As a matter of fact, we will save \$15,000 to the tribe and, in my opinion, will not lose \$1 in any other way.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am so much in accord with the gentleman from Oklahoma in this matter that I should like to yield my other three minutes to him, so that he may make a full statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] asks unanimous consent to yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for one minute?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] was the last attorney for his tribe and that there has not been one for that tribe during the last eight years?

Mr. CARTER. That is true, and let me say a word on that. When the Dawes Commission came to Oklahoma—and that commission came there for the purpose of making a treaty with those tribes and for the purpose of winding up their affairs—it found those tribes very antagonistic.

The Cherokees, being a virile tribe, showed a great deal of antagonism to these things the Government wanted to do. Now, the Choctaws and Chickasaws were the first ones—as I said one time in a public meeting—to take water, but the old chief of the Creeks arose in that meeting and said, "No; you mean the Choctaws and Chickasaws were the first ones to take their medicine." As a matter of fact, the Choctaws and Chickasaws were the first ones to treat with the Government, and the treaty which was made provided that their affairs should be wound up in eight years from June 28, 1898. Now, here we are lapped over in the twentieth century; 26 years have elapsed and still those affairs have not been wound up.

On the other hand, the Cherokees—and they were vigorous fighters, reluctant to agree to anything the Federal Government wanted them to do—were the last to agree to the Government's demand, yet they were the first, under the able and efficient management of their affairs by the gentleman now representing that district in Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], to wind up their affairs. As the gentleman from Oklahoma has said, we have passed all the legislation necessary; we have done everything that is necessary for a final settlement of their affairs; Congress has done all it can do and it is now simply a matter of administration. I agree with him, and I am not casting any reflection upon anybody when I say there seems to have been some dilatoriness in closing up these affairs, but I think this would help in closing them up.

I do not think anybody will consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma seriously. The bill as amended yesterday provided a limitation of \$1,500 on the annual expense account of each chief. Now, the gentleman from Oklahoma seeks to take this particular chief out from under the limitation and give him an unlimited account, while the chief in my district and in the other district represented by Mr. HASTINGS would be limited to \$1,500.

There is one real good reason why this particular chief should be made an exception; so good that I really regret to find myself unable to go with my friend. He should really be entitled to more compensation than any of these others, because he is about the only Democrat left among these tribal officials. Then there is another splendid reason for giving him a preference. In addition to being a capable, efficient chief, he is one of the strongest political factors in his section, and his section is embraced within the district represented by my colleague who offers this amendment.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will not the gentleman also say about this gentleman that he has saved by individual efforts \$30,000,000 to the people of his tribe?

Mr. CARTER. I could not say just how much he has saved; but he has been a conscientious and faithful chief, doing his duty all the time, and for that reason I think his salary ought to be continued, and he should be given a reasonable expense account. His salary is \$3,000 a year. The salary of the Choctaw chief is only \$2,000. The salary of the Creek chief is only \$600 a year. I think it would be hardly fair to the balance of the chiefs to single one out and make his expense account unlimited. If the gentleman wanted to offer this amendment, why did he not offer it so as to leave the law as it is today and make all their expense accounts unlimited.

Mr. McKEOWN. I expected the gentleman to take care of his own chief.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I am going to take care of my own chief; but when I do take care of him I must also take care of all other members of the tribes and conserve the expenditure of their funds to the end that per capita distribution of their funds may be resumed some time in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired and the question is, first, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 21, line 19, after the word "Choctaw," strike out the word "Chickasaw."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Another amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 21, line 22, after the word "officials," insert "other than the governor of the Chickasaw Nation."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEGG: In line 18, page 21, after the word "attorney," insert the word "each."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEGG) there were—yeas 13, nays 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of lands for the homeless Indians in California, including improvements thereon, for the use and occupancy of said Indians, \$8,000, said funds to be expended under such regulations and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] yesterday spoke of certain matters which I have called to the attention of the Indian Office. I think the committee will be interested in hearing the letters, which I have sent to the desk to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letters will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, January 25, 1924.

MY DEAR MR. CRAMTON: Reference is made herein to the statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1924, concerning the case of Maud Lee Mudd, a minor Indian heir of the estate of Lucy Lotson Beaver Perry, a deceased Indian, and to the employment by the guardian of Maud Lee Mudd of Hon. T. A. Chandler to represent the interest of the minor in the above-mentioned estate in the probate courts of Oklahoma and before the Department of the Interior. Reference is also made to your informal inquiry in regard to the matter.

The contract of the guardian with Hon. T. A. Chandler was not submitted to or approved by this department. It is understood, however, that Mr. Chandler's employment in the case was approved by the county court. No payment of fees to Mr. Chandler for his services under his above-mentioned employment has been approved or authorized by this department out of any individual Osage, Quapaw, or other restricted individual Indian funds of Maud Lee Mudd or out of the restricted estate of Lucy Lotson Beaver Perry, deceased.

Cordially yours,

CHAS. H. BURKE, Commissioner.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, January 25, 1924.

Mr. CRAMTON: We have a proposed bill which will shortly be introduced in the Congress having for its purpose modification of existing law with reference to guardians of restricted Indians in the Five Tribes, that we hope may be enacted at an early date, that will, we believe, stop extravagance, if not scandal, and be for the better protection of the Indians.

Cordially yours,

CHAS. H. BURKE, Commissioner.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
House of Representatives.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma yesterday in no way tried to reflect upon the Interior Department in the statement he made regarding this fee. The gentleman from Oklahoma knowing from the records and from the services that were to be performed in this case that the fee allowed was out of the ordinary, called attention to the fact for the purpose of stopping the payment of that and other fees if this has not yet been passed. I agree with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that there should be some legislation regulating the handling of probate matters in Oklahoma, and I am now preparing legislation of that kind, and, if necessary, will ask this Congress to investigate some cases before I get through.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance and support and improvement of the homesteads of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, \$200,000, to be paid from the funds held by the United States in trust for said Indians and to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1925, a detailed statement as to all moneys expended as provided for herein.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word so that I may ask the chairman a

question. Will you please explain why this item has been reduced from \$250,000 per year to \$200,000 per year?

Mr. CARTER. I think I can answer that question, if the gentleman has not the information at hand. While the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] is looking it up, I will say that the bureau advised us that the funds of these tribes were getting so low that it would be necessary to cut down the amount appropriated for them annually.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Another question. Can the gentleman give the committee information as to the amount of funds on hand to the credit of these respective tribes of Indians?

Mr. CARTER. The last information I got about it was over the phone from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He told me, but I really have not it clear enough in mind to state it now. I do not know the exact amount, but he said it was considerably reduced and if there was not a reduction this year they may not be able to make a distribution of the funds next year.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the former bills had carried items to the extent of \$250,000 per year and this bill reduces that amount to \$200,000. There must be some good reason for it, and I was trying to develop the reason for this decrease. There are quite a number of Indians involved in these tribes, and a reduction of 20 per cent in the amount of the per capita payment will be considerable.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman that from my examination of the hearings there is not an exact statement as to the condition of the funds, but my understanding is the same as that of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], and such statement as there is in the hearing would justify the belief that it was because of a reduction in the amount of money available that this amount was reduced.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Would the chairman of the committee object to an amendment placing this sum at the former amount, \$250,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. Why, certainly, for the reason that the reduction is by reason of the necessities of the case, and unless the gentleman has information to a contrary effect, of course, we would not feel we could accept such an amendment. The statement of Mr. Meritt in the hearings was probably not clearer because both Mr. Meritt and Mr. CARTER and the committee had the understanding that this appropriation was each year being made as large as the funds would permit. Mr. Meritt calls attention to the fact that this is \$50,000 less than the sum that has been so authorized annually in the last several years, and says:

This fund is derived from the sale of surplus lands under the act of June 5, 1906, and is deposited in the United States Treasury at 4 per cent interest, both principal and interest being subject to expenditure for the benefit of the Indian and in such manner as Congress may direct. It is customary to pay this money to the Indian in two payments, one in the fall so they will have funds to carry them through the winter and the other in the spring for the purpose of agricultural equipment, seed, and so forth. As the money belongs to the Indians and is badly needed for the purpose set forth above, it is recommended that the item be approved in conformity with the custom of previous years.

All of which makes it apparent that it is not from any lessened impression of their needs but probably from the necessities of the case as to the amount of money available.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Upon the statement made I will withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary miscellaneous expenses incident to the general administration of Indian irrigation projects, including salaries of not to exceed five supervising engineers, not to exceed \$50,000; for pay of one chief irrigation engineer, not to exceed \$4,000; one assistant chief irrigation engineer, not to exceed \$3,000; one superintendent of irrigation competent to pass upon water rights, not to exceed \$2,500; one field cost accountant, not to exceed \$2,250; and for traveling incidental expenses of officials and employees of the Indian irrigation service, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem not exceeding \$3.50 in lieu of subsistence when actually employed in the field and away from designated headquarters, not to exceed \$6,500; not to exceed in all, \$65,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman to what the words on page 27, line 8, "not to exceed \$50,000," apply. Does that have reference to the salaries of the five engineers, or does it embrace other expenses?

Mr. CRAMTON. The salary of the five engineers and other miscellaneous expenses.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not \$5,000 each?

Mr. CRAMTON. No.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the maximum salary of the five engineers at the present time?

Mr. CRAMTON. The \$10,000 in each case includes the salary of the supervising engineer, the clerk, assistant, and, in some cases, for rent and travel and miscellaneous expenses of employees connected with the different offices.

Mr. BLANTON. What do the five supervising engineers draw?

Mr. CRAMTON. The salary of the chief irrigating engineer is \$4,000. These others would have a salary somewhat less.

Mr. BLANTON. They are not over \$4,000 then?

Mr. CRAMTON. I should say they are not over \$4,000. I am just advised the salary for each of these is \$2,600.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For improvement, maintenance, and operation of the Fort Hall irrigation system, Idaho, \$49,000, reimbursable.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In examining the hearings in reference to this particular item I find that it was originally estimated that it would irrigate 52,000 acres of land, and there is actually under cultivation only about 24,000 acres; that about 75 per cent of this acreage is actually cultivated by white owners and lessees. It also appears that the cost of operation and maintenance on this particular project is from \$2 to \$2.50 per acre, and that the Government is only receiving from the white owners and lessees about \$1.25 per acre. I was wondering if the chairman of the committee could explain why it is that the Government is only getting about \$1.25 out of the white owners and lessees for operation and maintenance charges.

Mr. CRAMTON. That question, as the gentleman has already noted, the chairman of the committee went into somewhat in the hearings, because I got the impression when I was on the reservation that such insufficient payments were made as the gentleman has mentioned. There was some discussion and further information requested. The committee has taken it up sufficiently with the Indian Service so that we hope and anticipate that the charges collected from the white owners will be their full share of the portion for the operation and maintenance that they ought to pay us. We have not put any limitation in the bill. In fact, the information at hand was not quite full enough to render a complete decision. I will say to the gentleman that I am interested in the question and intend to go into the matter further next year. In the meantime we hope the Indian Service will make a collection for operation and maintenance from the white owners and lessees of Indian land that will cover their fair share of the cost.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. The paragraph carries with it an appropriation of \$49,000, which is reimbursable. The estimated cost of putting water on the land was \$45 per acre. From the hearings I discover that a great many white owners and lessees have only contracted to pay \$6 per acre. I would like the gentleman to state why that is.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not clear about that. Whenever it is mentioned it appears that there is a past chapter of history. Suffice it to say that my understanding is that in the past a United States Senator from that State—no longer a Senator—succeeded in putting something over. As I understand, the time has gone by when that can be corrected, but that does not mean that we should sit back and allow anything else to be put over.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. It is stated that it will require several thousand dollars to complete the project, and in addition to these \$6 contracts there are supplemental contracts at \$15 per acre, making in all, where there are two contracts, \$21 per acre. That would show, if that information is correct, an actual loss to the Government of \$24 per acre. Are we to understand that the Government is going ahead and finishing the projects knowing that it will have to take a loss of \$24 per acre?

Mr. CRAMTON. The loss, if any, so far as I know anything about it, will not be in connection with anything we are doing, whether we go ahead and complete it or stop now. There is, I imagine, a loss connected with the \$6 contract. That is something that I say I have not bothered to go into the details, because it appears to be a closed incident, something that happened in the past and something that I do not need to apologize for. It is in connection with that, if there is a \$24 loss—I have not figured it out—it is in connection with that and not in connection with anything now being done.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. As I say, the estimated cost is \$45 per acre, and on page 299 of the hearings it shows that there are no cases where contracts are above \$21 per acre, and in some cases \$6 per acre.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. If it be true that an improvident contract was made some years ago, I am wondering if we could not stop it by failing to appropriate now for something that it is apparent can only bring back a loss to the Government.

Mr. CRAMTON. If we did that we would not be any better off. We would have that loss now just as we have had it in the past. There is no loss anticipated in connection with further construction, and there is further construction for the benefit of the Indians as well as the whites. It does not seem desirable to discontinue it.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. There seems to be a loss upon the 24,000 acres, if I read the hearings correctly. The Government can not ask to recover in any instance any more than \$21 per acre from the white owners and lessees.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. Probably this statement should be made: Some 18 years ago, and as to the exact time I am not sure, this reclamation project was undertaken and the bill that carried the authorization fixed the price above which the charges per acre might not go. The charges fixed were \$6 per acre. The project was developed as indicated in the bill at that time, and it is my understanding that the cost of the development was considerably in excess of \$6 per acre.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has again expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. A few years ago the Government wanted to reclaim additional lands and reconstruct portions of the canals essential for the benefit of the Indians on the Blackfoot Reservation, and at that time estimates were made as to the cost per acre. This work could not be carried forward without involving white settlers who had been benefited by the \$6 per acre contract. When the matter came before the committee the committee recognized the cost per acre that had actually occurred on the prior reclamation and that it had exceeded the amounts recited in the estimates and in the law itself; and, therefore, the committee wrote into the appropriation bill a proviso that no moneys should be expended for additional reclamation of lands owned by private owners unless they should share in the cost of such work. Upon that basis I would say to the gentleman that all additional reclamation work has been carried forward.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. I infer then that in this case it is a fact that for some years past estimates as to this work have been incorrect.

Mr. FRENCH. Not at all. The first estimates before the work was undertaken were undoubtedly incorrect, and the unusual thing was done of writing into the law itself the amount beyond which the expenditures to the water users might not run. Those estimates were undoubtedly incorrect, but at the same time the moneys have been expended for the reclamation. The expenses were higher than had been estimated, and the reclamation project was carried through at a price that was beyond what the law had recited; and because of that very fact we felt that it was only proper, in making additional appropriations for the rehabilitation of the reclamation system, that we should write into the law a proviso that all owners of water rights should share in the additional burden for the rehabilitation of the system, or the work would not be done.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. In the past this proviso and that provision limiting the cost per acre inured wholly to the benefit of the white owners and lessees.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; it was a loss that was sustained by the Government.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. But the white owner that gets his water for \$6 per acre benefited by it.

Mr. FRENCH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. And made great profit. That land is rated now at from \$100 to \$150 per acre, is it not; that is, a great portion of it?

Mr. FRENCH. Some of it might attain that value. This particular project is in the district of my colleague [Mr. SMITH], who is absent to-day on account of illness. He is closely familiar with this project and the acreage valuations. I can tell the gentleman, however, in a general way, that outside of the first contract that was entered into when it was limited by the law itself, the white settlers there have had to bear their share of the cost of the rehabilitation of the project. The rehabilitation of the project was undertaken to take care of the Indian lands, but it could not be carried forward unless the white owners of the land would benefit also, therefore we wrote into the law that it would not be undertaken at all until the owners—the white beneficiaries—should enter into a contract to bear their proportionate share of the additional cost upon the project.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I want to read to you what our sub-chairman thought about this matter when it was before the subcommittee. He then agreed absolutely with our colleague from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD] that it was unjust for the white men to take for \$6 something that cost the Government \$45, a loss to the Government of \$39 an acre. Here is what our chairman, Mr. CRAMTON, says on page 298 of the hearings:

Those white owners and white lessees ought to be required by the service—and if this committee thought it was necessary we would put it in and they could not have water otherwise—that they pay the actual cost of operation and maintenance. It is these same owners that originally agreed to pay \$6 an acre for the water rights, which cost something like \$45 an acre, and they have not even paid, as I understand it, \$6 an acre.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment. They were together then, Chairman CRAMTON and our colleague from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD]. They were of the same mind, that the Government ought not to be robbed of \$39 per acre.

