

# Congressional Record.

## PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION.

028387

### SENATE.

SATURDAY, March 15, 1924.

(Legislative day of Friday, March 14, 1924.)

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Fess	Ladd	Robinson
Ball	Fletcher	Lodge	Sheppard
Bayard	Frazier	McKellar	Shields
Borah	George	McKinley	Shipstead
Brandeggee	Gerry	McNary	Shortridge
Broussard	Glass	Mayfield	Simmons
Bursum	Gooding	Neely	Smith
Cameron	Hale	Norris	Smoot
Capper	Harrell	Oddie	Spencer
Caraway	Harris	Overman	Stanfield
Colt	Harrison	Owen	Stephens
Couzens	Howell	Phipps	Trammell
Curtis	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	Warren
Dill	Kendrick	Ransdell	Weller
Ernst	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Ferris	King	Reed, Pa.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair announces that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are engaged in a committee hearing. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask leave to submit a conference report on House bill 5078, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator does not desire to take it up for consideration at this time?

Mr. SMOOT. If it leads to any lengthy discussion I shall not press it unduly.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will say that a Senator who can not be on the floor just at this moment asked that it be not taken up in his absence. I refer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] who will be here in a few minutes. He is now engaged on the business of the Senate outside the Chamber in a committee hearing. The report can be submitted and lie upon the table to be taken up later.

Mr. SMOOT. I will withdraw my request for the present and submit the report later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah withdraws his request.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair) laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, fiscal year 1924, contingent expenses, United States Senate, for payment of expenses incurred by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate on account of attendance of Senators at the funeral of the late President, Warren G. Harding, \$5,000; for purchase of furniture, \$5,000, in total amount \$10,000, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed. (S. Doc. No. 65.)

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establish-

ment, fiscal year 1924, maintenance, Senate Office Building, for an extension of a freight elevator to the attic story of the Senate Office Building, including a new pent house, wiring, and new concrete floor in the entire attic story of this building, also one new revolving door on the ground floor at the southwest corner of the building, \$23,558, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed. (S. Doc. No. 66.)

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of the Lions Club of Rawlins, Wyo., praying for the passage of the so-called Capper truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of members of the Milton Women's Club, of Milton, Fla., praying for the passage of legislation creating a Federal department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, praying an amendment to the Constitution regulating child labor, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of members of Pride of Columbus Council, No. 207, Daughters of America, of Columbus, Ohio., praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson selective immigration bill, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the lodges of the S. N. P. J. (fraternal organization of Yugoslav people), of Cleveland and Neff, Ohio, protesting against the passage of selective immigration legislation, and especially against the proposal to register, photograph, and finger-print immigrants, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CAPPER presented the petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., praying for the passage of legislation authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer certain materials, machinery, and equipment to the Department of Agriculture for road building purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newton, Kans., praying for the passage of legislation creating a Federal department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Newton, Kans., remonstrating against the participation of the United States in the League of Nations or the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Saffordville and Newton, in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson selective immigration bill, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of L. C. Weeks, as local secretary of the Federated Shop Crafts and of the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, of Osawatimie, Kans., praying for a repeal of the so-called Esch-Cummins transportation act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry employees of the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., of Pittsburg, Kans., remonstrating against amendment of the transportation act of 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FESS presented a resolution adopted by the Ohio Horticultural Society, at Columbus, Ohio, favoring the passage of the so-called Purnell bill, relative to more complete endowment of agricultural experiment stations, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Springfield (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the so-called Lucretia Mott amendment to the Constitution, providing that men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United

States and all territory subject to its jurisdiction, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Orrville, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Brookhart-Hull bill, requiring that all strictly military supplies be manufactured in Government-owned navy yards and arsenals, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented resolutions of the Trades and Labor Council of Lima and of teachers of the public schools of Delphos, both in the State of Ohio, favoring the restriction of the traffic in narcotics, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the Akron (Ohio) Bar Association, favoring the passage of legislation exempting from taxation \$5,000 of personal income, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2146) to amend section 84 of the Penal Code of the United States (Rept. No. 256);

A bill (S. 2147) to complete the construction of the Willow Creek ranger station, Montana (Rept. No. 257);

A bill (S. 2148) to empower certain officers, agents, or employees of the Department of Agriculture to administer and take oaths, affirmations, and affidavits in certain cases (Rept. No. 258);

A bill (S. 2149) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, and to promote reforestation (Rept. No. 259);

A bill (S. 2150) to authorize arrests by officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture in certain cases and to amend section 62 of the act of March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States" (Rept. No. 260);

A bill (S. 2151) to increase the subsistence and per diem allowances of certain officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture (Rept. No. 261);

A bill (S. 2164) to repeal that part of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912," approved March 4, 1911, relating to the admission of tick-infested cattle from Mexico into Texas (Rept. No. 262);

A bill (S. 2316) to allow credit in the accounts of A. W. Smith (Rept. No. 263); and

A bill (S. 2711) for the relief of the Pitt River Power Co. (Rept. No. 264).

Mr. HARRELD, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1174) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine claims of certain members of the Sioux Nation of Indians for damages occasioned by the destruction of their horses (Rept. No. 265); and

A bill (H. R. 4161) authorizing the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to acquire necessary rights of way across private lands, by purchase or condemnation proceedings, needed in constructing a spillway and drainage ditch to lower and maintain the level of Lake Andes, in South Dakota (Rept. No. 266).

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 655) to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 267) thereon.

Mr. DILL, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) to change the name of "Mount Rainier" to "Mount Tacoma," and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 268) thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED.

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on yesterday they presented to the President the enrolled bill (S. 684) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the commencement on June 18, 1923, of the work of carving on Stone Mountain, in the State of Georgia, a monument to the valor of the soldiers of the South, which was the inspiration of their sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters in the Spanish-American and World Wars, and in memory of Warren G. Harding, President of the United States of America, in whose administration the work was begun.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. HARRELD:

A bill (S. 2838) to provide for expenditure of tribal funds of Indians for construction, repair, and rental of agency buildings, and related purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 2839) for the relief of George Turner; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2840) for the relief of C. C. Carson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2841) for the relief of Wesley Mathis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2842) to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2843) to enable persons in the United States to engage in cooperative purchasing, for importation into the United States, of raw commodities which are produced principally in foreign countries; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed bills of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6426. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 6941. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 7449. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7783. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 7816. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 7039) to amend section 72 of chapter 23, printing act approved January 12, 1895, relative to the allotment of public documents.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolution and act:

On March 12, 1924:

S. J. Res. 57. Joint Resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the District of Columbia of a statue by Jose Clara personifying "Serenity."