Mr. CRAMTON. And I have not changed my mind since.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood the gentleman to say that they would have put some kind of a restriction here, but they did not have the time to go into the matter fully.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, no. I have not said anything of the kind.

Mr. BLANTON. What was the excuse the gentleman gave?

Mr. CRAMTON. That so far as the cost of construction is concerned that is a closed incident; that we have no power to open the matter. The statement the gentleman has just read as to something being put into the bill—

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield for a speech.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to give the gentleman all the information I can.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will probably have time to answer.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was trying to give the gentleman the information that he was seeking.

Mr. BLANTON. What else did Chairman CRAMTON say as to the present water charges? He says, speaking of water charges now, and the cost of the water to the Government:

My information was that it cost about \$2.50 an acre. Perhaps it is \$2; but that the white lessees and white owners are paying \$1.25 an acre for operation and maintenance charges, etc.

Showing they are getting it very much cheaper than it was costing the Government. That is just the way it is always when the Government is involved in private business. It is robbed all the time, and that led me here the other day on the floor, in answer to my friend from Wisconsin, our new active Member [Mr. SCHAFER], when I said that the Government ought not to be engaged in private business. Mr. SCHAFER asked me whether I would be willing to apply that to the Government Printing Office, and I told him, "yes," because private enterprise could do the work better with 2,000 than the Government is doing with 4,000 men.

The next day a party who represented himself to be one of the city editors of the Washington News came into my office and said, that having noted my colloquy with Mr. SCHAFER, he wanted to ask me about whether private enterprise could better conduct the printing office. I said: "What do you think about it?" He said: "I agree with you." Then he discussed with me the report of men there being dissatisfied and that some claimed the Public Printer was not qualified as an expert. The next day, to my surprise, in the Washington News appeared a statement that BLANTON was preparing legislation to abolish the Government Printing Office. [Laughter.] Something of which I never dreamed and never heard of, and, to my

surprise, again yesterday there was a purported interview with the Public Printer, who was asked to comment on my proposed plan to abolish the Government Printing Office, something that never was contemplated. When we see these things in the paper it causes a loss of confidence in the integrity of that paper's columns. Now, the other papers here in Washington do not misquote men with their alleged interviews. What I said was the Government had no business engaging in matters that private enterprise can better do for the Government.

I think it is well, going back to the subject, for our chairman of our subcommittee to take the time when he finds men are drawing \$45 of value from the Government for \$6—I do not care if some Senator did put something across on the people—I think he ought to study out a plan to retrieve the Government in that loss, because the Government's interest in the matter is the interest of the people of the United States, and I think the committee ought to pay some attention to it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the waters are muddied enough now, so I ought to make just a word of explanation. The hearing that was read by the gentleman from Texas, which he does not appear clearly to have understood, was as follows:

Those white owners and white lessees ought to be required by the service—and if this committee thought it was necessary we would put it in and they could not have water otherwise—that they pay the actual cost of operation and maintenance.

As to the cost of construction, that being a matter of law, this appropriating committee has no recourse whatever. It can not affect that difference between \$6 and \$45 the gentleman has spoken about, but the cost of operation and maintenance we can do something about, and the position of the committee on that was accurately stated by me. I am glad of the chance to repeat it now, that if it is necessary in order to get these white owners and white lessees to pay the cost of operation and maintenance they ought to pay, we will put it in the bill or else stop their water, and I hope this statement I am making now on the floor will be noted. That is a danger that is likely to occur if they do not pay their fair share. Now, what is a fair share? Whether it is \$1.25 or \$2.50 I have not satisfied myself; some additional information that is not in the hearings has been furnished me, but I am not satisfied yet with that information. I am not prepared as yet to act except to lay down this proposition that these white owners and lessees must pay their share fairly for operation and maintenance. I am sure the Indian Bureau will look closely into the matter and will see that this is done. The charge for construction, the original construction, is out of our hands.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Would not the department have the power to cut those people off from service if they did not pay the charges?

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, certainly. The hearing shows they are doing that.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. I understand they have given three notice to vacate because of failure to pay for the land. I do not know anybody who has been cut off.

Mr. CRAMTON. They do not give them any water. Mr. Reed said:

We do not give them any water if they do not pay. Some of them have not had any water for two or three years.

That is clear enough.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. On some land it also appears in the hearings they allowed them to continue. There is a large acreage that had service last year that has not paid.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not think that appears definitely, and, of course, under the present agricultural depression there is a little leniency as to the time of payment in all cases. The figures I have here attempt to show that they do pay their fair share, but I am not satisfied that the figures are based upon a proper per cent of the acreage of Indian and white ownership.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. That is what I think the committee is interested in.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman admits he does not now know whether a proper charge was \$1.25 or \$2.50?

Mr. CRAMTON. Absolutely; I am freely admitting that.

Mr. BLANTON. My criticism was just a friendly criticism, with a smile, as the gentleman will remember.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; but, of course, the smile does not go into the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. I was not hitting my friend under the belt. My contention was that now was the time for him to ascertain those facts. We have until the 1st of July to pass all of these supply bills. Why should we hurry them through here without getting the proper information and laying it before Congress so that you can come here with a recommendation to us? We are hurrying the bill through and we do not know what we are voting on half the time.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am afraid my friend has confused the charge of construction with the charge of operation. I was afraid he was not making it clear to the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] deserves this modification. He stated it was not fair for the white settler to pay \$6 an acre for land that cost the Government to reclaim \$45 per acre.

Now, as a matter of fact, as I stated a little while ago, the Congress, about 16 or 18 years ago, attempted by law to fix the price for the irrigation of this land. It was a false policy. It should not have been attempted at that time, and it indicates the folly of a great body like this attempting to go too much into detail in a matter of legislation. It was thought, apparently, that the project could be carried through at that low cost and the Government underwrote it. The settlers went upon the land. The upshot of it was that it costs more than \$6 an acre. And yet that was the contract entered into by the Government with these settlers.

Now, then, when the proposition was put before our committee four or five years ago to enlarge this reclamation project and reconstruct certain canals in some parts and strengthen the reservoir in order to make it safe, the doing of which work was essential that the Government might recover the money that it had put into the project, it was necessary to consider the white settler's land as well as the Indian's land, because they were both part of the project.

When the matter came before our committee we said, "We shall not appropriate one dollar unless from now on the white settler shares with the Indian in the cost of the construction program." This program was written into law, and it is costing those settlers \$15 an acre, and possibly more, in addition to what they had already paid in order to reclaim this land.

They unquestionably ought to bear the entire cost of reclamation of their own land, but as the chairman of the subcommittee has said, it was a question that we could not reach. It was a question that was disposed of before the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was in Congress, and it was a question that was disposed of long before the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] was chairman of this subcommittee. We have met the situation as we found it, and since that time these settlers have been bearing their proportionate share of the construction work for the rehabilitation of the system.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. But in the present situation in the present Congress, with the gentleman from Idaho and the gentleman from Texas both sitting and being compelled to vote on it, we are giving them \$49,000 more, and even with the present new contract they will be paying only \$21 when it costs the Government \$45, and the Government will be losing \$24 an acre.

Mr. FRENCH. No. If the Congress should pass a certain law on a certain subject it would not be necessary, for the validity of the law, to keep on passing it year after year. We passed a law to carry on the additional work on this project. Precedent to the beginning of the work it was stipulated that the contracts to share in the expense should be made. They have been made, and they do not have to be made over again annually. The law takes care of that, and the settlers will be obliged to carry the cost of the additional construction and improvement work.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will not deny that this will cost the Government \$45 an acre?

Mr. FRENCH. The contracts have been worded so as to take care of whatever additional cost there will be, and not as under the first contract, are they limited by an arbitrary price.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman admits now that it is to cost those settlers only \$15 an acre in addition to the \$6 they have already paid.

Mr. FRENCH. No. The approximate amount that was estimated four or five years ago was \$15 additional, but it is going to be several dollars more than that, probably, and the contract provides specifically for taking care of that additional burden.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has not convinced me.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Were these \$6 contracts entered into before construction was begun?

Mr. FRENCH. Before what construction was begun?

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Were these \$6 contracts entered into prior to the construction of the works?

Mr. FRENCH. You mean in the beginning?

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Yes; in the beginning.

Mr. FRENCH. That was the law. The law undertook to fix the maximum cost of reclamation, and the contracts made under that law were, of course, made with that limit of cost.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Were the contracts made?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, whether those contracts were made as contracts or whether these settlers are standing on the guaranty in the law, that the cost shall not be more than \$6 an acre, I could not say. It is a contract in either event.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. The hearings, as I read them, call for \$6 an acre. Were there ever any contracts entered into calling for \$6 an acre?

Mr. FRENCH. The statute itself is a contract. Some four or five years have passed by since we first met the problem. I was on the subcommittee at that time. We went into the matter then, but whether the contract was the statute itself and the acceptance of it, or whether it was an additional writing and an acceptance of it, I could not say.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Was this statute the joker which has been referred to?

Mr. FRENCH. Some have called it that.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. So that the joker was in getting legislation in the first instance to supply water at \$6 per acre?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, it may have been a joker. Or again, with the limited irrigation experience of the times, it may have been earnestly believed that \$6 an acre would be the maximum cost of this reclamation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement from the Indian Service as to the operation and maintenance cost and collections on Indian reservations where a portion of the irrigated lands have passed out of Indian ownership, in connection with which I want to say that it is a subject in which I am interesting myself and studying to the end that we may make sure that the white owners and white lessees are paying everywhere on Indian projects their fair share of the cost of operation and maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement of operation and maintenance costs and collections on Indian reservations where a portion of the irrigated lands have passed out of Indian ownership. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Statement of operation and maintenance cost and collections on Indian reservations where a portion of the irrigated lands have passed out of Indian ownership.

ARIZONA.
COLORADO RIVER PROJECT.

	1921	1922	1923
Entire project:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	\$44,271.19	\$33,017.42	\$37,697.43
Collections.....		2,919.56	3,965.87

All land owned by Indians. Water charged for on basis of amount actually delivered. All collections made from white lessees. Details not available as to costs of operation and maintenance for leased land.

COLORADO.
PINE RIVER VALLEY PROJECT.

	1921	1922	1923
Lands owned by whites:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	\$501.87	\$994.08	\$1,045.31
Operation and maintenance assessment....	501.87	694.08	1,015.31
Operation and maintenance collections....	154.00	96.50	85.80
Lands owned by Indians, not leased:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	8,604.43	4,826.13	7,291.91

No collections made from Indians.

Statement of operation and maintenance cost and collections on Indian reservations where a portion of the irrigated lands have passed out of Indian ownership—Continued.

IDAHO.

FORT HALL PROJECT.

	1921	1922	1923
Land owned by Indians not leased:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	\$47,028.90	\$40,637.09	\$40,916.15
Land in white ownership:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	20,347.74	16,899.35	17,298.10
Maintenance and operation assessment.....	20,347.74	16,899.35	17,298.10
Maintenance and operation, per acre.....	1.50	1.25	1.25
Maintenance and operation collections.....	22,449.25	16,223.61	18,379.15
Land leased by whites:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	9,021.81	6,671.54	6,006.72
Maintenance and operation assessment.....	9,021.81	6,671.54	6,006.72
Maintenance and operation, per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maintenance and operation, per acre.....	1.50	1.25	1.25
Collections.....	7,003.73	6,730.09	3,665.63

¹ 3,188 acres long-term improvement leases with maintenance and operation fixed at \$1 per acre.

The act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. L. p. 1024), provides that this land shall be free from construction and maintenance and operation charges so long as it remains in Indian ownership.

MONTANA.

CROW PROJECT.

	1921	1922	1923
Land in white ownership:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	\$23,485.52	\$12,578.18	\$29,999.19
Maintenance and operation assessment.....	13,498.44	14,896.34	15,259.74
Maintenance and operation assessment, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maintenance and operation collections.....	7,989.66	6,832.40	2,680.68
Land leased by whites:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	6,185.70	3,423.20	12,221.50
Maintenance and operation assessment.....	3,408.40	3,906.80	6,124.70
Maintenance and operation, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maintenance and operation collections.....	1,226.80	2,122.44	487.40
Lands owned by Indians, not leased:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	59,313.12	27,130.58	59,833.24
Maintenance and operation assessment.....	34,088.40	32,130.70	30,434.70
Maintenance and operation assessment, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Collections.....		None.	

¹ A small area covered by old leases which provides a charge of 60 cents per acre

OREGON.

KLAMATH PROJECT.

	1921	1922	1923
Entire project:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	\$3,768.74	\$7,611.42	\$5,717.74
Operation and maintenance collections.....	32.50		989.00

Details are not available at present as to land ownership. All collections are made from white owners or white lessees. The superintendent states that tribal funds will be available and that he believes the charges can be collected from Indians during the coming irrigation season.

UTAH.

UINTAH PROJECT.

	1921	1922	1923
Lands in white ownership:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	\$23,711.85	\$21,500.78	\$25,413.50
Operation and maintenance assessment.....	21,412.45	18,322.03	21,304.81
Operation and maintenance assessment, rate per acre.....	1.07	.905	1.11
Operation and maintenance collections.....	13,051.36	11,572.70	19,231.16
Lands leased by whites:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	44,285.82	41,581.68	49,138.67
Lands owned by Indians, not leased:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	14,182.08	14,357.77	16,970.60

¹ No charges for operation and maintenance assessed against Indian-owned lands.

WASHINGTON.

YAKIMA PROJECT—AHTANUM UNIT.

	1921	1922	1923
Lands owned by whites:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	\$758.40	\$568.63	\$767.79
Operation and maintenance assessment.....	750.00	703.75	712.50
Operation and maintenance assessment, rate per acre.....	1.25	1.25	1.25
Operation and maintenance collections.....	750.00	703.75	712.50
Lands leased by whites:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	4,451.36	3,474.40	4,709.11
Operation and maintenance assessment.....	4,175.00	4,370.00	4,370.00
Operation and maintenance assessment, rate per acre.....	1.25	1.25	1.25
Operation and maintenance collections.....	4,175.00	4,370.00	4,370.00

Statement of operation and maintenance cost and collections on Indian reservations where a portion of the irrigated lands have passed out of Indian ownership—Continued.

WASHINGTON—Continued.

YAKIMA PROJECT—AHTANUM UNIT—continued.

	1921	1922	1923
Lands owned by Indians, not leased:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	\$579.92	\$678.72	\$859.59
Operation and maintenance assessment.....	\$50.00	\$40.00	\$16.25
Operation and maintenance assessment, rate per acre.....	1.25	1.25	1.25
Operation and maintenance collections.....	\$50.00	\$40.00	\$16.25

YAKIMA PROJECT—WAPATO UNIT.

	1921	1922	1923
Lands in white ownership:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	\$38,174.40	\$47,510.40	\$55,930.83
Operation and maintenance assessment.....	31,680.00	32,320.00	29,360.00
Operation and maintenance assessment, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Collections.....	31,680.00	32,320.00	29,360.00
Lands leased by whites:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	38,587.71	50,393.07	62,773.56
Operation and maintenance assessment.....	32,023.00	34,281.00	32,952.00
Operation and maintenance assessment, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Collections.....	32,023.00	34,281.00	32,952.00
Lands owned by Indians, not leased:			
Operation and maintenance cost.....	7,519.20	7,319.13	19,764.37
Operation and maintenance assessment.....	6,240.00	4,979.00	10,375.00
Operation and maintenance assessment, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Operation and maintenance collections.....	6,240.00	4,979.00	9,375.00
In addition to above the following collections have been collected for storage maintenance from class B lands:			
28,667 acres, at 30 cents.....	8,000.00		
30,655 acres, at 20 cents.....		6,131.00	
29,695 acres, at 40 cents.....			11,878.00

WYOMING.