On March 14, 1924:

S. 2014. An act to authorize the Park-Wood Lumber Co. to construct two bridges across the United States Canal which connects Apalachicola River and St. Andrews Bay, Fla.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

H. R. 7449. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 6426. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 6941. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain



widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 7783. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 7816. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### CHANGE OF DATE OF INAUGURATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The question is upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia by striking out in line 3 the word "six" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four," so that the amendment as amended would read:

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years; and no person hereafter elected shall be eligible to reelection.

I desire to say just a word on the amendment. I have been impressed by the arguments that have been made, particularly by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], to the effect that six years is too long a time for which to elect an Executive, particularly if it should develop that a serious mistake had been made by the people in that choice. It seems to me that four years is a sufficiently long term.

I have also been impressed by arguments that have been urged by various Senators that it is a misfortune to the country that the Executive of any party is bound inevitably by the exigencies of party politics to give more or less of his attention during his first term to the matter of his reelection. I believe in the long run the country would get better service if we should make the President ineligible for a second term and confine his term to four years. It seems to me that is a sufficiently long time to enable a Chief Executive fairly to work out the policies which he has promised to work out, and if it develops that the people were not satisfied with those policies they ought to have the right to change at the end of four years rather than at the end of a longer period such as six years. By adopting the amendment which I suggest to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia we would get the advantage of having an Executive chosen for a definite term with definite knowledge beforehand that he could not be a candidate for reelection. He must then know that whatever record he makes he must make within the four years.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

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

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, of course, there is much which can be said both in favor of and against the proposal to limit public officers to one term, but what is the distinction, in the opinion of the Senator from Ohio, proper to be made between the terms of executive officers and the terms of legislative officers? If executive officers should be denied the privilege of being reelected, if they should be limited to a single term, why should not the same principle be applied to members of the legislative branch of the Government?

I take it that the principal purpose of denying an executive officer the right to succeed himself is to remove him from the temptation of acting in the performance of his duty in a way to incur public favor. If it is right and proper that an executive officer should be removed from influences which tend to make him conform toward public sentiment in the performance of his duties, why is not the same principle applicable, for instance, to Members of Congress, to those who serve in the legislative department? Is not the argument which can legitimately be advanced in favor of single terms for executive officers quite as strong, if not stronger, in favor of single terms for legislative officers?

When the whole argument has been summed up, is it desirable that either executive or legislative officers should be

placed above or below the reasonable influences which are exerted on both executive and legislative servants of the people naturally arising from what they believe to be the state of public opinion as it relates to the performance of their respective duties? In a Government, such as ours, where all authority rests finally upon mature public opinion, do we desire to say that the public officers shall be placed in a position where indifference to public sentiment shall be premiumized? I think it worth while to remember that it might be subversive of the public interest to place either legislative or executive officers in a position where they would naturally be indifferent to the influences which gave them power.

I know there has been in progress throughout the country during recent months a campaign of education or propaganda—you may name it whichever you please—in favor of a single term of six years for the President. So far as my information goes, it is based solely on the theory that the Chief Executive, out of a desire to succeed himself in office, might render decisions and take action which would be subversive of the public interest, and that if we should remove him from that motive there would naturally result a temperament and a disposition which would make the Executive always conform to his convictions of the public interest, uninfluenced by his own ambitions. Every Executive, however, in the natural course, becomes surrounded by powerful and designing influences. I do not need to recall to the Senate instances where the Chief Executive has been regarded as subject to unofficial influences of men in private life. When the argument is summed up, I believe it will be found that the condition is better under the present system than it would be under the proposed system, where either Executive or legislative officers would be independent of the influences that gave them their power and position.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I think the observations of the Senator from Arkansas are pertinent and proper, and, as his observations always are, they are well worthy of most careful consideration. It seems to me, however, that the argument which the Senator has so ingeniously and ably made is directed at the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] rather than to the amendment to the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is entirely true.

Mr. WILLIS. I think, however, the Senator's questions are perfectly proper and fair, and I wish to answer them as best I can.

In the first place, I think there is a vast difference between the execution and administration of laws on the one hand and the enactment of laws on the other hand.

I think I can see several very good reasons why it might be desirable to limit the term of the Executive that would not be applicable at all to the case of a Representative in Congress or a Senator. I think the President occupies a relationship to the people, and ought to occupy a relationship to the people, quite different from that which obtains between a Representative or a Senator on the one hand and the people on the other. The people generally look to the Chief Executive as the personification of national sovereignty. It will be remembered by those familiar with the great classic of the history of government, Guizot's History of Civilization, that he points out that the Executive is in a sense the personification of the sovereignty of the people, and that is why all of us, no matter what the stress of party contest or bitterness may be, have a respect for the office entirely separate and apart from the personality of the individual who temporarily happens to occupy it. Because that is true, because the Executive is the personification, in a sense, of the sovereignty of the Nation, I believe that in the long run the people will get better service and the Executive himself will be in a position to have his service better understood if it is known beforehand that he can not be a candidate for reelection.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the argument of the Senator, it seems to me, is answered by recurring to two or three particular crises in American history when it would have been almost disastrous if the people had not been permitted to reelect such men as Washington and Lincoln. That is particularly true with reference to Lincoln. It is said, and I imagine it is true, that some friends of Lincoln came to Washington from Springfield, Ill., prior to the commencement of the campaign in 1864 and went to a Member of the House and asked him to introduce them to Lincoln friends in the House and the Senate; that they were naturally anxious about his politi-

cal future, and were desirous of getting in touch with them. The gentleman to whom they spoke took them over and introduced them to a Representative from Illinois, and said that if Lincoln had any other friends in the House he did not know who they were. It is a notorious fact that what we might call the "organization," or the leaders of the party, were practically unanimous against Lincoln's renomination; but the people thought otherwise and, as usual, they were ahead of their leaders. I think it would have been a disaster if he had not been reelected. It was almost a disaster when he was assassinated, and it would have been worse if he had not been reelected.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Idaho is quite correct in the observation that it would have been an unspeakable calamity if President Lincoln had not been reelected, but, on the other hand, if we should adopt the amendment of the Senator from Georgia without the amendment which I am now proposing it would have been an equally unspeakable calamity, speaking with great respect to the then Chief Executive—it would have been a calamity indescribable if the predecessor of Mr. Lincoln had had two more years in which to serve. That, to me, is the answer, or an answer to the argument in favor of a six-year term. I quite agree that it would have been a tremendous misfortune if President Lincoln had not been reelected or if President Washington had not been reelected, and yet I can easily conceive of circumstances in which it might be a calamity if a President were reelected. We have to work out those things according to the doctrine of chance.

Mr. BORAH. That is true, but I think there is a difference between denying the people the right to exercise their judgment and relying upon that judgment when they do exercise it. I do not think there is a great deal of danger after a President has been in office for four years if he submits himself again to the electorate and the electorate approves of him. There is not a great deal of danger in that reelection. Does the Senator think there is?