WIND RIVER PROJECT.

	1921	1922	1923
Land in white ownership:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	\$16,255.62	\$16,102.57	\$26,230.22
Maintenance and operation assessment.....	13,498.44	14,896.34	15,259.74
Maintenance and operation assessment, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maintenance and operation collections.....	7,989.66	6,832.40	2,680.68
Land leased by whites:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	4,283.77	4,382.37	10,743.75
Maintenance and operation assessment.....	3,408.40	3,906.80	6,124.70
Maintenance and operation assessment, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maintenance and operation collections.....	1,226.80	2,122.44	487.40
Land owned by Indians, not leased:			
Maintenance and operation cost.....	41,076.04	34,732.53	52,316.04
Maintenance and operation assessment.....	34,088.40	32,130.70	30,434.70
Maintenance and operation assessment, rate per acre.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maintenance and operation collections.....		None.	

¹ Small payments are the result of payments amounting to \$11,934.20 having been deferred until Dec. 1, 1923.

² A small acreage is covered by old leases which provide for operation and maintenance charges at the rate of 60 cents per acre.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not vouch for the figures; in fact, I am inclined to think that they are not all based upon a proper division as between Indian lands and those of white owners and lessees, but that is a matter for further investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance and operation of the irrigation systems on the Flathead Indian Reservation, in Montana, by and under the direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, including the purchase of any necessary rights or property, \$50,000 (reimbursable).

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVANS of Montana: Page 31, line 18, strike out the paragraph and insert:

"For continuing construction, maintenance, and operation of the irrigation systems on the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana, including the purchase of any necessary rights of property, \$350,000 (reimbursable), to be immediately available."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is language in the amendment which makes it legislation on an appropriation bill and that there is language in it which changes existing law.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I beg to suggest that this is the identical provision carried in the bill last year and was clipped from the bill itself.

Mr. BLANTON. The language beginning with the word "including" makes it legislation.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. That is in the bill of last year.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but it is legislation.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would be glad if the gentleman from Texas would indicate the particular words to which he objects.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment again for the information of the committee. The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. "To be immediately available" is one part of my point of order; that is a change of existing law. This is an appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1925, and the appropriations are not available until the 1st day of next July, so that makes it legislation of itself. Then the words "including the right to purchase property," and so forth, is legislation. Then there seems to be a change in the name of the reservation from the Fort Belknap Reservation to the Flathead Reservation, so that would be a change of existing law.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. The gentleman is talking about one and I am talking about another. He is referring to the wrong paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has concluded, I should like recognition.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is right. My glasses are pretty bad, and I find I allowed my eyes to read the wrong line.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman then has but two points of order against the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; my other two points of order still hold good.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am opposed to the amendment, and I am also opposed to the point of order. I think the amendment is in order as to the language making the appropriation immediately available. That has been repeatedly held to be in order by the various occupants of the chair, for the reason that this committee has the same jurisdiction over appropriations for the current year as for the next fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. Since there has been a change in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, the question of making an appropriation available is no longer a question which is reached by a point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. The other point of order relates to the purchase of rights of way. Now, Mr. Chairman, the whole item is based upon this language in the Snyder Act:

For extension, improvement, operation, and maintenance of existing irrigation systems and for the development of water supplies.

That language is broad enough to include the purchase of the land that is necessary for such extension, including rights of way in addition.

Here is an existing Government project under construction, and the gentleman is proposing in his amendment to continue the work of construction that is now under way.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that construction authorized by present law?

Mr. CRAMTON. Is authorized by the Snyder Act, which I have read. It specifically, in very broad language, provides for "the extension, improvement, operation, and maintenance of existing Indian irrigation systems."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It seems very clear that this is authorized by law, and about the only change made in the present law is that it provides for a continuation of the construction; it also changes the amount and makes the amount immediately available. The Chair is of the opinion that that does not make the amendment subject to a point of order, so the point of order is overruled, and the gentleman from Montana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, several days ago I talked to the House briefly about this irrigation project, urging and insisting that a reasonable appropriation be made to carry on this work. The amendment offered by me is an exact duplicate of the bill of last year, and it carries \$350,000 for a continuation of this work.

This, Mr. Chairman, I believe is the only project in the bill that is being abandoned by the bill, the only live project. On this project there has been expended about \$4,500,000 or \$5,000,000. It will take \$1,500,000 or perhaps \$1,800,000, I think the figures are, to complete the project. It appears to me that it would be very unwise to discontinue this work at this time. The project appears to me to be a worthy project. The Government has gone into it, has made an im-

plied contract with these people that it would reclaim this land, it has started its reclamation and put \$4,500,000 or \$5,000,000 into it, and to abandon it would be at a very great loss to the Government and at a very great loss to the people who have gone there. There was some considerable question in the minds of the committee, at least, about where the money was to be used. I gathered some information, and I find out that the Bureau of Reclamation recommended the expenditure of this money on this project. The Secretary of the Interior recommended the expenditure of this \$350,000 on the project. The Bureau of the Budget recommended to the committee that it be passed, and personally I can see no real good reason why this work should be discontinued. I have taken the matter up with a number of people interested in the project since the committee brought in its report, and I desire to read for the information of the committee some letters and shall ask permission to introduce the others in the RECORD. I read from a letter from Flathead Project Water Users' Association:

FLATHEAD PROJECT WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION,
CENTRAL ORGANIZATION,
Ronan, Mont., January 7, 1924.

Hon. JOHN M. EVANS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We desire to impress upon you the necessity of securing the appropriation recommended by the Reclamation Service for the Flathead project. It seems absurd that we are put to the necessity of each year begging for an appropriation. It certainly is a very plain and undisputed fact that money must be appropriated to complete this project some time, and the longer the delay the greater the cost.

We were led to believe that the project would be completed in five years. On account of inadequate appropriations this time has now been extended to 15 years and the project is not yet completed. The overhead charge goes on just the same, and has already doubled the estimated cost which we will have to pay.

The canals are almost completed, but our water storage is inadequate. Most of the last appropriation is being spent for storage. There is at the present time more than \$100,000 worth of material and equipment on hand and camps are built and stocked up with supplies. It is now rumored that no appropriation will be made to continue construction. These supplies, material, and equipment are going to be allowed to spoil and deteriorate, and we must bear this loss and added expense of resuming operations. This has been more or less the program since work was started, and is the main reason for the lack of success of both the Reclamation Service and the settler.

This project was opened for settlement in 1909. Very little water was delivered the white settler before 1916, and the delivery of water was not satisfactory until 1918. After water is delivered it takes several years to reclaim the land and bring it to a stage of profitable production.

We are now criticized on account of our idle lands. The owners of these idle lands are in most cases settlers who became discouraged waiting for water. If the appropriations had been sufficient at the beginning to complete the project within a reasonable time, we would not have lost a great many of these settlers. The ones who remained would not have suffered such heavy financial losses by trying to farm arid land without water. New settlers are now coming in and taking up these idle lands.

We have the best water supply in Montana. The ditch work has been developed in excess of the storage capacity. At the present stage of development this was the proper thing to do. With new settlers coming in and with the increased demand by those who are here there will soon be a shortage of water. This will again retard the development of the project and bring disastrous results to those who have growing crops.

Yours very truly,

FLATHEAD PROJECT WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION.
B. F. JOHNSON, *President*.
FRANK DOSER, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

I have some other letters and resolutions, Mr. Chairman, passed by the water users' association there, which I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letters are as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas the Flathead project has been properly authorized by law, and up to the present time approximately \$5,000,000 has been expended on construction of same, representing about 65 per cent of the completed cost of the project.

Whereas the lands embraced in the Flathead project are semiarid in character and several successive crop failures have proved that farming can not be carried on successfully without aid of irrigation; diversified farming is being carried on in districts where the water is available. Dairying is the principal industry on the Flathead and will be carried on more aggressively as the water is made available.

Whereas the people in the Reservoir Valley of the project came here at the invitation of the Government and filed upon our lands under promise that they would be irrigated, and, while no time is named for the completion of the project, we had every reason to believe that the water would be made available at a reasonably early date. It is now 15 years since first construction work was started, and as result of the methods employed by the Government the construction charges will run almost double the estimates made during the early years of construction.

Whereas there are now more than 100,000 acres upon which laterals and ditches have been constructed; however, during the dry years the storage provided thus far is inadequate to provide the necessary water to run into the ditches. The canals and ditches were built considerably in advance of the reservoirs. During dry years there must necessarily be a shortage of water. There are 15,000 acres upon which no construction work has been done whatsoever.

Whereas there is now approximately \$100,000 worth of equipment on the ground, which will depreciate during periods of nonconstruction, the present organization would be lost, and experience has taught that it takes a great deal of money to reassemble an efficient organization.

Whereas an average of at least 25,000 acres has been irrigated during the past three or four years, which we think is a good showing, considering progress that has been made on other projects. We have been subjected to the same conditions affecting farm products throughout the country. The Flathead project is a good project, and time will prove the wisdom of Congress in making provision for irrigation of these lands.

We therefore most urgently request that suitable appropriations be forthcoming from Congress that will insure the earliest completion of the project. Nothing can be gained by further dilatory methods, and the only businesslike thing to do is to complete the project. The sooner it is completed the sooner the Government will start reimbursement to itself. We urge your very kind consideration of the foregoing. Respectfully submitted.

RESERVOIR FARM BUREAU,
By CHAS. LEWELL, *President*,
J. A. SIZEMORE, *Secretary*.

POLSON, MONT., January 12, 1924.

To the honorable Senate and Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas first construction work on the Flathead irrigation project was started in 1909, after being properly authorized by law, and there has been expended up to this time approximately \$5,000,000, representing 65 per cent of the completed cost of the project according to the estimates of the United States reclamation department.

Whereas men and women, at the invitation of the Government, entered upon these lands in good faith, expecting that the promises made to them when they filed upon these lands would be carried out; and while it is true that the Government did not state any specific time for the completion of the project, it is only fair to assume that the water for irrigation purposes would be made available within a reasonable length of time.

Whereas the lands embraced in the Flathead project are semiarid in character and successive crop failures have proven conclusively the futility of attempting to raise crops without the aid of irrigation. The climate and soils are best adapted to diversified farming, especially dairying, the latter industry being carried on extensively on lands where water is available.

Whereas there are now about 110,000 acres upon which laterals and ditches have been constructed, but during dry years the storage reservoirs, now only partly constructed, are inadequate to supply the water needed to run into the ditches. Fifteen thousand acres in the Crow division have no ditches as yet.

Whereas an average of 30,000 acres has been irrigated during the past three or four years (excepting the past year, which was unusually wet), which is as good a showing as has been made on many Government projects. In fact, several projects conceded to be successful projects have not made as good a record as the Flathead, as evidenced by statistics in the Reclamation Record.

Whereas there is now over \$100,000 worth of material and equipment on the ground which will depreciate during periods of nonconstruction and the present organization would be lost, thus adding additional charges to be finally assessed against the unit holders. In 1913 the Indian Department in a pamphlet stated that the estimated completed cost of the Flathead project would be \$6,000,000 and that the irrigable area of the project comprised 152,000 acres. The only natural inference to be deducted from the foregoing is that each acre

of land would bear its proportionate cost of construction, which would be about \$40 per acre.

Whereas the Camas division of the project waited 10 years before they received a drop of water, and recently the announcement came as a sort of Christmas present that unit holders in this division would be assessed \$125 per each acre of land. It is inconceivable that the Government would condone an injustice of this character.

Whereas the landowners on the Flathead project have been subjected to the same strenuous conditions affecting the growers of farm products all over the country. Even the farmers owning land contiguous to the largest cities have not received for their products on the average the cost of production. It is most unfair to expect the farmers of the project to account for their stewardship during these distressing and unprecedented times.

Whereas all the transcontinental railways running through Montana have spent and will continue to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in advertising Montana, while Congress sits back as a reactionary form of government, telling of conditions in connection with irrigation that are unmerited and resulting in defamation of the name of our fair State.

Whereas the Flathead project has been properly authorized by law and about \$5,000,000 has already been expended. The dilatory methods of the Government have resulted in almost doubling the charges estimated in 1913. What is to be gained by further temporizing methods? The only businesslike thing to do is to complete the project, and the sooner the better. Under present methods of construction the unit holders and Government alike must suffer. The sooner the project is finished the sooner the Government will start reimbursement to itself. I therefore urge that an appropriation sufficiently large to insure the early and economical completion of the project be forthcoming from Congress.

JAMES HERBERT,

Vice President Northwest Reclamation League.

POLSON, MONT., January 15, 1924.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to proceed at any length, but I do think it is due the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] that I should make a very brief statement on behalf of the committee. The purpose of the committee has not been to abandon this project. Whether the committee would ever come to that conclusion or recommend such a course to Congress I do not know. Certainly we are not now recommending the abandonment of the project. We are simply recommending a suspension of the work of construction. When the representatives of the department were before the committee, as the gentleman from Montana must have recognized, they were not well informed with reference to the situation on this project. In part that has been due to a division of supervision between the Indian Service that has charge of Indian matters and the Reclamation Service which has been carrying on the work both of construction and operation and maintenance on this project. The Indian Service when before us could not give us the information we felt we needed. We asked them to have the officials of the Reclamation Service come in, and when they arrived they were very little better informed than the others. The officials that have the information are in the field. So the committee had to proceed on such information as they had and, without going into detail, it developed that there is now under constructed works 105,500 acres, of which only 30,811 acres are irrigated. I have a letter now from the chief clerk of the Bureau of Reclamation, which I am going to ask to put in the Record without reading in full. It supplies some additional information. It emphasizes one or two points that are worthy of consideration. First, that some parts of any irrigation projects are not actually under irrigation—the farmsteads, the roads, and so forth—and that always reduces it 10 per cent or more. In addition, the project at present does not give an assurance of sufficient water for the entire 105,500 acres; but neither one of those facts would account for the big gap between 30,000 acres and 105,500 acres, and hence the committee felt sure that for the present, until a larger acreage is availed of than at present, we could very well suspend this work, and hence our recommendation. There is one other thing which I think the department and the Congress ought to have more information about before they go ahead with this work of construction, and that is a matter that is in the hearings discussed somewhat and when the bill was first reported to the House was discussed somewhat by the gentleman from Montana and myself, as to what are the conditions as to payment of their fair share of operation and maintenance by the white owners and lessees. All of that information can be assembled in the next year. When another appropriation is proposed, I assume that a very full showing of facts can then be made to the committee and the committee can act with more intelligence

than they can this year. Until that time I am not able to see anything in the situation that would do anyone an injustice by following the course that we recommend. This is simply an appropriation for operation and maintenance and nothing for construction. I am obliged to oppose the amendment. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD this statement from the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, January 23, 1924.