Mr. WILLIS. No. Frankly, I say I do not think there is a great deal of danger in that respect; I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. BORAH. If we believe in representative government, it is fundamental that the ultimate judgment of the people must be the basis of our faith. There is just one feature of the situation which is disturbing to me, and if I knew how to control it I should be glad to do so. I do think that Presidents ordinarily devote too much time during the first four years to the effort to be reelected for a second term.

Mr. WILLIS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. HARRELD. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho this question: Suppose that after Mr. Lincoln had been renominated the will of the leaders to whom the Senator referred as being opposed to him had prevailed and Mr. Lincoln had been defeated, can the Senator not conceive that there might have been complications arising from that which would have been avoided if it had been known from the beginning that he would not succeed himself, thereby affording an opportunity to provide against that contingency?

Mr. BORAH. Well, no; I think the disaster which would have resulted would have been the same whether the leaders had prevailed or whether the Constitution had made it impossible. We would have been deprived of Lincoln in either case, and it would have been a disaster.

Mr. HARRELD. I think that is true.

Mr. BORAH. But there is one thing about the leaders in American politics—that after they find out what the people really want, they generally accede to it.

Mr. HARRELD. That is true.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I want to suggest one other thing for the consideration of the able Senator from Idaho, and that is this: The adoption of this amendment, in my judgment, would make out of the Presidency an office that is more directly the servant of the people and very much less an office that is devoted to political leadership. As long as you have it in the Constitution so provided that the President is eligible for reelection it is absolutely inevitable that he will be looked upon as, and to some extent he will be, a leader of his party. Political considerations are going to have large effect. On the other hand, if you provide in the fundamental law that the Chief Executive can not be reelected, you have very largely removed him from the influence of mere political considerations and have brought him face to face with the sense of his respon-

sibility to the people. He knows that, politically, when he is elected to the Presidency his career is finished, and whatever he is to accomplish for the benefit of his country he must accomplish in the four years. I think it will place the Presidency upon a higher level and will bring to any man who is elevated to that great office a greater sense of his responsibility to the people.

Mr. BORAH. Certainly you would not want the President to cease playing politics and have the Senate playing politics; so we ought to limit the service of Senators to one term also.

Mr. WILLIS. That might be desirable, but I think it is unwise to undertake to doctor all the different departments of the Government at once.

Mr. BORAH. So we will begin with the other fellow's department.

Mr. WILLIS. We will begin with the proposition that is before us.

Here is another consideration: I submit this without any reference to the turbulent times through which we have recently passed in this body and perhaps in which we are. I am not thinking particularly about that, though it affords an illustration. I have never known of any President of the United States whose motives were very seriously misjudged.

Going back no further than the administration of President Wilson—and I can speak of that very freely, because I chance to belong to the opposite party—we could multiply illustrations where undoubtedly the motives of the President were misunderstood. It was said that he did thus and so because he was shaping affairs so that he and his party might win in the next election. Sensible and thoughtful men can give numerous illustrations of that sort of thing, and I have no doubt that that has been true of every President we have ever had. I think no doubt it is true in the instant case that the motives of the Chief Executive are misunderstood and misinterpreted. I do not complain about that. It is one of the things that is inevitable in politics, because we are looking all the time to the next election; but if there were a provision in the fundamental law that the Chief Executive should be elected for four years, and four years only, then he would be looked upon as he ought to be, as the representative of the sovereignty of the Nation and not as a political leader.

I therefore believe that the amendment I have suggested ought to be adopted, so that this proposed amendment will provide for a four-year term instead of a six years, and then that the President shall be ineligible for reelection.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. I think the Senator has finished his remarks on that phase of the matter; and if so, I desire to ask him a question.

The purpose of this amendment, as I take it, is to change the date of inauguration and the ending of the terms of Members of Congress, so that we will not have a "lame-duck" situation in the United States in the future.

Mr. WILLIS. That is the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]; yes.

Mr. DILL. That being the purpose, does the Senator think it is a wise thing to do to mix with that purpose—the question of how long a President shall serve? In other words, waving aside the arguments for or against a single term, if the Senator is for the amendment as it now stands, does he not think it endangers the ratification of the amendment to put into it another proposition, and one that is entirely different, namely, the length of time that a man can be President?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I think that is a very proper question, too; and if I had my way about it, I quite agree with the Senator from Washington that I should rather consider the propositions separately. We have to deal, however, with things as they come before us. Here is an amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senate is bound to vote upon it. Since it is before us, I can see no objection to acting upon the matter now, and therefore I have offered my amendment.

Mr. DILL. I want to say to the Senator that I shall vote against this amendment and the amendment of the Senator from Georgia also, because I do not want to mix the two propositions.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to appeal to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] to withdraw his amendment, regardless of the merits of the amendment to it offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS]; and it is immaterial, as I look at it, whether the latter amendment is agreed to or not. I should like to have the amendment offered by the Senator



from Georgia defeated, for the reasons that were so well stated by the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL]. I am not sure but that upon full debate and discussion I should vote for the Senator's amendment. The Senator, however, ought to see now, immediately when it is suggested, what a controversy of opinion arises at once as to whether that ought to be put in the Constitution. If that amendment should be put on the one I have proposed, it would couple with a proposition that has but little or no opposition one that would lead to endless controversy, and might bring about the defeat of the whole thing.

I appeal to the Senator from Georgia, under the circumstances, to withdraw his amendment. If a vote is taken on it, his amendment will not get the support of many Senators who are in favor of it, so that it would be an injustice even to the amendment to make the record that we are about to make. I do not want to vote against it myself, but I should have to vote against it. I should plead with the Members of the Senate, the friends of the original joint resolution that has been reported from the committee and is before us now, if they want that idea enacted into law and want the legislatures to approve it, not to couple with it another proposition upon which probably the people are practically equally divided.

It seems to me, under the circumstances, that the Senator from Georgia ought to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I think with some sympathy of the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], but it strikes me that this is a very important proposal. It is one about which I have thought for many years. This is the first time in my experience that it has ever come before a legislative body in a form where we can vote for or against it, and for that reason I should like to have just a moment to consider it, whatever may be the attitude of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] as to withdrawing it.

I have listened to the comment for and against the amendment. I am thoroughly convinced that this is not a matter that is impulsive, not a matter that has come without long consideration, that we ought to write into the organic law the ineligibility for reelection of the Chief Executive.

I fully appreciate the one outstanding objection that was raised a moment ago by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in which he referred to the possible danger of failure to reelection in the midst of war, speaking especially of the reelection of Lincoln in 1864. I admit that that is a contingency that might arise, but it is not very apt to embarrass us greatly. I admit that in the progress of a great conflict, where the entire policy has been under the direction of an Executive, the change of that Executive in the midst of it might present some danger. I also recognize the argument of Hamilton that was made in the Constitutional Convention, and later in his argument in the *Federalist*, that reeligibility is an invitation to do a real service and is a suggestion against doing anything that might meet with the disapproval of the public. All of those items I have thought of at other times, but I do not believe that they overbalance the value of writing the ineligibility for reelection into the Constitution.