Hon. L. C. CRAMTON,
Chairman Interior Department Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CRAMTON: I was suddenly injected into the hearing before your committee respecting the Blackfeet, Flathead, and Fort Peck irrigation projects in Montana, and because of subsequent demands in connection with the Reclamation Bureau hearings did not have satisfactory opportunity to amplify the hearing on the Montana projects. The resulting record seems to me not entirely fair to the Flathead project in that possibly undue emphasis is laid upon the discrepancy between figures for the acreage under ditch in recent years and the acreage actually irrigated. These figures are given for a six-year period at page 146 of the 22d annual report, Bureau of Reclamation, as follows:

	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922
Acres irrigable.....	80,300	84,300	91,000	98,000	105,500	108,920
Acres irrigated.....	15,863	27,128	34,453	32,836	30,485	30,356
Percent.....	19	32	38	34	29	28

While these figures undoubtedly show a wide margin between irrigable and irrigated acreage, the natural inference from the figures of a failure to use the facilities available, I believe, is substantially lessened by a number of other facts, as follows:

First. The figures given as irrigable agree with the official records and are, in fact, the total areas commanded by the ditches and intended for use in prorating water charges, but, necessarily, portions of such areas are occupied by farmsteads, roads, farms, ditches, etc., so that not all can be irrigated and cultivated. For such reasons probably the most complete use of the irrigable area to be ultimately expected will involve the irrigation of from 80 to 90 per cent.

A good index of this is offered by the Orland reclamation project in California. Tried by the acid test of repayment to the Government the Orland project heads the list. It is an unqualified success agriculturally. It has served some water for more than 12 years, and for more than half that period the entire project area has been under ditch; yet the area actually irrigated on the Orland project, as shown at page 50 of the twenty-second annual report, Bureau of Reclamation, was during 1922 slightly less than 75 per cent of the acreage irrigable, and during no year has exceeded 75 per cent. If such a figure be assumed as a maximum the foregoing data for the Flathead project would make a much better showing.

But a fairer comparison probably would be made by taking the figures for the Orland, not for to-day, years after its completion, but for a series of years when it was partially incomplete, as is the Flathead project to-day. If we take for that purpose the six-year period ending with the year when the Orland project first had under ditch its full area, the comparison is as follows:

Per cent of irrigable acreage actually irrigated.

Orland, 1910-1915.....	35	19	30	46	52	44
Flathead, 1917-1922.....	19	32	38	34	29	28

It might be still fairer to the Flathead project to compare it to some other than the Orland, and such a comparison would be still more favorable to the Flathead.

Second. With a project under construction like the Flathead the canal system is extending to new lands from year to year, as shown by the above statistics. This means new settlers or newly irrigated farms, and the settler of ordinary means can not put his entire farm to use the first year nor the second, but gradually adds to the area prepared for irrigation, cultivated and watered. For this reason the irrigated area is expected to lag behind the irrigable, both increasing from year to year as new farms are brought under the extended canals and the older ones progress toward more complete development.

Third. It is noted, however, that the figures for the Flathead project are somewhat erratic and one factor working an influence in that direction is the fact that the water supply is not sufficiently developed. Storage construction naturally falls into large units, and in order to distribute as much as possible of the water available the canal systems on the Flathead project are temporarily developed ahead of the stor-

age. It is difficult to make a precise, quantitative statement of this factor, but there have been times when the water available on the Flathead project was the controlling factor, and undoubtedly the temporary lack of assured supply exerts a restraining influence on the work of preparing fields for irrigation and planting.

As it stands to-day the storage development on the Flathead project assures a full water supply for only about two-thirds of the area under ditch.

Fourth. Under these conditions, and with the Flathead project located as it is in the transition zone between distinctly arid and humid conditions, it is common practice to cultivate or pasture some of the land without irrigation, often combining such operations with the more intensive ones of irrigation on the same farms. This is more or less standard agricultural practice in the zone where the rainfall permits.

Fifth. Perhaps a fairer test of the extent to which the irrigation works are taken advantage of and desired will be afforded by statistics on the number of farms rather than numbers of acres. The majority of the farms are irrigated in whole or part and a substantial portion of the farms and lands under ditch but not irrigated are Indian lands. We knew, of course, that the Indians develop slowly in the use of irrigation. The bulk of the white farmers on the Flathead project who can get water are irrigating, and they are anxious to organize irrigation districts under the State law so as to compel all the irrigable lands to carry a share of costs.

The Interior Department appropriation bill as reported to the House limits the Flathead project to operation and maintenance, for which it proposes an appropriation of \$50,000. This figure may have been taken from my letter of January 4 appearing at page 799 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 10. That letter, however, outlined a program for the expenditure of an assumed appropriation amounting to \$300,000, of which \$50,000 would be chargeable to operation and maintenance. With the work reduced to operation and maintenance alone the overhead would fall entirely on that work and probably the figure named would be insufficient; also there are always some little jobs that fall near the line dividing construction and maintenance, some being charged to one account, some to the other, when both kinds of work are being done. To care for the essential things of this sort and the overhead an appropriation for maintenance and operation alone should probably be at least \$60,000, better \$70,000, to care for emergencies.

Respectfully,

J. B. BEADLE, Chief Clerk.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

When it comes to looking after the interests of his own people and seeing that they get everything it is possible for any constituency to get from the Government, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] has not a peer in this Congress. He is on the job continually looking after their interests. Why, it seems that he has been to this committee—one of the most hard-boiled subcommittees in the entire Appropriations Committee—and forced them to put \$50,000 into this bill for his district on this proposition. He got that much out of them. Probably no other man from the entire Northwest could have done that. Usually he is affable, usually he is pleasant looking, usually he is smiling, but whenever he gets up here and tries to pull \$300,000 more out of this Committee of the Whole House, because his colleague from Texas, who likes him, makes a point of order against it, he immediately begins to frown. Now, I want to show you why his colleague made that point of order. Here is a project in our colleague's district that is actually irrigating now 30,811 acres. How much of this land do you suppose is cultivated by Indians out of that 30,000 acres? Just 2,000 acres. This is an Indian project.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Does not the gentleman think it would be a pretty good proportion to have 2,000 Indians on 30,000 acres of land?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but only 155 Indians are cultivating the 2,000 acres. I am just showing you that it is the white man's hand that is coming in here and asking for this \$300,000 extra, because these other 28,000 acres are cultivated by white men there seeking to benefit from this Indian appropriation. This is an appropriation for Indians, not white men. The Government is spending money on this project for Indians, not white men. If it were all for the Indians, I would not say a word.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I do not blame the gentleman from Montana; I think he deserves commendation for getting all he can, but he must give me the right to get up and stand between him and the Treasury of the United States if I can do

so honestly and fairly and squarely, with \$300,000 of public money involved.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I am sure the gentleman was not here when I discussed this matter the other day, because I said it was not an Indian project, it was used under the law for the white settlers for settlement.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; I have been on the floor continuously during this entire debate. This is handled through the Indian Bureau.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And our friend Indian Commissioner Burke is in charge of it.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Commissioner Burke is at the head of the bureau.

Mr. BLANTON. So it is an Indian proposition after all. It is Indian in theory but white man in practice.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman has got enough in the \$50,000, already in the bill, and I think he ought not to have the extra \$300,000 he is requesting.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on this paragraph may be closed in five minutes, and that time be yielded to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that further debate on the paragraph be closed in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the principal opposition to this amendment has come from the gentleman from Texas, who starts out talking about the wrong paragraph and then speaks about 2,000 Indians farming on this irrigation project. There is no claim whatever of there being 2,000 Indians on this land. In fact, the situation is this—that there were 30,000 acres of irrigated land last year, and 1,700 acres of this was occupied by Indians. We are not claiming that this is an Indian project; we are claiming that the project was put under way and that the appropriations in the past have been made on the basis that the white people have been invited there to make their homes, and for 15 years the United States Government, by following dilatory methods, has helped to bring about, and is the chief cause of bringing about the present situation in regard to this project. It is also to be remembered that there is about \$100,000 worth of equipment on the ground, and that about 65 per cent of the construction cost of this project has been spent; that the storage facilities for the water back in the mountain—and I speak of it from personal knowledge, because I visited it this summer—has not been completed to the point where in dry years there is enough water to fill the ditches and the laterals leading out onto the land which must be irrigated. These people have come onto the land during the last 15 years at the invitation of the Government and have made their homes there, and because we have been dallying about the completion of the project they have been going away, found it necessary to sell out, and the lands have fallen into the hands of a few people, not able to put all of it under the ditch or make it productive. Now we are going to say, because of the hardships which exist, because of the agricultural stagnation in the country, we are going to stop the construction on that project and leave the people without sufficient water in a dry year, and say to them, until you do the impossible thing, make a success on an incomplete irrigation project where success is therefore not possible, because the storage facilities do not make available enough water, we are going to stop until they bring full success, which I say is impossible. We are only asking that you do the thing that the reclamation officials asked the committee to do this year, that which the Budget provided funds for, but which the subcommittee took the absolute authority to legislate out of this bill. It is not a matter of the Indians, not a matter of the protection of the United States Government, but it is a matter of absolute justice and square dealing to the people out there in that new country in adverse circumstances, trying to make a home for themselves and build up a community of American citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Out of the 30,000 acres cultivated only 2,000 are cultivated by the Indians.

Mr. LEAVITT. Less than that.

Mr. BLANTON. The balance of the 28,500 acres is cultivated by white men.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I was not a great ways out of the way.

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentleman is wrong in saying that it is an Indian matter. It should be an appropriation under the Reclamation Service, and you are proposing to leave them with inadequate reservoir facilities to supply the ditches, no water to fill them, and let them go to ruin because the Government of the United States does not fulfill its contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For operation and maintenance, including repairs, of the Toppenish-Simcoe irrigation system, on the Yakima Reservation, Wash., reimbursable as provided by the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. L. p. 28), \$25,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 34, line 17, strike out "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, for several years the item for operation and maintenance has been \$5,000. In the hearings on this matter it is stated that the amount requested is for the purpose of operating and maintaining the present system and for commencing the construction of a storage reservoir. I am quite in accord with the construction of that reservoir, but the amount that is carried, \$25,000, would be of no substantial importance in that direction. The first step necessary is the acquisition of a reservoir site and rights of way, which it is anticipated will cost about \$60,000. If we were to proceed at all in the construction of the reservoir, \$60,000 for the matter of such purchases would be the minimum that should be appropriated, and then they would not thereby advance the final completion greatly without taking up the actual work of construction. Therefore, with grief in my heart for my good friend from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS], who has been actively urging that the whole \$200,000 be appropriated, I am obliged to offer this amendment, which will continue the operation and maintenance and defer work on construction until a proper unit for that project is appropriated.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer as an amendment to the amendment to strike out \$5,000 and insert \$60,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Amend the amendment of Mr. CRAMTON by striking out the sum of "\$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the sum of "\$60,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that while it is not disclosed on its face, yet this combination that we find existing between our subchairman and the gentleman from Washington shows that their object in trying to change this from \$25,000 to \$5,000 and then to \$60,000 is for new construction of a reservoir.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the Toppenish-Simcoe project was begun several years ago. We made an appropriation at one time within the last five years of \$75,000, and I believe at another time of \$50,000, so that this is not new construction. This is a part of the Wapato Indian reclamation project on the Yakima Indian Reservation in the State of Washington. Every hearing that you may examine for the last several years you will find contains the statement that this is the most successful Indian reclamation project in the United States. We have spent considerable money there. We have a ditch dug along the side of the hill, which the chairman, Mr. CRAMTON, saw last summer when he visited this spot. The work having been begun, people naturally thought it would be continued, and that would have been the business thing for the Government to do, and about 1,200 people came in there expecting to settle on these lands and develop them. We have a ditch there that is doing nobody any good. A hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars have already been invested in that, and it is lying there now and has been for the past three years. The department recommended \$200,000 to the Budget, but the Budget in making their rather indiscriminate cuts cut this down to \$25,000. The department has said that if they could have \$60,000 this year it would be possible for them to make real progress in the further develop-

ment of the project. This is a part of the Wapato project, which is recognized as the most successful and best paying Indian project in the United States. Because the Budget Director saw fit to cut down the estimate of the department from \$200,000 to \$25,000, without rhyme or reason, I do not believe this legislative body ought to sustain the Budget. While there is no coalition, I assure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], between the chairman and myself—if there was, I would have tried to have him make the sum \$60,000 instead of \$5,000—I do not believe his amendment ought to prevail, because it is offered upon the theory that the \$25,000 would not be enough to carry out successfully the work they want to prosecute this year. Therefore I ask you gentlemen in the interest of fair play to the people who went there in good faith, three or four or five years ago when the Government was spending money and started the work, to support my amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is this an Indian project?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes. It has nothing to do with the general criticism of the reclamation projects over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This project, the storage division, shows that up to June 30, 1923, has cost the Government a total of \$4,468,000. Then, what is called the Tieton division of this has cost \$3,389,000.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman is speaking of the Yakima project.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. We were referring to the Wapato Indian project, not the general reclamation.

Mr. BLANTON. There are so many Government projects up there in that country that cost so many millions of dollars that we get mixed on them. The total cost of this project has been \$461,240 for this Indian project, as appears on page 459 of the hearings. The reason that I thought that there might be some kind of a combination between our chairman and the gentleman from Washington is because while the chairman was making his amendment the gentleman was not the lady in waiting, but was the gentleman in waiting—

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Begging the gentleman to make it \$60,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Waiting for him to put in his amendment so that he could then get in his own. The chairman admitted that he did not think more than \$5,000 ought to be given for this project this year.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. That is for operation and maintenance.

Mr. BLANTON. But over his judgment he put \$25,000 into the bill.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. That was the recommendation of the Budget.

Mr. CRAMTON. We had that further information on the subject which came to me after the bill was reported.

Mr. BLANTON. And after the gentleman reported the bill he now wants to put it at \$5,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. And I hope to have the assistance of the gentleman from Texas in that effort.

Mr. BLANTON. And when he made the motion he knew the gentleman was going to make an amendment offering to change it to \$60,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I think he might have asked \$200,000 if I had not made the other.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Two hundred thousand dollars was recommended by the department and is really what ought to be appropriated as a business proposition.

Mr. BLANTON. I think possibly there is not any combination.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. There is no combination, and I hope the gentleman will support my amendment, as it is good business policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. I think there is some combination.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is pretty hard to be quicker than the gentleman from Texas all day long.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 18, noes 12. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pipestone, Minn.: For 250 pupils and for pay of superintendent, \$50,000; for general repairs and improvements, \$90,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to line 10 to correct a typographical error. Strike out \$90,000 and insert \$9,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 40, line 10, strike out "\$90,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chillico, Okla.: For 750 pupils and for pay of superintendent, including not to exceed \$2,000 for printing and issuing school paper, \$125,250; for general repairs and improvements and for new hospital building, \$24,750.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: Page 41, line 25, after the figures \$24,750, insert "and also for the construction of 3 miles of concrete road from the Chillico School or campus to the Kansas State line, connecting with the Arkansas City, Kans., public road, \$30,000."

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order—

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit the chairman of the committee to protect his bill—

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want the offering of an amendment to cut me off from making a point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. That has not been done—

Mr. BLANTON. It was done the other day, and the Chair held because I did not get recognition—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized if he desires to make the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I make a point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas, in that it is a proposed appropriation that is not authorized by existing law, and that it proposes to build a road outside of the school grounds and is not authorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this proposed road is altogether upon the reservation which is used in the maintenance of the school. The reservation is used in whole for the teaching of agriculture and domestic science and such other subjects as are necessary to be taught to make good American citizens out of the young Indians; and the superintendent of the school, Mr. Blair, a wonderfully fine man, has urged the making of this appropriation in order that the young engineers and mechanics among the Indians and among other young men there should do the work—might use this amount of money invested in cement in building this road which is upon the reservation and promote the improvement of the reservation, the walks and roads leading from it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas know of any law under which this is authorized?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I think there are several.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. The third paragraph authorizes the appropriation of money for industrial assistance and advancement and the general administration of Indian property. It is unquestionably an improvement of the property.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. CARTER. Is this road on land belonging to the school or on other land?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. It is entirely upon the Indian lands; yes, sir.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is clearly in order. The Snyder Act, which is the organic act under which we are operating it, contains this language:

For the enlargement, extension, improvement, and repair of buildings and grounds of existing plants and projects.

These are grounds of an existing Indian school which is proposed to be improved by the building of the road, and it is clearly in order.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I do.

Mr. SNYDER. I agree with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I am fully acquainted with the Chilocco situation and know where this road is to be placed, and I believe that the Snyder law, so called, is broad enough to carry this appropriation. As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL] has pointed out, it has a secondary object—the education of these larger students there in the construction of roads. They have at the school all of the appliances and appurtenances necessary to build roads, and what they are asking this appropriation for is for a sufficient amount of money to buy the cement. Clearly, to my mind, it comes under the law of repair to the actual school property as it exists there. I think there can be no question as to its coming into the same category as an addition to a building.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from New York that the amendment on its face says, "For the construction of 3 miles of concrete road."

Mr. SNYDER. It does mean that 3 miles of road will be constructed, but all that they want the money for is to buy the concrete, and they are calculating to build the road with their own help—the Indian boys in the school and those connected with the reservation.

Mr. CRAMTON. First, let me be sure as to the point that the only desire is to purchase material for the construction of the road. No doubt the gentleman would be willing to modify his amendment?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I would be.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am content to have a ruling of the Chair on the point that is pending. I only want to make this observation, that I did not understand that the road in question was entirely upon Indian land. That, of course, would make some difference.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman able, from reading the amendment, to tell whether it would be, or not?

Mr. SNYDER. I had nothing to do with preparing the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. If the amendment is not clear as to where the road is to be built, I ask leave to change it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can later on propose a modified amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think we are degenerating into a practice whereby the Chair is permitting a new school parliamentary procedure to be carried out in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will make his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that when a point of order is made against an amendment that point of order should be disposed of without permitting modifications and suggestions to come in and leave the point of order to be suspended in the air.

The CHAIRMAN. The last point of order made by the gentleman from Texas is overruled. The Chair will permit the gentleman from Kansas to offer a modified amendment and submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in discussing the point of order pending it would be easier for the Chair, perhaps, to decide the point if the amendment is in this form: "For the purchase of material for the construction of a road" within the limits prescribed in the amendment, entirely upon Indian land, so much money; so that it would read, "For the purchase of material for the construction of 3 miles of concrete road from the Chilocco Indian School to the Kansas State line, all upon Indian land, \$30,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

Mr. CRAMTON. And on that, Mr. Chairman, I would, of course, like to renew my point of order and have a decision from the Chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: Page 41, after line 25, after the figures, insert "and also for the purchase of material for the construction of 3 miles of concrete road from the Chilocco Indian School to the Kansas State line, all upon Indian land, \$30,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] makes the point of order that the amendment is not in order. Does he wish to be heard?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not care to take any further time upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on the understanding that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL] has succeeded the former chairman of the Committee on Rules I have no objection. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry into effect the provisions of the sixth article of the treaty of June 1, 1868, between the United States and the Navajo Nation or Tribe of Indians, proclaimed August 12, 1868, whereby the United States agrees to provide school facilities for the children of the Navajo Tribe of Indians, \$200,000: *Provided*, That the said Secretary may expend said funds, in his discretion, in establishing or enlarging day or industrial schools.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this is not an increase over last year?

Mr. CRAMTON. No. For two or three years it was \$100,000. For the current year, which is what the gentleman refers to, it is \$200,000. The Budget Bureau recommended this year \$100,000, but the committee felt desirous to continue the work expeditiously, and continued the same amount as the current year.

Mr. SNYDER. I would just like to say, if I may occupy a moment, that I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CRAMTON, and his coworkers, Messrs. FRENCH, MURPHY, CARTER, and TAYLOR of Colorado, on the splendid way in which this bill is brought to us this time, particularly in the sequence that it represents. It is more comprehensive and easier to understand than ever before in the nine years that I have served on the committee.

I also want to call attention to the splendid way in which, during the last four years, the total amounts of appropriations have been kept down in this department. If I may, I would like to put into the RECORD here just what has taken place. To that end, I submit the following memorandum regarding Indian Service appropriations from 1920 to 1924:

Appropriations for Indian Service from 1920 to 1924.

	Treasury.	Tribal.	Total.
Fiscal year—			
1920	\$11,116,397.03	\$3,933,995.00	\$15,050,392.03
1921	10,028,722.22	2,807,342.12	12,836,064.34
1922	10,042,554.67	2,716,921.50	12,759,476.17
1923	9,817,702.00	2,483,572.92	12,301,274.92
1924	11,011,505.00	2,416,000.00	13,427,505.00

You will note that the bill for the fiscal year 1921 was reduced by \$2,200,000 to a total of \$12,836,064.34. That was the last bill that was brought in by the Committee on Indian Affairs, in charge of the then general Indian appropriation bill. The first year the Committee on Appropriations brought the bill in they reduced that amount to \$12,759,476.17. The following year they reduced it again to \$12,301,274.92, and the next year, which was for 1924, the current year, it was raised to \$13,427,505. This bill now before the House carries \$13,136,815, or approximately \$300,000 less than the current bill, and only about \$400,000 more than the lowest amount that was ever carried in the bill in the last 10 years.

Mr. CRAMTON. The figures the gentleman has been quoting were, of course, both gratuities and tribal amounts?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. That is the total bill. It is a remarkable record, which goes largely to offset the discontent existing among Members of the House with respect to the efforts made by the Committee on Appropriations, as it now exists, as compared with the old method.

I have some doubt in my mind yet as to whether this is the best method, but certainly we can not complain about the subcommittee that has handled this bill, and particularly as to the Indian part of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I have been sitting here wondering what has occurred between the subcommittee and the distinguished gentleman from New York. Only yesterday I was reading the proceedings of a former Congress where, when this subcommittee brought in the Indian appropriation bill, the distinguished gentleman from New York used up an entire day in making points of order against it. I have forgotten exactly how many points of order he made, they were so numerous, but when he got through with that bill its father and mother would not have recognized it; he cut it all to pieces from top to bottom; and I was also reading the many criticisms which the distinguished gentleman from New York made of this committee. Surely something has occurred to revolutionize the gentleman's idea of the committee.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I will tell the gentleman what has caused me to change my mind, but that had nothing to do with the action I took at the time the gentleman refers to.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell the gentleman what has happened. The gentleman passed the Snyder bill and that solved the whole situation. It came from his proper legislative committee, and it made in order, through the legislative committee, and properly so, all of the items the Appropriations Committee had been bringing in.

Mr. SNYDER. I will tell the distinguished gentleman from Texas why I took that action on the floor. We were led to believe that if the new rule were put into effect and this Appropriations Committee was created we would thereafter be able to legislate for ourselves and not do our legislating in another body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. SNYDER. In just a moment. And what I did proved to be a fact, for the simple reason that every item we took out on this side was put back in the Senate. Now, why have I changed my mind? Because I am convinced that, while fewer men, perhaps, are involved in the investigation of these financial matters, the three, four, or five men who are making the investigation have made an intensive examination and have not materially raised the amounts. So I am convinced we are getting better efficiency and better appropriations under this system than under the old system.

While I lose considerable prestige in my committee by having the jurisdiction in the Committee on Appropriations, I am really here in the interest of all the people of this country first. [Applause.]

Some of the members of my committee will recall that when I first took my place on that committee I made this statement:

Heretofore there have seemed to be only two parties to this Indian affair, namely, the Government and the Indians; but from now on there is going to be a third party, the taxpayer.

And I went to work with that in view, and I am pleased to say that every member on both sides, Democratic and Republican, fell in with me along that line, and we reduced the last Democratic estimate which was sent in from \$17,000,000 to a little over \$12,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish the distinguished gentleman from New York were on this subcommittee in order to help look after "Old Man Taxpayer."

Mr. SNYDER. I think the present committee has done mighty well.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I feel, and the House must recognize, that the statement which the gentleman from New York has just made ranks him as a very efficient legislator and a very broad-minded statesman, because of his willingness to avow that the transfer which was made was in the public interest. It is a splendid spirit which he manifests. I think it is due that this should also be said: That the present situation has been made possible by the initiative of the gentleman from New York in preparing a very good code for the guidance and use of the Appropriations Committee in dealing with Indian matters. The Snyder Act, so called, is definite, concise, and comprehensive, and the situation at which the gentleman from Texas marvels is due to the real reform produced so largely by the gentleman

from New York and a desire on the part of the Appropriations Committee to follow that and to exclude legislative items which are not in order under it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I did not come here to be praised; I came here to extend a compliment where I believed it was well earned, and that is all I have to say. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, if the mutual admiration society has concluded its sitting, I move that we resume the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For aid to the common schools in the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole Nations and the Quapaw Agency in Oklahoma, \$150,000, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be subject to the limitation in section 1 of the act of May 25, 1918 (40 Stats., p. 564), limiting the expenditure of money to educate children of less than one-fourth Indian blood.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma offers the following amendment: Page 45, line 8, strike out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$578,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman how much time he wants on this amendment?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I will say to the chairman that as I am going to discuss a matter which has a bearing on the future policy of the Government in educating Indians, I would like to have at least 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto may be concluded in 20 minutes, of which time the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] shall have 15 minutes and the committee 5 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman from Michigan with the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not.

Mr. BLANTON. You are not going to allow the amendment to go through?

Mr. CRAMTON. Not if we can help it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 20 minutes, 15 minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] and 5 minutes by the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in 1922 the Department of the Interior, through the direction of the United States Commissioner of Education, made a report of a survey of Indian education in the State of Oklahoma. In that report I find the following information and suggestions:

The education of the children of the Indians in Oklahoma is one of the important educational responsibilities of the State and National Government. The crux of the problem is the proper adjustment of educational responsibility between the State of Oklahoma and the United States Government. That one-third of all the Indians in the United States live within the borders of this State is an exceedingly significant fact both to the State and the Nation.

Probably the consideration most vital to the State of Oklahoma in its relation to the education of the Indians arises from the wide distribution of the Indian people throughout the State with their extensive areas of nontaxable land, some parts of which have fertile soil while others are rich in oil and minerals. The estimated amount of nontaxable land and the Indian population are distributed through 66 of the 77 counties. Such a distribution of people and property requires the serious thought of the people of Oklahoma and the cooperation of the United States Government with its special and legal responsibility for the Indian people.

The number of Indian youths of school age in Oklahoma (6 to 21) is 30,798.

The number enrolled in public, Government, and mission schools is 25,424.

Twenty-one thousand two hundred and forty-five Indians, forming 84 per cent of the Indian school enrollment, are already in public schools of the State.

Only 3,584 Indians, or 14 per cent of the Indian school enrollment, are in Government and tribal schools. This comparatively small proportion by no means represents the influence of the Government schools on Indian education. The Government institutions, of which there are 18 boarding schools and 1 small day school, are well managed and effective in the activities of their program.

Covering the amount of money spent by the Government on the education of the Indian in Oklahoma, the report shows:

1. Tuition and aid for public schools among the Five Civilized Tribes.....	\$175,000.00
2. Public-school tuition in western Oklahoma.....	22,932.12
Total public-school support.....	\$197,932.12
3. Support of Indian children in United States Indian schools from—	
(a) Five Civilized Tribes.....	120,000.00
(b) Western Oklahoma.....	252,000.00
Total expenditures, United States Indian schools.....	872,000.00
PAYMENTS FROM TRIBAL FUNDS.	
1. Support tribal schools.....	\$242,800.50
2. Contract schools among Five Tribes.....	41,997.64
Total expenditures tribal funds.....	284,798.14
Total all Government and tribal funds.....	854,730.26

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Has the gentleman any figures to show the relative amount of taxes paid by Indian property?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I will cover that in the next paragraph.

After disclosing the amount spent by the Government at this time the report then, by figures as follows, shows the injustice that is being done to the State in the matter of aid, as follows:

The potential taxes on untaxed lands can only be estimated on the basis of reports obtained from county tax assessors and officers of the United States Indian Bureau. The estimates relating to the taxation of untaxable lands are as follows:

Number of acres of untaxable land.....	7,000,000
Average value per acre of untaxable land (1922).....	\$18.33
Average rate of school taxation (1922).....	10 mills
Taxable value of 7,000,000 acres, at \$18.33 per acre.....	\$128,300,000
Potential tax, at 10 mills.....	\$1,283,000

Comparison of potential tax and United States Government expenditures for Indian education:

Potential tax.....	\$1,283,000
Appropriations for United States Government and tribal funds.....	855,000
Total.....	428,000

The difference between these two figures, amounting to \$428,000, is the present loss to the State because of nontaxable Indian lands, and this difference added to the amounts now expended by the Government from congressional appropriations and tribal funds equals the sum that will become available for the support of public schools when the trust period expires.

Extensions of the trust period have already been ordered by Congress in a number of Indian reservations. The status of the trust periods is shown in the following statement. It is estimated that five and two-thirds million acres of the land owned by the Five Civilized Tribes in the 40 counties of eastern Oklahoma will not be taxed until 1931.

After this showing, and realizing that sooner or later all Indian youths must be educated in the public schools, the report as to necessities and conditions says:

It is evident that the United States Government should adopt a policy of liberal support for all educational movements providing for the preparation of the Indian youth to enter the public-school system, so that the transfer may be made with the least possible friction or injustice to the Indians.

Out of an Indian school population of almost 30,000 in Oklahoma, there are about 21,000 in public schools. On account of limited funds, school terms are in many instances short, courses are confined to mere academic subjects, teachers of meager qualifications are employed, attendance laws are unenforced, and buildings are unsatisfactory. This is particularly true in the outlying rural districts, where the majority of the Indians live.

And then after this review, it makes, among other recommendations, the following:

RECOMMENDATIONS.

The school system should be organized so that the Indian youth shall ultimately be educated in the public schools of the State. To this end the responsibility of the Federal Government will gradually decrease, and that of the State will increase, until the schools are entirely controlled and maintained by the State. In view of the fact that the

trust periods on Indian lands are to expire within 5 to 10 years, unless extended by Congress, it is important that the State shall make all possible effort to improve the rural schools of the Indian districts, incorporating in the curriculum those phases of education which are vitally related to home life, so that the Federal Government may resign its responsibility in favor of the State with the assurance that satisfactory standards of education will be maintained.

The Federal Government should provide liberal financial aid for the education of Indian children in public schools during the trust period.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUDSPETH. As I understand the gentleman, his contention is that if the Government would permit the taxing of these Indian lands it would not be necessary to make these appropriations.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. No; we would then collect \$1,283,000. Understand, however, that I am not advocating the taxing of these lands, as they are very properly being kept off the tax rolls by the Government by reason of treaties with the Indians.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And that could be used for the education of the Indians in your State?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, an analysis of this report brings forth these salient points:

That the education of the Indians in Oklahoma is one of the most important educational responsibilities of the National Government.

That Oklahoma is to-day educating in her common schools 21,245 out of the 30,798 Indians of school age within her borders.

That the Government is spending through governmental and common schools the sum of \$679,730.26 a year on the education of 3,584 Indians and is only allowing Oklahoma \$170,000 last year and \$150,000 this year for educating in her public schools 21,245 Indian youths.

That this condition must continue for at least seven years.

That sooner or later Oklahoma must bear the burden of the education of all of them, and according to the recommendation of the bureau that wherever possible it is better for the Indian that he be educated in the public schools.

Mr. Chairman, Oklahoma complains of none of these things. Oklahoma has no criticism to offer. Oklahoma is proud of her Indian citizenship and is determined that they shall have the best, and that her young shall share equally with the white in all the good things of Oklahoma.

We do, however, call your attention to the fact that in this report the school system in some of our districts is severely criticized by reason of conditions that exist on account of limited funds, and in reply to that we call attention to the fact that by reason of these unrestricted lands taking from our tax rolls in these school districts such a heavy toll of revenue that our last legislature found it necessary to make an appropriation of \$650,000 to replace in these school districts the revenues that would have been received by them if these lands had not been kept off the tax rolls through the agency of the Government.

We do not come to you in this matter asking aims, but come asking that the Government do its duty. That it is not doing it in this matter is disclosed by the figures which show that it is through properly carrying out its treaty with the Indians; and this it should continue to do, depriving the school districts of school taxes amounting to \$1,283,000 and only offering us in return \$150,000.