In the first place, the President must be, in the nature of our institutions, the party leader. It does not mean that he wants to be; it means that he must inevitably be the party leader. I know, as other Members sitting here know, that our late President would not have turned over his hand for a reelection. Those of you who knew him as well as some of us did, who have talked over matters with him as we did, know that what he was compelled to do that appeared to be directed by considerations of party welfare was not so much of his choice as it was by reason of his being the head of the Nation and the head of a political party. In other words, this requirement of being a party leader is not necessarily from choice; it is from the stress of the situation. A man at the head of the Nation in a country like ours, which is party governed, could not, if he wanted to, free himself from the obligations of party leadership; and the President of the United States, under the stress of party leadership, is compelled to devote most of his time not so much to issues of statesmanship as to the party interests. I repeat that that grows out of our organization, and I am convinced that it is better for the country, and especially better for the incumbent, that the length of his service should be definitely fixed and that there should be an inhibition to his succeeding himself, not so much because his conduct would not warrant it but because it is not for the welfare of the Government that it should be done.

I think four years is too short a period, I would say to my colleague from Ohio. Six years would be too long for a bad man, as would four years be too long for a bad man. Under our system of government we are not apt to elect as the head

of the Nation a man who would prove to be a detriment to the Nation; and if we assume that the length of time should be shorter, or even fixed, because of that danger, then four years would be just as objectionable, or in a degree it would be, as six. Four years is not time enough for an Executive to outline a well-defined, constructive policy. That is too short a time. Even at the present time, when a President standing for reelection is defeated, there is a period of time from the election until the end of his term which is absolutely useless so far as constructive legislation goes, for an Executive who is a candidate and is not elected to succeed himself is wholly without confidence and without spirit. That is a period of time that is almost an interregnum; that is without any force whatever. Ineligibility would correct this situation. It strikes me that four years is too short; six years will not be too long, and the provision as to ineligibility is of so great value to relieve the country from too much partisanship and at the same time relieve the President from the oppressive demands of party leaders which are so weighty that no man can bear up under the details which require him to devote most of his first term to looking after his election for a second term. All of these things strongly argue to me that we should make the President ineligible, but not limit the term to a shorter period than six years.

The provisions throughout many of the States limiting the governors to one term have not shown that such a practice is dangerous. The terms are not short where the governor is limited to one term. Where there is a provision for a succession of terms the terms will be short. In my own State the governor's term is for two years. One election is always suggestive of a second election, provided the governor can get the approval of the people. Therefore four years, as a rule, is the limit in Ohio, although we have had two cases where there were three terms instead of two. So in practice we have four years in two terms. I do not see that there would be any danger in making that four years in one term and making the incumbent ineligible to election to succeed himself.

The same is true in Pennsylvania and is true in a great many other States. I do not think any State which has a provision making the incumbent of the office ineligible, and limiting him to one term, has found that there is any inconvenience or danger connected with that practice, and for the same reason I think such a practice would be of value in our Federal Government.

As Senators know, it has been the practice for Presidents to stand for reelection, or renomination, for the Presidency. The first President of this Republic served two terms. While it is true that the second President had only one term, he was a candidate for election to a second term. Likewise the third, fourth, and fifth Presidents served for two terms. The sixth President served only one term. Jackson served two terms. Then for a long period the rule was only one term, but Senators will note that, beginning with the Civil War, the rule became two terms. Lincoln served two terms, and Grant two terms. True, Hayes served only one term, but in the campaign, in his letter of acceptance, Hayes announced that he would not stand for a second term and was against the practice of a President succeeding himself. But not so with other Presidents who were alive at the time the first term expired. In other words, since the Civil War the practice has been for a President to seek a second term. While not every one has been reelected, almost every President has stood as a candidate for a second term. In practice, therefore, we have eight years as the tenure of the presidential office. Eight years is not too much. But it involves the exigencies of reelection with all the confusion and liability incident to it. Six years would be better, especially if we limit it to one term. I am convinced that the better plan, judged by public welfare as well as integrity of leadership, argues strongly for one term of six years and ineligibility to a reelection.

So, Senators, whatever be the attitude of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] about withdrawing his amendment, I hope the time will come when the Congress will favorably consider making the term of the presidential office six years and making the President ineligible for reelection. I am for the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] proposing a constitutional amendment fixing the commencement of the term of President and the time of assembling Congress. I will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to this joint resolution, and if it is not agreed to at this time I hope further consideration will be given to the subject at some time when we can have fuller consideration and secure a vote in the Senate upon it.

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield, if the Senator wants to make a request.

Mr. SPENCER. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address of ex-Secretary of the Navy Denby which was delivered at Detroit yesterday, and following it—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I object.

Mr. HARRISON. It has already been placed in the RECORD, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator from Mississippi yielded to me. I thank him.

Mr. HARRISON. I made no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. SPENCER. I know the Senator did not.

Mr. HARRISON. I made the observation that I thought some one had already placed that speech in the RECORD.

Mr. SPENCER. The objection was made by my colleague. I will not trespass upon the Senator's time now.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the remarks made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], that "sometimes the Senate plays politics," and that when it does, "the President is justified in playing politics." I agree also with the proposition advanced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] that "sensible and thoughtful men everywhere know that Presidents give much time to efforts to secure their reelection." I want to substantiate that by a statement of some recent facts.

The other day we defeated the so-called Norbeck bill, which, it was alleged, sought to give some relief to the farmers in the wheat area. I noticed in the press this morning an article regarding the action of the Senate on that bill, in Ned McLean's paper, the official organ of the Republican Party, an inspired article, coming from the White House, because they seem to speak by the cards in this article. I shall not read it all, but only those lines that are pertinent to the issue. It is quite remarkable. The article reads:

President Coolidge was disappointed at the defeat of the Norbeck-Burtiness bill providing a fund of \$50,000,000 to encourage diversification in farming, it was made known at the White House yesterday.

That fact was made known yesterday at the White House.

The President had thought the bill had a great deal of merit and that it would be helpful in the present distressing conditions in the agricultural regions. It was in harmony, it was said, with the President's recommendations in his message to Congress.

I do not think there is any doubt about that. That is the one and only farm-relief measure he has indorsed. The article continues:

The defeat of the Norbeck-Burtiness measure leaves only the McNary-Haugen bill before Congress to provide relief for the farmers of the wheat sections. This bill in no manner conflicted with the Norbeck-Burtiness bill, but is looked upon as a measure that would virtually fix prices and, it is understood, does not fully meet the views of Mr. Coolidge.