We claim that for the Government to properly compensate Oklahoma in this matter is as much a part of the cost of running the Government as any item in this entire bill. We are willing that the Government shall have credit for all it is expending on schools in Oklahoma, both in appropriations to the State and in Government and tribal schools, but so long as you deprive these school districts in which these Indian children are being educated of these revenues we think this Government is too great and too generous to deny us the difference. Mr. Chairman, that balance is \$428,000 this year, the amount I am by this amendment increasing this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I desire that it be fully understood that in offering this amendment I am not attempting to conflict with those who have this bill in charge. The reason that I did not present it to the committee was that the data and facts were not called to my attention until after the committee had made their report. I am satisfied that the gentleman in charge of this measure, knowing his interest in morality and education, would have lent me an attentive ear had I presented the facts to him. I believe that every other member of the committee, who are equally as interested as he is in these matters, would have seen the justice of our claim. Under these conditions we might have

waited until next year, but this report says, or rather intimates, that there should be no delay for the reason that the time is already limited as to when these schools must be put in shape to properly care for the education of all the Indian youths of Oklahoma.

Consequently, I ask the members of the committee and the Congress not to pass this measure over lightly, but, in the name of these Indian youths who are demanding education, and in the name of the white youths of Oklahoma who have for 16 years gladly divided their educational facilities with these Indian children, I ask you to consider that if this condition was in your State instead of mine would you not believe that you were entitled to this equity and justice; and, that being the case, are you not ready to-day to extend this to Oklahoma?

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWREY. I understand this appropriation from the Government amounts to about \$7 and a fraction per year for each Indian child in the public schools.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes, sir; I presume your figures are correct.

Mr. LOWREY. Taking the figures 21,000 and 150,000.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWREY. How much does your State appropriate for your general public-school work per capita?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The State does not appropriate. The levies are made by school districts; but I remember that during the last legislature, in discussing some legislation regarding Ottawa County, it was estimated at, I think, about \$33 per pupil.

Mr. LOWREY. What I wanted to get at was how much for the whole State. What does the State appropriate, in other words?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. It is not a State appropriation. We just had to make this appropriation of \$650,000 to make up the cost in the weak districts that could not raise sufficient funds by reason of these nontaxable lands.

Mr. LOWREY. I do not mean for the Indian children. I mean, what is your per capita appropriation in the State for education?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I have not those figures at hand, but it will run four or five times what this will amount to.

Mr. LOWREY. That is what I wanted to get at, what it costs you to educate a child and then what part of that the Government was paying for these Indians.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars, according to this bill, and my contention is that it should be \$578,000.

When statehood came to Oklahoma, as soon thereafter as possible, we built a schoolhouse on every hill and in every valley. We opened the doors of these schoolhouses just as readily to the Indians as to the whites, although there was placed upon us an extra burden by reason of the fact that in hundreds of these districts the lands of these Indian youths and the oil that flowed from many of these lands were not taxable for school purposes. These school districts that are suffering are in the country and not in the city, and it is the farmer of Oklahoma that has to the greater extent borne this burden for 16 years. He is continuing to bear it and is taxing himself to the limit; but he believes that the time has come when his Government should help him bear that burden, which is, as a matter of fact, the Government's burden. Consequently I plead with you to grant this concession. The amount asked for is only a very small appropriation, considering the expenses of government. No taxpayer will ever feel that this increase has been made, but in doing so the Congress and the Government will have the satisfaction of knowing that it has done its duty.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's suggestion of a painless extraction of several hundred thousand dollars from the taxpayers of the United States is interesting, and if that were the only item, and that would end it, it would probably be painless—a mere matter of \$400,000 spread out over the entire United States—but, of course, when it gets to the taxpayer it is not one item alone. There are thousands of them that make a very thick volume. The committee that reported this bill has shown its sympathy with education and has announced its sympathy with the education of Indian children in the public schools where that was feasible. This committee recommended increases of \$145,000 above the Budget figures for the education of Indian children. In addition, the real increases are greater than that, because the individual increases for the boarding schools were more than that, but some of it was taken up through anticipated lapsed appropriations. As to the particular item in question for the Indian children of Okla-

homa, the bill proposes \$150,000. There is a general item in the bill for the education of Indian children generally to take care of situations very much similar to that in Oklahoma, although in not as great a degree, and it is because the situation in Oklahoma presents a certain problem in a greater degree than in other States that we have not left them to the general blanket item but have put in this specific item of \$150,000 for Oklahoma, which is not done for any other State. The gentleman makes an impressive argument as to their needs in Oklahoma because of the nontaxability of Indian lands in that State, but the gentleman should remind the House, or the House should have in mind, that when Oklahoma sought statehood they themselves put in their State constitution a provision exempting the Indian lands from taxation.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. That was not a requirement, I suppose, of the Federal Government.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I want to correct the gentleman there.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will be glad to be corrected.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I will state the situation about that: We did not put that in our constitution and we thought for several years that this land was taxable.

Mr. CRAMTON. But is it not true—

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. May I finish my statement?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have only five minutes, and I can not yield too much of that time. Is it not true that by reason of the provision in the State constitution of Oklahoma the lands of the Indians are nontaxable?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. No; by reason of treaties with the Indians and by reason of the enabling act which admitted us to statehood. We ran a deficit of \$9,000,000 in our revenues down there, expecting we were going to tax these lands, before we got a court decision.

Mr. CRAMTON. My information was different; but if it was in the enabling act, it was, then, with the consent of the people of Oklahoma, desiring that statehood be granted to them.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. We had to accept whatever was given to us at that time.

Mr. CRAMTON. They were anxious to be admitted, and it was with their consent and it was upon their urging that statehood was granted upon those terms. Therefore we have gone as far as we can in this item. The situation is fairly well taken care of. The statement before the committee shows that formerly there was appropriated \$300,000 for this purpose—never as much as the gentleman from Oklahoma urges. Three hundred thousand dollars was the most that was ever appropriated, and that was decreased year by year until it is now down to \$150,000. We are recommending the same amount for next year as for the current year. The regulations are a little more strict now as to the payment of the tuition, to make sure that the districts actually get the children in school. So the \$150,000 seems to be a pretty substantial compliance with their needs in this time of unparalleled financial burden of the Government. I hope the amendment which the gentleman proposes, making it nearly threefold more than it ever has been before, will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma) there were 11 ayes and 16 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RELIEF OF DISTRESS AND CONSERVATION OF HEALTH.

For the relief and care of destitute Indians not otherwise provided for, and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases, including transportation of patients to and from hospitals and sanatoria, \$500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be used also for general medical and surgical treatment of Indians, including the maintenance and operation of general hospitals, where no other funds are applicable or available for that purpose: *Provided further*, That out of the appropriation herein authorized there shall be available for the maintenance of the sanatoria and hospitals hereinafter named, and for incidental and all other expenses for their proper conduct and management, including pay of employees, repairs, equipment, and improvements, not to exceed the following amounts: Blackfeet Hospital, Montana, \$12,500; Carson Hospital, Nevada, \$10,000; Cheyenne and Arapahoe Hospital, Oklahoma, \$10,000; Choctaw and Chickasaw Hospital, Oklahoma, \$35,000; Fort Lapwai Sanatorium, Idaho, \$40,000; Laguna Sanatorium, New Mexico, \$17,000; Mescalero Hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Navajo Sanatorium, Arizona, \$10,000; Pima Hospital, Arizona, \$13,000; Phoenix Sanatorium, Arizona, \$40,000; Spokane Hospital, Washington, \$10,000; Sac and Fox Sanatorium, Iowa, \$40,000;

Turtle Mountain Hospital, North Dakota, \$10,000; Winnebago Hospital, Nebraska, \$18,000; Crow Creek Hospital, South Dakota, \$8,000; Hoopa Valley Hospital, California, \$10,000; Jicarilla Hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, \$5,000; Indian Oasis Hospital, Arizona, \$10,000; Shawnee Sanatorium, Oklahoma, \$40,000.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I move to strike out the last word. I desire at this juncture to call attention of the committee to the underpay of physicians and nurses and employees of the Indian medical service of the United States. There are approximately 240,000 dependent Indians, wards of the United States, who have at this time some 85 hospitals and sanatoria with a total capacity of more than 2,200 beds, with which there is connected a medical service consisting of about 119 physicians, who give all of their time to the Indian medical service, and 56 physicians who give a part of their time to that service. This service extends over many States and many reservations. At the present time there is a disgraceful condition in connection with the lack of proper hospitals and hospital facilities, particularly a lack of hospitals for the treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, and pneumonia. The Indian is particularly susceptible to tuberculosis for reasons which we have not time to discuss at this moment.

Twenty per cent of all the deaths among Indians, according to the statistics one year ago, were caused by tuberculosis. Out of every 66,000 Indians examined carefully by physicians about 50 per cent had trachoma, a destructive eye disease which, if left unchecked and untreated, not only destroys the eyesight but it is very contagious.

I resided for some winters among the Indians in the State of California, in the Colorado desert, on the eastern side of the coast range mountains. I was surprised to find so many Indians who had lost their eyesight from trachoma and suffered great distress and economic loss, besides the danger of contagion.

I also saw a great deal of the health conditions among the Indians in Arizona—the State of my good friend and colleague Mr. HAYDEN—among the Navajos, Papagos, and the Hopis. There was uniformly a great spread of the diseases mentioned among all these, and it is an unfortunate and disgraceful fact that tuberculosis has to be treated (under the present shortage of hospitals) in general hospitals, with all the danger of contagion and lack of humanity that goes with that condition. The Indians also lack at this time hospitals for incurable tuberculosis and for hospitals for curable tuberculosis, and for many manifest reasons. They also need a school-sanitarium or hospital for crippled and tubercular children who are able to go about somewhat in the air and who should receive at the same time educational advantages and who should be kept constantly under medical and surgical treatment for tubercular conditions that afflict them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. [By unanimous consent Mr. KINDRED and Mr. SNYDER were given leave to extend their remarks in the Record.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Seminole Indians of Florida, \$10,000.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee for making the appropriation of \$10,000 for the Seminole Indians of Florida, and I wish to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 21, after the semicolon, insert "Provided, That an additional sum of \$10,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing cattle, hogs, and fencing the lands for the benefit of the Seminole Indians."

Mr. BLANTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Would it be in order to strike out line 21, granting \$10,000 to the Seminole Indians in Florida, as a substitute for the gentleman's amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order to perfect the text.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does this amendment restrict the amount to fencing lands for the Indians and the purchase of stock for the Indians?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, since I have been in Congress for the past nine years the House has been very liberal toward the Seminole Indians of Florida. I am a member

of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and this House has granted every appropriation that I have asked. The late lamented James R. Mann materially assisted me in securing these appropriations because he believed the Indians were entitled to this assistance. Unfortunately, past administrations have not expended the money as Congress directed in the appropriations that Congress gave. For the benefit of the newer Members of the House, and also some of the older ones, approximately \$46,000 of the amount appropriated from year to year by my colleagues for the benefit of these Indians has been allowed to revert to the Treasury because the then Commissioner of Indian Affairs and myself disagreed as to the policy that should be followed in taking care of the Seminole Indians.

First, to make myself perfectly clear, I am opposed to making the Seminoles of Florida the wards of the Government. When this Government places them on their feet I want the Government to leave them alone, but my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] will recall that when former Congressman Walsh, of Massachusetts, made the point of order, I stated to him that unless the Commissioner of Indian Affairs would expend the appropriations that my colleagues granted I would not ask for any appropriation, and I meant it, because there was no use in securing an appropriation if it was not going to be used.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman was so modest in his demand that I was merely trying to protect his amendment from a point of order.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, without going into why these appropriations were not expended after both the House and Senate made them, I will say that I believe the Seminole Indians of Florida are more entitled to an appropriation than any Indians mentioned in this appropriation bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I notice that the President in his message said that he was in favor of certain farm relief bills. When I get those bills I find that they provide for buying cattle and other things for the farmers generally. Will that relieve these Seminole Indians, or are they excluded?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. They are not citizens.

Mr. WINGO. And those bills will not take care of these people?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. No. And I want to thank my friend from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], because no ulterior motive can be charged to me. Unfortunately the Seminole Indians of Florida can not vote. If they could vote, I believe they would vote for me, because I have worked hard for them. They are not citizens, however, and they simply get whatever the Congress thinks they are entitled to and whatever amount Congress is willing to give them.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought the gentleman represented the silk-stocking district of Florida. He surely has not any pauper Indians in his district?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The gentleman is getting away from my subject, and I hope he will not, because I have some facts which I desire to state. I represented the late James R. Mann, who was one of my constituents. One day I met him and Mr. William Jennings Bryan out in the corridor when they were talking together. I said: "Mr. Mann, you can see why it is so hard for me to please all of my constituents. When I vote to please Mr. Bryan I displease you, and when I vote to please you I displease Mr. Bryan."

Oh, my district has some poor people in it and also some silk-stocking people, and we are glad to have all of them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman wish to convey the impression to the House that Mr. Bryan is a silk stocking?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. No, no. I meant to convey the impression that my friend, Mr. Mann, was a big man and a partisan Republican, and that Mr. Bryan is a big man and a partisan Democrat, but I do not care to go into that. Getting down to the facts, for the first time in the history of this country, and I regret as an American citizen to refer to it to-day, the Government in dealing with the Seminoles violated a flag of truce. In 1837 Osceola, then the chief of the Seminoles, under a flag of truce went to General Jessup, at St. Augustine, to discuss the terms of the treaty and stop warfare, and while they were under that flag of truce was placed in irons, cast into prison, and died of a broken heart. We talk about Germany regarding a treaty as a scrap of paper. When I think of these poor Indians, although they are not allowed to vote, I wonder if sometimes we should not first remove the

note from our own eyes. Let me read this from the treaty of May, 1832:

ART. VI. An agent, subagent, and interpreter shall be appointed to reside within the Indian boundary aforesaid, to watch over the interests of said tribes; and the United States further stipulate, as an evidence of their humane policy toward said tribes, who have appealed to their liberality, to allow for the establishment of a school at the agency, \$1,000 per year for a period of 20 years, and \$1,000 a year for the same period for the support of a gunsmith and blacksmith, with the expenses incidental to his shop.

Just think of it! Just think of our interest in their welfare and our humane policy toward them!

Legend has it, tradition has it, that every Indian that signed that treaty was gotten drunk by the representatives of this Government. Whether that be true or not, I lay it down as a principle of law that this treaty would not stand in any court if made between an American and an American, because it is signed by the representatives of this Government in their own handwriting and every signature of the Indians is made by his mark, without a single witness to the signature to show whether the Indian knew what he was doing or not. Furthermore, even the interpreter signed that treaty by making his mark.

We go on down to the next treaty of 1832. This one was signed in September, 1832. I read:

The Seminole Indians, regarding with just respect the solicitude manifested by the President of the United States for the improvement of their condition, by recommending a removal to a country more suitable to their habits and wants than the one they at present occupy in the Territory of Florida, are willing that their confidential chiefs—

shall enter into this treaty.

That treaty is signed by the marks of the Indians without any witnesses thereto.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the number of those Indians?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. At the present time?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Those that never moved from Florida number about 600.

Mr. ALLEN. And what is the amount of their territory?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I shall come to that in a moment. I want to read now from additional articles of the first treaty, where it shows they were not all satisfied and evidently we were not so zealous in guarding their rights.

Whereas Neo Mathla, John Blunt, Tuski Hajo, Mulatto King, Emathlochee, and Econchatimico, six of the principal chiefs of the Florida Indians, and parties to the treaty to which this article has been annexed—

And so forth.