Of course, in his New York speech the President came out against the McNary bill, not in name, but in substance. He said he was against all price-fixing measures; but he was for the Norbeck bill. The article continues:

Among friends of the President defeat of the Norbeck-Burtiness bill is attributed largely to the absence from the Senate of its author, Senator NORBECK, who is campaigning in South Dakota for Senator HIRAM JOHNSON. Had he been present—

Says this inspired article—

they said yesterday, the bill might have been passed. Commissioner of Indian Affairs Burke—

Mr. Burke comes from South Dakota, I may say. He is an appointee of the present administration, a nice gentleman, with whom I served in the House—

asserted that Senator NORBECK's presence was vital to the success of the bill, but that he chose rather to go campaigning in South Dakota in the hope of beating the President in the primary campaign. Senator NORBECK has been canvassing the State for several days, and will remain there probably until the election on March 25.

Confidence that President Coolidge will carry South Dakota, notwithstanding the vigorous campaign that is being waged for Senator JOHNSON, was expressed by the Coolidge managers yesterday. They realize that the contest is close, but all reports from there indicate that the President is holding his own.

So, Mr. President, in the list voting against the bill that was indorsed by the President, the so-called Norbeck bill, which even the gentlemen from the wheat areas said would not meet all of the situation—they voted for it only as a part of a general program—I find the names of some of the President's closest friends, men, may I say, to whom the President had only to whisper and they would have turned tumblers. Evidently the President did not take very much interest in the Norbeck bill. He just said he was for it and wanted it passed. But the leaders here, the men closest to him, voted against it. I find in this list BALL of Delaware. He can be said to be a pretty strong friend of the present administration and of President Coolidge.

BORAH! He has recently been a very great friend of the President, because the President has sought his advice on numerous occasions, but unfortunately has not accepted his advice. If he had, the President would be in a better fix than he now finds himself.

BRANDEGEE! A very close friend of the President, who wants to help him carry out all of his measures.

COUZENS! I had better pass that Senator's name, since he got into a controversy with the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the President's man Friday.

DALE! There is no closer friend of President Coolidge in this body than the new Senator from Vermont, Mr. DALE.

Mr. EDGE, who is seeking reelection, and who on all occasions, when he can stretch his conscience a little bit, votes with the President.

ERNST, of Kentucky! Always to be relied upon in administration matters.

GOODING! A recent convert. He showed a good deal of courage when he voted against the Norbeck measure the other day. He said he voted against it because he wanted a broader measure passed—one like the McNary bill. I believe, as he termed it. Some one suggests the Norbeck bill provided nothing about sheep. It only mentioned poultry.

LODGE! The President never had a better and closer friend and greater champion than the distinguished leader on the other side—Mr. LODGE. When some one criticizes the President, after he incubates it in his mind for two or three hours and hastens to the White House to find an explanation, he comes back and defends the President most eloquently. He is always on the watchtower to defend the President. He voted against the bill.

McLEAN! Another one who can be relied upon.

MOSES! The election had not been held in New Hampshire at the time MOSES voted on this proposition.

PEPPER! PETER! The President has no warmer friend here. He does not take his advice. He treats the senior Senator from Pennsylvania as he does my friend from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] at times, especially when the recommendation comes to demand the resignation of the Attorney General.

REED of Pennsylvania! Another who is the mouthpiece at times for the administration, especially when the Treasury Department is criticized.

SMOOT! He can always be relied upon, and he voted against the proposition.

WADSWORTH is another, and WATSON, "JIM" WATSON, may I be allowed to call him.

That is the crowd on the other side which voted against the measure, the President's closest and warmest political friends. Yet in this inspired article we read that the President is very much disturbed—hurt, may I say—because the Norbeck-Burtiness bill did not pass, and lays it to NORBECK's absence, because NORBECK was over in South Dakota pleading that the delegation from that State go instructed for HIRAM JOHNSON.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. It may be that these Senators in voting against the bill took the message of the President of December 6 last at its face value when the President said:

No complicated scheme of relief, \* \* \* no resort to the Public Treasury will be of any permanent value in establishing agriculture. Simple and direct methods put into operation by the farmer himself are the only real sources for restoration.

Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely; but at that time perhaps he did not know that the vote in South Dakota and North Dakota, in the wheat area, was going to be so close. HIRAM JOHNSON at that time had not got busy out there. Although the President has come out against the McNary bill, as this inspired article supposes and as is generally understood, the pressure will be brought on him, especially as the Republican convention ap-



proaches, and he will turn around and indorse the McNary bill in the end.

There is another proof. Let me say that the absence of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] did not defeat the bill. The Senator from South Dakota was paired on the measure. His vote was counted. He even went to the extent, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of arranging a pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER], a Republican Senator. The bill would have been defeated whether its distinguished author was here or not. They are trying to prejudice his cause in South Dakota because he had taken up the cudgels of the opponent of the President of the United States.

Of course everyone knew when the President a few days ago, on last Saturday, in fact, raised the tariff on wheat 12 cents a bushel, from 30 cents to 42 cents a bushel, that he was playing politics, that he was trying to bring into his camp the great wheat areas of the country. He was attempting to deceive the farmers, as the Republican Party in the past had deceived them. But there have been some leaders in the ranks of the Republican Party that have not attempted to deceive them on the question of the tariff on wheat. I have before me here utterances by the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who has studied the tariff question as few men have and who comes from the great Middle West. In a speech which he made in 1909, in discussing the question, this is what he said as to the tariff on wheat:

I want Senators to remember that I come from a State which probably puts more in value into the channels of trade every year than any other State in the Union in agricultural products. We will this year supply the people of the United States and the people of the world with products that will surpass the value of \$700,000,000, and—

He said further—and this is the President of the Senate talking—

it is idle for even an enthusiast to assert that the price of those products is directly affected by the protective tariff.

Let me get closer to some of you. I want to read from another speech made by one who made a great reputation in this body, who came from the great Middle West and who is gone now, the late Senator Nelson, from Minnesota. Here is what that distinguished Senator said in speaking on the question of the tariff on wheat. This was in May, 1909, when the Payne-Aldrich bill was before the Senate:

I do not recall—

Said Senator Nelson—

the millions of bushels produced by the State of Minnesota, but I desire to tell the Senator that the tariff on wheat which is on the statute books has not done us a particle of good. It would be like a tariff on cotton, because up to this time we have been exporting from 150,000,000 to 250,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. The price of our wheat is fixed by the Liverpool price—the export price—and no duty up to this time has helped us.

I could read to you, Mr. President, from a report made by a commission composed of Republican and Democratic Senators some time ago. Upon that commission was the distinguished leader upon the Republican side, Mr. LODGE. The commission was appointed to look into the question of how the tariff on agricultural products affected the price. They said "the price of wheat was fixed in the world market and that the tariff had no effect."

But since this plea to the voters of the Middle West by the President raising the tariff on wheat from 30 to 42 cents a bushel, what are the results? How did it affect the price? Here are the facts. The increased duty was fixed on March 7, just a week ago. I read to you from a morning paper, the Washington Herald. Some of you might not want to accept that because it is not Ed McLean's paper, but it is a pretty reliable paper. The item is dated Chicago:

The farmer has been given more protection. The result is a drop in the price of wheat on the board of trade market of 8 cents a bushel. More than 7 cents slumped off yesterday and to-day. Soon after President Coolidge acted to protect the wheat farmer by raising the flexible tariff on Canadian wheat from 30 to 42 cents a bushel, the troubles of the wheat farmer began.

In less than a week's time wheat has gone down in price, as this paper said, 7 cents a bushel.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I did not intend to divert the discussion from the resolution that is pending here, and I should not say a word with reference to anything the Senator from Mississippi has said if I did not feel that in fairness to one of our colleagues, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], I ought to speak, because otherwise the criti-

cism that was read from the newspaper, which I had not read myself, but which was read by the Senator from Mississippi, might be misunderstood.

As to how much time a Senator or a Member of the House should devote outside of the Congress to campaigns that are going on in his State is a question upon which men may very fairly and honestly disagree. I dislike very much to have come out from the White House what appears to have come in the way of criticism upon the Senator from South Dakota, and the statement made that if that Senator had been here the bill which bears his name would have passed.

I was not the author of the bill. As I have said before, when we began the hearings I was opposed to it myself, but I was there all the time. The Senator from South Dakota devoted more time to the consideration of the questions there involved than any other Member of this body, in my judgment. He was conscientious in regard to it. He worked early and late in regard to it. He felt as though it was his duty to go to his home State and participate in the campaign. He was careful to see before he went away that he was paired, so that his vote was not lost. He made a speech, a very able analysis of the bill, before he left the Senate.

It never has been my intention to say anything in regard to the matter. I have not participated, and would not have participated even if I could, in the contest that has come on in South Dakota, but the Senator from South Dakota had a right to participate in it. It happened to come at a time when his bill was coming on for a vote. He guarded himself and protected himself all the way through. There is not a Senator here but knows that I speak the absolute truth when I say that if the Senator from South Dakota had remained the bill would have been defeated just the same. I think it is very unjust for a statement of that kind to come out at this time in regard to the Senator from South Dakota, intended, I presume, to affect the result in South Dakota. It may be said that his colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], is also in South Dakota; and I mention that without any criticism of Senator STERLING. He has been there much longer than Senator NORBECK, participating in the contest.

Mr. ROBINSON. Which side of the campaign is he taking?

Mr. NORRIS. I am not authorized to speak for Senator STERLING, but I understand that he is for a delegation in South Dakota in favor of the renomination of Mr. Coolidge.

Mr. ROBINSON. If that be true it throws a very interesting light on the criticism that has been made of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK].

Mr. NORRIS. I have never been told that that is a fact, but that is my understanding. It does not seem to me that a statement of that kind comes with good grace from the White House. I dislike that it is necessary for me to mention it. I have not participated in the campaign and have not done a thing in the world, and could not if I wanted to, that would influence a single vote in South Dakota; but in the interest of absolute fairness it seemed to me that somebody was called upon to say as much as I have said, at least.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong the discussion of the joint resolution which is pending. I simply want to say a word in response to what the Senator from Nebraska said when he was on his feet before, that he feared the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, if it shall be amended in the way I have suggested, would endanger his resolution. If I shared that opinion, I would vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia and against my own amendment, because, as the Senator from Nebraska knows, I am cordially and heartily in favor of his amendment. But I do not share that feeling. I think the Senator will find that there is a very strong sentiment in the country in favor of the limitation of the executive office to a single term. At all events, as my colleague has pointed out, the question is before us now. There is no probability that we shall have another opportunity to vote upon the question of the presidential term, and I therefore trust that the Senator from Georgia will not withdraw his amendment. There is no pride of opinion about this. I think we ought to have a yea-and-nay vote to take the sense of the Senate.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I want to say a few words touching the pending amendment to the proposed constitutional amendment, and also concerning the proposed amendment itself.

A few Senators, and only a few, remain in the Chamber and listen to these debates, and yet one would imagine that when we are asked to change the fundamental law of the land it would call for the presence of every Member of this body. On

yesterday I counted, and I think there were but seven Members of the Senate present while the debate was going on. If we had a dispute here involving some slight political question we should speedily find these chairs filled. If there is no other reason why this joint resolution should be defeated, it is because it has not been considered by the Senate. It has been nominally before the Senate, but the Senate has been actually absent.

The old Constitution was written by some very wise men. It has served this country marvelously well. There has been no emergency in the life of the Nation or in the condition of the people which it has not been found adequate to meet. When we propose to change such a Constitution, it should be done only in the presence of some great and commanding reason.

I know this is the period of change, of alteration. The idea of progress seems to be that if you change a thing you have progressed, and hence to be progressive you must insist on change; but, Mr. President, putrefaction is change, but it is hardly progress in the right direction. It is the progress toward death and dissolution. If we were to amend the Constitution of the United States and destroy the Supreme Court, it would be a change, but it would be retrogression, not progression. If we were to change the Constitution of the United States and provide for the election of a king, it would be a change, but it would be a change that would destroy the Republic. So I beg to say in the inception of my remarks that those who confuse change with progress, and who believe that they can only occupy an exalted place in the forward march of progressivism by proposing changes frequently make the mistake of thinking that everything ought to be changed and confuse that with real progress.

There has been no system of government ever conceived in the brain of man that will not at times be found to fail to meet every possible exigency; and when some obstruction is met with there is in these modern days always some well-intentioned gentleman ready to come forward and propose a new system. He invariably proceeds in this wise: There are certain defects discovered in the present system; therefore it should be altered or destroyed, and there should be substituted for it a new system which its proponents solemnly assert will work perfectly; and yet when the new system is tried it almost invariably develops defects worse than those of the old and tried system. So we go on following this will-o'-the-wisp that is labeled "progress," and in many instances we find that instead of making progress we are making trouble.

The spirit of change broods over the land. If the Ten Commandments had not been written upon tables of stone the modern progressive gentlemen would have moved an amendment, and if any of them had existed in the days of Moses they would have insisted within 30 days on changing at least one-half of those immortal mandates.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Fletcher	Ladd	Robinson
Ashurst	Frazier	Lodge	Sheppard
Ball	George	McKellar	Shields
Bayard	Glass	McKinley	Shipstead
Borah	Gooding	McNary	Shortridge
Brandeggee	Hale	Mayfield	Simmans
Broussard	Harreld	Neely	Smith
Bursum	Harris	Norris	Smoot
Cameron	Harrison	Oddie	Spencer
Capper	Howell	Overman	Stanfield
Caraway	Johnson, Minn.	Owen	Trammell
Couzens	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Warren
Dale	Kendrick	Ralston	Willis
Ferris	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	
Fess	King	Reed, Pa.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Missouri is entitled to the floor.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield for me to present a conference report and ask for its consideration?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I submit the conference report on House bill 5078, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah submits the conference report designated by him and asks for its immediate consideration. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5078) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps I had better make a statement before the Senator from Arizona proceeds.