Every article is signed with a mark after the name of each Indian, showing specifically every time the Indians could not write and no doubt did not understand the treaties. I have argued time and time again in behalf of the Seminole Indians of Florida. My time is very short and I can not go into the question as I would like to do, but let me call your attention to volume 11 of the United States Statutes at Large, page 702. In article 6, the latter part, it says:

The remaining sum of \$200,000 shall be retained by the United States until the removal of the Seminole Indians, now in Florida, to the country west of the Mississippi River herein provided for that tribe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I want to show the gentleman it is not a gratuity. Now, in article 8 I find—I do not know why these two articles contain a different sum—but in article 8 appears the following:

The further sum of \$250,000 shall be invested in like manner whenever the Seminoles now remaining in Florida shall have emigrated and joined their brethren in the West, whereupon the two sums so invested shall constitute a fund belonging to the united tribe of Seminoles, and the interest on which at the rate aforesaid, shall be annually paid over to them per capita as an annuity.

That was set aside in 1856, and, according to this treaty, was to draw interest at 5 per cent, and the Members of this House can figure what these 600 Seminole Indians who are still residing in Florida would get if they should move to Oklahoma or west of the Mississippi River. Two hundred and

fifty thousand dollars, at 5 per cent interest from that date, would have to be paid to them, pro rata. Therefore you are holding in the Treasury this money for these people. I say, therefore, that the only conclusion that can be reached is that my amendment is not a gratuity. They should be taken care of. You owe it to them. This is the only band of men and women that this country was never able to conquer, and while we took their land from them and offered in exchange to give something they have refused if they would move out West, they still refuse to leave the land of their birth. Let me say again we took from them the beautiful State of Florida, that is now worth billions and billions and billions of dollars and is the paradise of the world for the silk-stocking people, who go there to enjoy themselves, and also many of the poor people from the good State of Texas and every State of the Union. We are glad to have all of them come to our fair State and become one of us, but we at the same time want to treat the Indians right.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman claims that this is giving them \$6,000 for stock for these 600 Indians. That would be \$10 apiece for stock. How many head of livestock would that buy?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Well, that would not buy one for each Indian.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many goats would it buy?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I hope we will not make this a laughing matter. Mr. Chairman, the State of Florida recognized that the Government owed something to these Indians, and that they have not been treated fairly. When the Indian Committee went to Florida, when my good friend, Congressman CARTER, of Oklahoma, was the chairman, to investigate their needs I told him that I would endeavor to get my friends to pass a bill in the legislature at Tallahassee to set aside 100,000 acres of land if the Government would give them cattle, hogs, and fence in the land. The State of Florida carried out my promise and set aside for the benefit of the Seminoles 100,000 acres of land, and we now simply ask the Government to give them the cattle, the hogs, and fence their land, so they can live on it.

Mr. CARTER. The Government has a reservation there.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. A very small reservation.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman referred to the unconquered Seminoles, saying that is the only race of people in America who had never been conquered. I desire to say to the gentleman, in order to correct his history, that the Utes were never conquered, and the Chickasaws never lost a battle either to white men or to any other tribe.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I accept the correction.

Let me say this on behalf of Osceola who was captured while under a flag of truce. If history is correct, he it said to his praise that never a woman or a little child was massacred when he was present or when he could prevent it, for he said he was fighting men and not women and children. I hope this House will give to this little struggling band, that has been forced back and back and back until almost on the verge of being forced into the ocean, this appropriation, and if it does, I want to be frank with you, next year I shall ask for another appropriation of \$10,000 or \$15,000 until they get on their feet and then make them citizens and cut them loose, but do not make them wards of the Government.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes on behalf of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this seems to be a very simple story, the story of the Seminole, if you confine yourselves to the facts. I know the facts in a general way, and I will state them as briefly as I can.

There are about 600 of these people down there. I am told by the Indian agent that they are divided into what is known as the East Coast Tribe and the West Coast Tribe. The East Coast Tribe is in the district of my colleague [Mr. SEARS], and represent about one-third of the Indian population. The West Coast Tribe is in the district I have the honor to represent, and if it has any headquarters at all in any civilized community it is in the town of Fort Myers.

Frequently visiting the town of Fort Myers I get at first hand the information which I am now about to give you. The Indian agent down there is a very good, and, I might say, godly man. He is a man who is unselfish in his devotion to the Indian, and who cares nothing at all about the position on ac-

count of the money it brings him. I do happen to know—and I tell you this of my own knowledge, and I am of opinion he would be sorry if he knew I was going to tell it—that last year that man spent out of his own pocket somewhere between \$800 and \$1,200 in administering to the relief of these people. This man of whom I speak is Capt. Lucian A. Spencer, as we call him, because he was chaplain of a company during the World War with the rank of captain. I know him well, because he became the chaplain of a regiment in which my son was an officer.

I have lived in that community for many years myself, and I have known these Seminole people for 35 years. They were roving people who made all the money they needed for their simple needs in the killing of wild game, the capture of plume birds, and the procurement of skins, principally otter skins and alligator skins. They had no particular home. The laws of the United States and of the State of Florida have become more and more strict as to the killing of game, until now there is nothing which they might kill with their guns which could be turned into money without the violation of law. They can not kill an alligator for his skin without violating the law, and they can not kill a deer or an otter or a bird of plumage or anything else and convert it into money without violating the law. The result of that is that they have no money and are wandering vagrants on the face of the earth, without any fault of their own and against every impulse of their proud and haughty nature.

Now, a large reservation has been made for them, partly by the State and partly by the Federal Government. If they are allowed to have their reservation fenced in part, so that they can raise some hogs and cattle, they can get along pretty well in a little while. In other words, they can be a self-supporting people in place of being paupers, dependent upon the bounty of the Nation.

Now, \$10,000 is allowed under this bill. That is \$2,500 higher than it has ever been before. Seven thousand five hundred dollars or perhaps \$7,250—I am not sure about the figures—has been allowed in the last two or three years, and invariably it runs over. This money that is to be appropriated now is simply to continue the system of pauperism under which they have been laboring. If you add \$10,000 to it you will convert the pauper into a self-respecting and producing citizen. That is the whole story.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, of the Seminole Indians there are now 461 in the State of Florida. It has been very difficult for the Government to do anything for these Indians and it has been very difficult for the white men to approach them, so that the efforts of the white men to assist them have been very slow in producing results.

For several years the appropriation was carried at \$7,000. In the current year it is \$7,000. The pending item is \$10,000, an increase of \$3,000. That is an increase in an item payable out of the Treasury for these Indians, so that the bill as a whole for the Indian Service shows a reduction of \$366,635 in items payable out of the Treasury. That is to say, we are cutting down the expenditures out of the Treasury for the benefit of the Indians to the extent of \$366,635 this year.

Notwithstanding that general policy, the Seminole item shows an increase of 50 per cent, from \$7,000 up to \$10,000.

A part of the increase, it was stated by Mr. Meritt in the hearings, will be used to purchase hogs for the Indians and to assist them in becoming self-supporting.

Now, as to the needs of these Indians. There is no doubt that they have been and are in a very needy condition. In the hearings Mr. Meritt said:

For a long time they would not have anything to do with the whites, but they are coming around to the point now where they will go to work in the orange groves of the white landowners.

Apparently it has been difficult to get them to work in any employment offered them.

The situation of the Seminoles in Florida is not a good one, because the Everglades are being drained and they can not rely upon that country for hunting and getting alligator hides, as they formerly did.

Mr. CARTER asked Mr. Meritt:

How many of these Indians have you got in school, Mr. Meritt?

Mr. MERITT. Not very many.

Mr. CARTER. Do you know exactly? Not over half a dozen, have you?

Mr. MERITT. Very few. We have some in school, but very few. They have reservations set aside for them and we are trying to get some of the Indians to locate on the reservations.

They have not been able to get them to go to the reservations which have been established for them. Mr. CARTER said:

The State set aside a reservation?

Mr. MERITT. And so did the Federal Government. They are scattered over a considerable area in southern Florida, some on the east coast and some on the west coast.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Perhaps the gentleman did not catch my statement that \$46,000 had been permitted to revert to the Treasury. That was under a former commissioner.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not concerned about that.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The gentleman made the statement that the Government could not do anything with these Indians.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I have not made such a statement.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I mean the gentleman read that from the hearings.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; that is not in the hearings; but it has been very difficult to do anything.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I will tell you why, and it will take just a second. When Congressman CARTER, of Oklahoma, tried to approach them, when he went down there, sent by Congress, the Indians said:

Me no talk to white men; white men lie; white men always lie.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; and that is the reason I have said those Indians have been hard to approach and have made it very difficult for the Government to do anything for them. But the Government has been persistent, and has provided schools which are not attended, has provided a reservation which is not used, and is now providing an initial expenditure for purchasing stock. We do not know yet how ready they will be to make use of that stock, but in this bill we are providing the money for the experiment.

The bureau has found, and my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] has given it as his judgment, and so have others, that one of the best ways to help the Indians is to help them to help themselves. We have been furnishing stock, equipment, and machinery for the Indians, but reimbursable, and out of \$4,000,000, \$3,000,000 has actually come back. This committee was so favorably impressed by that record that in this bill we increased the appropriation for that item from \$80,000 to \$150,000; we went \$70,000 above the Budget and we went \$70,000 over the request of the department, so thoroughly convinced were we of the benefits of the policy of buying stock and furnishing it to the Indians, putting them on their feet, and then having them pay back the cost of stock. There is nothing to prevent that increase of \$70,000 in part being used for these Indians in Florida just the same as it is available for Indians in a pitiable situation in the Southwest. But, of course, it has the reimbursable feature.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more, although I do not expect to use that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRAMTON. So the committee has been trying to take care of this situation, and I am sure that through the \$3,000 additional in this item over anything in recent years, and through the additional \$70,000 in the reimbursable item we are going as fast as we ought to be asked to go.

Now, the gentleman from Florida makes an eloquent plea for these 461 Indians; I suppose that probably means 70 or 80 families for whom we are making a direct appropriation of \$10,000, in addition to further appropriations in the bill for hospitalization, for schools, and for industrial relief. So that we are probably in this bill appropriating \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000—I do not know exactly how much—but more than \$10,000. The gentleman makes a statement here that is appealing, and you may say, "It is only \$10,000; why not give it to them?" But, my friends, there are numbers of Indian tribes for whom an equally appealing statement could be made, and, to my mind, with probably a better basis of results, because there are no Indians in the country now who are so unresponsive to the efforts of the whites. That is probably the fault of the whites, but it is the situation, and I must ask this House to support the committee. The point asked by the gentleman from Florida is more than the superintendent of that agency asked of the department. It is more than the

department asked of the Budget or the Budget has recommended, and I am obliged to ask the House not to permit sentiment, and the apparent smallness of the amount, to carry them away, but to sustain the committee in this provision which, I again emphasize, is more liberal than has previously been the case.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will my colleague yield? Of course, I know you do not want to mislead the committee. You say 70 or 75 families.

Mr. CRAMTON. There are 461 Indians, I am told—

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Out of a total of 600 Indians there are over 400 grown Indians.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am only guided by the hearings, and that is the official information that is before the committee.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. That is proof that the gentleman has not been guided correctly.

Mr. CRAMTON. If my friend will permit, that perhaps emphasizes how undesirable it is to try to take a thing up anew upon the floor and thresh it out here. If taken up in committee, if notice was given to us there were more than 460, further information could have been called for, but I am guided now by the official information before us.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. But not as to the number of families.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am only guessing at that.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. There are about 600 Indians and about 400 families. There are very few Indian children among them.

Mr. CRAMTON. Four hundred families?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I do not mean 400 families, but 400 grown people. There are very few Indian children among them; and under the treaty of 1932 that we entered into, if the same policy is pursued, there will not be 400 in the next two years.

Mr. CRAMTON. I dare say we are proposing to spend from \$50 to \$75 per capita—man, woman, and child—for the aid of these Indians next year, as against \$5 or \$6 or \$10 for other tribes in the Northwest and Southwest who are in a very pitiable condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SEARS of Florida) there were—yeas 16, nays 19.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, \$15,000.

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEFALD: On page 47, at the end of line 22, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, \$35,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, which, I think, is not good anyway, I want to ask the gentleman if he desires a gratuity appropriation for the benefit of the Chippewas. They have large funds of their own, have they not? I want to make this suggestion. I am not opposing the gentleman's amendment at this time, but I take it he has in mind an expenditure of funds of the Indians for their own benefit; and if so, the amendment would more properly come a little later in the bill.

Mr. WEFALD. The purpose of the amendment is that you will find on page 55 of the bill there is carried an appropriation of \$35,000 out of trust funds for general agency purposes.

Mr. CRAMTON. And you want that paid, not out of tribal funds, but out of the Treasury?

Mr. WEFALD. Yes; and in conformity with a treaty made with the Chippewa Indians.

Mr. CRAMTON. All right; I withdraw any objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. That the gentleman's amendment is not germane at this place or to the preceding paragraph. In other words, although he offers it as a new section, it must be germane to the preceding paragraph; and it is not germane, and is out of order, being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. These appropriations are for the general support and civilization, and a number of different agencies or tribes are being appropriated for. It seems to the Chair that this amendment is offered in the proper place.

Mr. BLANTON. But all these appropriations are under the Snyder Act, which will provide support and maintenance for

the Indians who were entitled to support and maintenance from the Government. The particular Indians that the gentleman from Minnesota seeks to provide for have sufficient money of their own in the United States Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not contend that that would prohibit the Government from taking out of the Treasury money for the support of other Indians?

Mr. BLANTON. The Indians for whom there is no authorization and who are not entitled to support and maintenance. I do not know of any authorization for such Indians that have money in the Treasury.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, while I am opposed to the amendment, I am opposed to the point of order. It would have been in order for the committee to have put the item in for these Indians under the Snyder Act. The gentleman has a right to offer his amendment and this is the proper place for it to be offered.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman does not contend that because the committee would have the right to put the item in that a Member from the floor would have the same right to offer the amendment? The present occupant of the Chair decided that question in a long line of decisions that a Member from the floor has not the same right that a committee would have that brings in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Regardless of what the present occupant of the Chair may have ruled on other occasions, it seems clear to him now that it is well within the rules for the committee to bring in such an appropriation. In this case, at any rate, a Member has the right to propose the amendment just offered from the floor. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take much time, because I am perfectly aware of the futility of attempting to amend the bill. I do not think it right or in order for the gentleman from Texas to always rise to a point of order the consequence of which is to bring disorder instead of order. I have prepared a statement which I want to read to place the case squarely before you. I think I am absolutely within my right to offer the amendment.

On page 55 of the bill, commencing with line 10, an appropriation of \$35,000 out of the trust funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota is authorized for general agency purposes. The use of the trust funds for the maintenance of governmental agencies in Minnesota is in violation of the agreements entered into with the Indians under the authority contained in the act of January 14, 1889. Section 7 of that act expressly limits the use of their funds to the payment of certain enumerated expenses, which do not include agency expenses. When the agreements were negotiated the Indians were assured by the commissioners that their trust fund would only be encroached upon in case of "failure of crops or other unforeseen misfortune." These agencies are maintained in pursuance of a governmental policy and not at the instance of the Indians. After the agreements were entered into in 1889 not a dollar of the trust funds was ever used in defraying agency expenses until 1911, thus indicating the construction of the agreements by the United States. The Indians have long protested against the use of their money for the maintenance of the agencies. The Chippewas are one of the few tribes of Indians whose trust funds are used for agency purposes. As the use of their money for such purposes is in violation of the terms of their agreements, these appropriations ought not to continue out of their funds. The expenses of these agencies should be defrayed out of the Public Treasury as are the expenses of practically all the other agencies throughout the country.

That is the statement of facts upon which I base the contention that this amendment should be adopted. I will admit that the situation of the Chippewa Indians is one of the most complex of all the Indian tribes that we have to deal with. I do not wish to take up any more of your time, I simply submit the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, it provides that this shall be paid out of the Federal Treasury rather than out of the tribal funds, making it a gratuity?