The item in the appropriation bill about which the Senator from Arizona desires to make statements is amendment numbered 47, known as the Bright Angel Trail appropriation. In the case of that amendment the House insisted upon its disagreement with an amendment, and at the proper time I shall move to agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, as well as the amendment numbered 60. Amendment numbered 60 is the Howard University item, in which the appropriation for the medical building is eliminated.

Now, if the Senator from Arizona desires to speak upon amendment numbered 47, he may do so.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I will read for the benefit of the Senate the amendment as printed in the RECORD in a letter from me which was introduced yesterday:

On March 11 the House receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 47 and concurred therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert: 'For the construction of trails within the Grand Canyon National Park, \$100,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That said sum may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase from the county of Coconino, Ariz., of the Bright Angel Toll Road and Trail within said park, under such terms and conditions as he may deem proper; and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct an approach road from the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of said park.'"

That is the question that I wish to take up in my remarks.

The amendment is objectionable on the following grounds:

1. Under the statutes of the State of Arizona the said Bright Angel Toll Road and Trail can not be purchased by the Secretary of the Interior for the United States from the county of Coconino and any negotiations between the Secretary of the Interior and the county of Coconino would be futile.

2. A new trail from the rim to the bottom of the canyon is not necessary for the reason that there are three accessible trails from the rim to the bottom of the canyon at the present time, two of which are in use, of which one belongs to the National Park Service, and the third, belonging to the National Park Service, is available for use if necessary.

3. There is no paramount necessity for appropriating this sum for a duplication of a road or trail for public use which is being adequately served at the present time, and the capacity of the present road or trails will serve the public for many years to come.

The legal objections to the original item were clearly pointed out to the Secretary of the Interior in a letter addressed to him under date of July 16, 1923 (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 11, 1924, p. 4003); but notwithstanding such objections the board of supervisors entered into such illegal contract "in accordance with the letter dictated by Government officials and others while in conference," and these facts were withheld by these Government officials from the Congress when the original item in the appropriation bill was presented.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior stated: "No part of this sum will be paid over to the county until a satisfactory deed has been executed and delivered, vesting full and complete title in the trail in the United States." This statement was clearly intended to convey the idea that the county of Coconino was to receive the \$100,000 provided for in the bill, whereas as a matter of fact there was no intention on the part of the Government to pay the county of Coconino one cent, and the only thing the county was to receive was an indefinite promise that the Government would spend \$100,000 on a road some time in the remote future.

The objections to the original item can be applied to the amendment, as above stated, and in addition thereto it is to be pointed out that the said item was not included in the Budget as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.



Mr. President, this controversy has been up before Congress for some little time.

First, I want to state that under the existing laws of the State of Arizona the trail can not be purchased and can not be sold by the board of supervisors to the Government or anyone else unless the State legislature amends the present law governing toll roads and trails. There are already three trails in existence from the rim to the bottom of the canyon, serving all present needs, and they will serve all future needs for many years to come.

By the following evidence it will be seen that the county of Coconino, Ariz., does not desire to sell the Bright Angel Trail. On March 14, 1924, the board of supervisors of Coconino County, by unanimous vote, passed a resolution opposing the sale of the trail as provided under this item.

I have here a telegram from Williams, Ariz., which I wish to read into the RECORD.

WILLIAMS, ARIZ., March 15, 1924.

Senator RALPH H. CAMERON,  
Washington, D. C.:

Board of supervisors in meeting March 10 unanimously declared themselves opposed to sale of Bright Angel Trail as outlined in Hayden bill.

W. C. RITTENHOUSE,  
Chairman Board of Supervisors, Coconino County.

To make sure that they had been kept informed and knew of the new proposals, I will read a telegram received from Flagstaff, dated March 13, sent on March 12:

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., March 13, 1924.

R. H. CAMERON,

127 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Board of supervisors received the following message from HAYDEN:

"House has adopted the following provisions in place of Hayden amendment to which the board of supervisors objected:

"For the construction of trails within the Grand Canyon National Park, \$100,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, provided that said sum may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase from the county of Coconino, Ariz., of the Bright Angel Toll Road and Trail within said park under such terms and conditions as he may deem proper, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct an approach road from the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of said park."

Advise your action.

BURT.

This morning I received a telegram from the clerk of the board of supervisors of Flagstaff, dated Flagstaff, Ariz., Coconino County, March 14:

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., March 14, 1924.

Hon. RALPH CAMERON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

By resolution adopted this day the board of supervisors of Coconino County have declared themselves opposed to the sale of the Bright Angel Trail and Toll Road on the terms as outlined by the Hayden bill.

J. B. RICKEL, Clerk.

By the Hayden bill they mean the amendment that is now pending before the Senate.

The Senate, I believe, has been misled as to why this controversy came up. I read from a copy of a letter which I received from the Secretary of the Interior:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,  
GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK,  
Grand Canyon, Ariz., April 4, 1923.

THE DIRECTOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is a brief report on my trip with the Appropriations Committee members, CRAMTON and CARTER, and Congressman HAYDEN, from Grand Canyon through the Navajo country to the Petrified Forest National Monument. Taking up this report where I ended my report of March 31, you will be interested to know that on the evening of the 31st the conference was held at El Tovar on the Grand Canyon road problem and particularly on the proposition of our taking over the road from Maine to the park and expending on that road money to be appropriated by Congress for the Bright Angel Trail. The following were present at the conference:

Congressmen: Hon. L. C. CRAMTON, Hon. C. D. CARTER, and Hon. CARL HAYDEN.

State officers: F. R. Goodman, State engineer.

County officers: Board of supervisors—R. E. Taylor and W. C. Rittenhouse (John Ley was absent); Frank Harrison, county attorney.

National Park Service officials: H. M. Albright, G. C. Bolton, and I. I. Harrison.

Fred Harvey Co.: R. Hunter Clarkson.

I will merely state the conclusions arrived at in this conference, giving you a full report later.

It was agreed finally by the board of supervisors that the county of Coconino would sell the trail for \$100,000, this money to be expended by the Federal Government in the construction of a road from Maine to the south boundary of Grand Canyon National Park. It was recognized by all present that the figure of \$100,000 represents a little more than the trail is worth, figuring the value on the basis of capitalizing an annual net return to the county of \$4,000 or \$5,000. We all agreed that inasmuch as Coconino County is the second largest county in the United States with an area of 18,623 square miles, only 11.1 per cent of which is in private hands and therefore taxable, the Federal Government should be very liberal in the matter of purchasing the trail. While, of course, the Members of Congress could not make any commitments for Congress, they feel that the park should take over the road from Maine to the park boundary and reconstruct it and maintain it just as we do the Cody and Jackson Hole projects to Yellowstone.