Mr. WEFALD. It provides that it shall be paid out of the general Treasury.

Mr. CARTER. As the gentleman knows, we have a treaty of 1889 with the Chippewa Indians authorizing the use of their funds for administration, school, and other purposes. Now, I am always an advocate of the protection of the Indian funds, but I am as strong or a stronger advocate of complying with the treaties made with the Indians. Since we have a treaty that this shall be paid out of their funds, and inasmuch as they have an enormous fund of \$7,000,000 in the Treasury, I

do not think the gentleman ought to expect the House to violate that treaty by taking money out of the Federal Treasury as a gratuity. Under the treaty the plain and specific terms provide for the payment from the tribal funds.

Mr. WEFALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. WEFALD. I want to remind the gentleman that until the year 1911 all of the expenses for administration and agency purposes were paid out of the general fund, out of the general Treasury, and not in conformity with the treaty with the Chippewa Indians.

Mr. CARTER. That statement is correct until the last line. The present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Burke, was a member of the House, and he found that most of these items were being paid out of the Federal Treasury. He called attention to the fact that the treaty provided for the payment of the items out of the Chippewa fund, and he inaugurated the system of having them paid out of the tribal fund, and since which time I think they have been paid in accordance with the terms of the treaty.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEFALD] will prevail, but, as he stated, it is hopeless to expect that it will. I am glad to know that my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is so strong for carrying out the treaties that were made with the Indians and taking care of the Indians.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, the gentleman has known that all of the time.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. It must please the Seminole Indians in Florida to have some one tell them he at least talks for them in Washington, some 1,600 miles away. However, it is a useless job telling Members the facts and reading them the treaties, and then in turn telling the Indians of the money they could get if they were foolish enough to leave Florida and go to some other State. They win with a membership that listens to the argument, and then those who come in from the cloakroom and who have not listened to the argument outvote them; but what can you expect when such is the case?

Mr. CRAMTON. Who has stated at any time in the debate that anyone is insisting that they leave their State of Florida? It might have been stated that they should go to work.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The treaty of 1832 said that whenever these Indians would leave Florida and move west of the Mississippi, \$250,000 in the Treasury, drawing 5 per cent interest, would be divided equally among them.

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, surely my good friend from Florida will not say that an Indian is showing bad judgment in going to such a splendid future State as Oklahoma and leaving Florida.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman tell us what the treaty said about what would happen to those who did not see fit to move but who remained there?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. What has happened to them is just what the committee has just done. The white man has broken faith with them from the very beginning. I want to thank my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], who has just asked me a question. I should like to move to Oklahoma myself, if Florida was not such a wonderful State and the people there were not so good to me. The gentleman was a member of the committee that visited Florida, and he saw the condition of those Indians and he voted for the proposition.

Mr. HASTINGS. And I have voted for it ever since.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. And he knows the State of Florida set aside 100,000 acres of land for their benefit, believing that upon the recommendation of those who visited that State at that time we would give those Indians cattle and hogs and horses and would fence the land, because they can not live on land alone. I am not complaining; I am a good loser, although at present such would not appear to be the case. However, I never did like to talk to a judge who was asleep, and I never like to talk to a jury when they are out considering some other question, and I do not like to have distinguished colleagues walk from the cloakroom and say, "Oh, well, I am with the committee, regardless of the treaty."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment for just a moment to keep the record straight. My colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] admits that there is a treaty between the Government and these Indians.

Mr. CARTER. He states it.

Mr. BLANTON. And if he states it, he admits it.

Mr. SNYDER. And it is a fact.

Mr. BLANTON. And the distinguished gentleman from New York states that it is a fact that there is a treaty between this

Government and these Indians; that their maintenance must be paid out of their own money which is in the Treasury. In that event, why does the chairman of the committee get up and say that a point of order to an amendment seeking to make the Government pay it, when that would be in violation of the treaty, is not in order?

Mr. CRAMTON. The chairman of the subcommittee made the statement because it is true. Whether or not they have money does not affect the parliamentary status but it does affect the advisability of the amendment, and I personally am entirely against the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to take more than a minute, but I want to say this: That treaty is just as much the law of this land as the Snyder Act, and whenever a treaty provides that maintenance money for Indians must be paid out of their own money, and some one seeks to take it out of the Treasury, it is a change of existing law, and my point of order was good. However, it has been overruled.

Mr. WEFALD. And I maintain that the treaty does not say that.

Mr. BLANTON. My colleague from Minnesota is in error, and this is the first time, I believe, that he has ever been in error on a question of fact.

Mr. WEFALD. If the treaty does say that, I think this House ought to be shown.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5078, the Interior Department appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition signed by post-office clerks—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can put that in the basket; it does not require unanimous consent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FENN was granted leave of absence, for four days, on account of important business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow after the conclusion of the address of Mr. DAVILA, Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ROGERS] may have permission to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that to-morrow after the conclusion of the address of Mr. DAVILA, the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ROGERS] may have permission to speak for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which I do not intend to do, it does not embarrass the committee at all to have a limited amount of literary program before proceeding to our work, but I should feel obliged not to grant an extension of time—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It will not provoke a controversy.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand it entirely. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the gentleman from New Hampshire has concluded his remarks to-morrow I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House to-morrow for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. That makes a total of 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. That will be the limit of the patience of the committee, and I shall not object to this but would to any further consumption of time.

Mr. ROACH. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I happen to know the subject upon which the gentleman from Missouri intends to address the House. Whether it will provoke con-

trovery I can not say. The gentleman serves notice—I have no objection as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 26, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

308. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the State of Pennsylvania a certain tract of land under water in the Delaware River, no longer needed for lighthouse purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

309. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, for special services in the office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Army, \$35,000 (H. Doc. No. 168); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

310. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Alien Property Custodian for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, for the expenses of the protection and return of works of art loaned by the Austro-Hungarian Government to the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, \$8,514.83 (H. Doc. 169); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

311. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, amounting to \$418,960.28 (H. Doc. No. 170); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

312. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, amounting to \$154,000 (H. Doc. No. 171); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

313. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, for gunnery and engineering exercises, \$24,300 (H. Doc. No. 172); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

314. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, submitting abstracts of proposals received during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1923, for materials and labor in connection with works under the Engineer Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

315. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting an additional offer from the Tennessee Electric Power Co. and its associates covering the manufacture of nitrogen and fertilizers at Muscle Shoals (H. Doc. No. 173); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 661. A bill authorizing the President to appoint two additional circuit judges for the eighth circuit; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 5416. A bill to authorize the setting aside of certain tribal lands within the Quinalt Indian Reservation in Washington for lighthouse purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 384. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across Waccamaw River in South Carolina near the North Carolina State line; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4807. A bill granting the consent of Congress

to the State Highway Commission of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across West Pearl River in the State of Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4817. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois and the State of Iowa, or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River connecting the county of Whiteside, Ill., and the county of Clinton, Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAPES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4182. A bill authorizing the city of Ludington, Mason County, Mich., to construct a bridge across the Pera Marquette River; with amendments (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3800. A bill to cancel an allotment of land made to Mary Crane or Ho-tah-kah-win-kaw, a deceased Indian, embracing land within the Winnebago Indian Reservation in Nebraska; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3900. A bill to cancel two allotments made to Richard Bell, deceased, embracing land within the Round Valley Indian Reservation in California; without amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2030) for the relief of Anna W. Newman; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Morris S. Baker; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2005) for the relief of William J. McGee; Committee on Appropriations discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4319) authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes; Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 6194) for the relief of officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRITEN: A bill (H. R. 6195) to establish a permanent special working fund for the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LYON: A bill (H. R. 6196) to amend section 98 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6197) to permit joining the United States of America as a party defendant in an action in Federal and State courts in certain actions affecting title to real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6198) to amend section 5147 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARRETT: A bill (H. R. 6199) to amend the revenue act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6200) to correct the status of certain commissioned officers of the Navy appointed thereto pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 6201) to amend the revenue act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6202) to amend sections 11 and 12 of the merchant marine act, 1920; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 6203) to amend and modify the war risk insurance act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 6204) to provide for acceptance of active sea duty with regular Navy in lieu of examination for license to officer and command an ocean-going merchant craft of unlimited tonnage; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6205) to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting interstate transportation of the products of convict labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6206) providing for the election of delegates to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, a public utilities commission, a board of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6207) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice all that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation which lies in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 6208) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Morrillton, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 6209) providing for the purchase of a site to be used for the erection of a public building thereon at Salem, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: Resolution (H. Res. 158) to cancel the lease of the Mammoth Oil Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, petitioning the Congress of the United States as to its policy relative to the Officers' Reserve Corps, a citizen component of the Army of the United States, as created by the national defense act of June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, asking Congress to enact appropriate legislation to provide the authorization and the necessary appropriation for the deepening of the Hudson River to the head of tide-water at the Federal dam at Troy; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging Congress to provide the necessary authorization and appropriation for the deepening of the Hudson River to the Federal dam at Troy by legislation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SWANK: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, petitioning the Congress of the United States as to its policy relative to the Officers' Reserve Corps, a citizen component of the Army of the United States, as created by the national defense act of June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6210) authorizing the President to restore Commander George M. Baum, United States Navy, to a place on the list of commanders of the Navy to rank next after Commander Walter Albert Smead, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 6211) granting a pension to Lucy Oglesby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLEARY: A bill (H. R. 6212) for the relief of the owner of barge No. 62; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROLL: A bill (H. R. 6213) granting a pension to Lizzie C. Weller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 6214) to correct the military record of George Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 6215) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 6216) for the relief of William Befuhs, alias Charles Cameron; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6217) for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Lighthouses; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 6218) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Pfleger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6219) granting an increase of pension to Melissa E. Dickinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6220) for the relief of Anna M. Roettger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 6221) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John M. Wallace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6222) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6223) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6224) granting a pension to Susanna Bulla; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) granting a pension to Lucinda Geary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 6226) granting a pension to Ava Pinkerton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6227) granting a pension to Henry F. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6228) granting an increase of pension to Christopher J. Rollis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 6229) for the relief of Frank W. Wiedenmann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 6230) for the relief of Owen J. Owen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) for the relief of R. W. Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6232) for the relief of James Shook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6233) granting a pension to Louise Donovan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) granting an increase of pension to John Seidel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 6235) granting a pension to August Richards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 6236) granting an increase of pension to James D. Lafferty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6237) granting a pension to Charles T. Westfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6238) to provide for an examination and survey of the mouths of Roanoke River and Mackeys Creek, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WELLER: A bill (H. R. 6239) granting a pension to Annie de Toro; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6240) for the relief of Helen Barry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6241) for the relief of Lieut. E. J. McAllister; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 6242) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Florence, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Kensington, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6244) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Madison, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6245) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Manor, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6246) granting a pension to Rose Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEGER: Resolution (H. Res. 157) to pay salary and funeral expenses of Andrew T. Sabol, late lieutenant of Capitol police; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

738. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of officers and employees of C. S. Hammond & Co. (Inc.), New York City,

N. Y., favoring Mellon tax reduction plan and opposing bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

739. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Massachusetts, favoring tax reduction and opposing the granting of a bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

740. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of District 6, Y. M. and Y. W. H. A. of New England, opposing further restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

741. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of the West Side Business Men's Club, of Taft, Calif., relative to the administration of the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

742. By Mr. COLE of Ohio: Petition of Farm Bureau of Hardin County, Ohio, concerning child labor resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

743. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, 1,200 members being present, in meeting assembled, in the interest of humanity, believing in the doctrine "that every laborer is worthy of his hire," having due regard and consideration of the present high cost of living, respectfully petitioning Congress to enact into law an adequate readjustment of the salaries of letter carriers and post-office clerks, providing a maximum salary of \$2,400 per year, and 80 cents per hour for substitutes for all work performed; whereas any increase permitted by law to said postal employees would not place an additional tax upon the American people because of the Post Office Department being self-sustaining; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

744. Also, petition of metal trades department, American Federation of Labor, urging an adequate provision for building up and maintaining a well-balanced Navy based on the treaty ratio arising out of the International Conference on Limitation of Armament, wherein a ratio was agreed upon by the respective powers, and has been ratified by those powers in a subsequent treaty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

745. Also, petition of the National Consumers' League, approving the Dyer antilynching bill and urging its passage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

746. Also, petition of regular Democratic Association of the seventeenth assembly district of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of the bill granting an increase to mail carriers and postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

747. By Mr. DYER: Petition of American Woman's Council of Justice, St. Louis, Mo., favoring tax reduction in order to permit the enactment of bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

748. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, favoring the passage of House bill 4123 to increase the salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

749. By Mr. KING: Petition of the Illinois Farmers' Institute, favoring the passage of the Purnell bill (H. R. 2243) authorizing the more complete endowment of agricultural experiment stations, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

750. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Ernest J. Clark, of Mutual Life Insurance Co., Baltimore, Md., protesting tax on sirup and carbonic gas; also Cloverdale Spring Co., Baltimore; also the Gosman Ginger Ale Co., Baltimore; and the George Blome & Son Co., Baltimore, protesting candy excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

751. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Massachusetts Dental Society, favoring the enactment into law of Senate bill 1785 and House bill 4845; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

752. Also, petition of members of District 6, Associated Young Men and Young Women's Hebrew Association of New England, opposing any further restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

753. Also, petition of the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, endorsing the principle of adjusted compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

754. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Defiance, Montpelier, Ottawa, Wauseon, and Van Wert, Ohio, asking for the repeal of the amusement tax now imposed upon motion pictures, vaudeville, and entertainments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

755. By Mr. WARD of North Carolina: Petition of National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners, for amendments to Interstate commerce act affecting railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 26, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

O God, our Heavenly Father, whose changeless goodness is manifested toward us in countless ways, hear Thou our prayer in the name of Him who loved the world in such infinite measure that He gave His life that it might be saved. Bless us with the pardon of our sins, with consciences that are sensitive to all wrong, and with strength to carry forward every good resolution. Every life is a plan of God, and the Father who plans is the Father who pities and redeems, and is the Father who loves and saves. Ever hold the cross before our waiting eyes that we may be inspired and guided by the sacrifice, service, and condescension of the Man of Galilee. Amen.

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

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House immediately after the approval of the Journal on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal, he may address the House. For how long?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Forty minutes.

The SPEAKER. For 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know on what subject?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. On the present condition of the air service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday night I delivered a 10-minute talk on the coal situation, which was broadcast by radio to the coal fields of Kentucky and other fields. I ask unanimous consent to insert that in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE COAL SITUATION.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following address that I made on January 22, broadcasted by radio:

Gentlemen of the Northeast Kentucky Coal Association and other friends, it is a matter of deep personal regret to me that I am denied the pleasure of being with you to-night, having been detained on urgent official business in connection with legislation now pending in Congress for the completion of the hospitalization program for the disabled ex-service men. I am speaking from here through the courtesy of Gimbel Bros., one of the great business establishments of America.

Although you are invisible to me, I can visualize you through the sense of this personal touch, and I want you to know that I am with you wholeheartedly, both in spirit and in purpose.

This is the first opportunity I have ever had of addressing a distant audience through the air by means of this great invention which evidences the marvelous progress of modern science and forecasts undreamed of possibilities for the future. Whether this means that there will be developed a fuel substitute for coal is a problem which remains for American genius to solve. Certainly it will not occur in your lifetime or mine and not until some remote period when the uncounted billions of tons of coal yet undeveloped approach exhaustion.

I am quite conscious of the fact (and it is a bit embarrassing to me) that this great fuel problem, so vital to our industrial and domestic life, has long had, and is still having, many great intellects, backed by long experience and expert knowledge, dealing with it, while I can speak only as a layman.

I am likewise mindful that I am now in the great State of Pennsylvania, where the rich productive fields of anthracite lie, and in the city of Brotherly Love, the fountain head of its monopoly.

However, I can not resist the temptation to say that the dominant thought in my mind is how the present prohibitive price of anthracite