The first \$100,000 appropriation will largely rebuild the very bad stretches of this road, particularly in Spring Valley, north of Maine. I believe that before we are through with the reconstruction of this road we will have to have a total of \$250,000. County supervisors will very shortly answer Secretary Fall's letter of July 6, 1922, setting forth the proposal that Congress appropriate not less than \$100,000, to be expended on the construction of the Maine road, and upon the appropriation of this sum the county will execute and deliver a deed to the Bright Angel Trail. All present at the conference expressed themselves as well pleased with the outcome thereof. An extra copy of this letter is inclosed for the records relating to the purchase of the Bright Angel Trail.

Cordially yours,

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT,  
Field Assistant to the Director.

Thus it will be seen, Mr. President, that the park officials themselves admit secretly that it will take \$250,000, but the Congress was led to believe \$100,000 was ample. This is just another instance of the deception used in these negotiations. When the real facts came to light, as the result of the wrangle here in Congress, the board of supervisors officially decline to be bound.

I now read a telegram received from Williams, Ariz., March 5, directed to Senator RALPH H. CAMERON, Washington, D. C.:

WILLIAMS, ARIZ., March 5, 1924.

Senator RALPH H. CAMERON,  
Washington, D. C.:

I attended meeting with Crumpton and others at Grand Canyon; tentative agreement was drawn there as a basis of which to work. I am opposed to sale of Bright Angel Trail under the terms of that agreement.

R. C. RITTENHOUSE,  
Chairman Board of Supervisors, Coconino County.

It has been said here in Congress that there was a unanimous agreement of the board at that meeting, but, as stated in the message I have just read, one member of the board out of three was absent, was not there at all. Mr. Rittenhouse, chairman of the board, never subscribed to the agreement.

A report of Secretary of the Interior Work appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1924, at page 3053, and quoting from the statement, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] proceeds:

Mr. President, I have heretofore stated that the title of Coconino County in and to the trail has been recognized by the courts and by legislative construction. The county's title can not be disputed. The \$100,000 proposed to be paid to Coconino County for the trail is to be expended in constructing, under the supervision of the National Park Service, a road from Maine, a village in Arizona, to the southern boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park, or to the upper or northern terminus of the trail. In other words, the \$100,000 proposed to be appropriated is not to be paid into the treasury of the county to become cash assets of the county; the \$100,000 will be expended, I repeat, under the supervision of the National Park Service for the construction of a road, some 62 or 63 miles in length, to the national park from the main artery of auto traffic, the Santa Fe Trail to the Grand Canyon.

I have a telegram, dated February 3 last, from Flagstaff, Ariz. Flagstaff is the county seat of the county of Coconino, the county in which is located the national park, and in which, of course, the trail is located and which is, of course, the same county in which the road proposed to be constructed from the Santa Fe Trail to the Grand Canyon is located.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CAMERON. I yield.

Mr. BURSUM. Do I understand that the county authorities are opposed to this appropriation?

Mr. CAMERON. Absolutely. The board of supervisors, at a meeting on March 10, unanimously declared themselves opposed to the sale of the Bright Angel Trail, as outlined in the Hayden bill, as they called it, but they meant the first Hayden amendment, which we refused to accept, and which went back to the House, but in the place of which a new amendment has now been proposed, which is now before the Senate.

Mr. BURSUM. The county has title to this trail?

Mr. CAMERON. Absolutely.

Mr. BURSUM. Is there any need for another trail?

Mr. CAMERON. I will state, for the benefit of the Senator and the Senate, that there are now three trails going from the south rim to the bottom of the canyon. One is known as the Grand View Trail, one is known as the Bright Angel Trail, and one is known as Hermit Basin Trail—three wonderful trails. There are trails enough in the Grand Canyon National Park to take care of the needs for scores of years to come.

Mr. BURSUM. If that be the case, what would the effect of this appropriation be; to coerce and browbeat the county authorities into selling their rights in order to give title to the trail to the National Park Service or to the Federal Government?

Mr. CAMERON. That is just what this legislation will amount to.

Mr. BURSUM. And in that way deprive the county of Coconino of larger revenue?

Mr. CAMERON. Last year they received from the trail something between seven and eight thousand dollars, probably a net to the county of between four and five thousand dollars. I say that the county can not sell this trail; but suppose it can, which I deny, then if this amendment is passed it will be used as a club to coerce or browbeat the county into the sale, because everyone knows the park management will exert to the fullest the pressure this amendment provides through threats to build a parallel trail, with the design, of course, to purchase Bright Angel Trail. The park management, already a monopoly-controlled institution, knows that by such threats they can coerce the county, and that is the joker in this latest amendment, which is a substitute to the other effort on their part to consummate an illegal act.

Mr. BURSUM. What is the proportion of public land and forest reserves and national parks to the whole area of Coconino County?

Mr. CAMERON. More than 85 per cent of the area of Coconino County, one of the largest counties in the United States, has been withdrawn, either for a national park, a national monument, a forest reserve, a game preserve, or some other reserve.

I dislike to take up so much time of the Senate in the discussion of this matter, but I believe it is my duty to discuss it fully. For that reason I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate, and I want to quote the record, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Under date of February 2 I called the Cameron case to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior, contained in the following letter, which appears on page 3497 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1924:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: With reference to the rights asserted by RALPH CAMERON in certain lands within the Grand Canyon National Park, I have noted the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States affirming the decree in favor of the Government dispossessing CAMERON of certain lands claimed by him that are highly essential to the proper development of the Grand Canyon National Park.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, would it not be feasible to modify the appropriation and give authority to the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate for a lease from the county so as not to deprive the county of its revenue, if it is desirable that the road be under the supervision of the Government?

Mr. CAMERON. I think they have that power now. I continue reading from this letter:

Being under the impression that the matter of actual dispossession of CAMERON was pending in the Department of Justice, I addressed an inquiry under date of January 18 to the Attorney General asking what action had been taken by that department. In reply I have a letter under date of January 25 from the Attorney General in which he recites the status of the litigation and then states:

"Since the entry of these decrees no further action has been taken by this department, nor has any further request been received from the Interior Department for action by us. I presume that if any additional proceedings by this department are desired request therefor will be made by the Secretary of the Interior, under whose supervision the Grand Canyon Park is administered."

I want to say again to the Senate that a great many years ago I built the Bright Angel Trail and also blazed the wagon roads into what is now the Grand Canyon National Park and around the rim for mining purposes. I will further state that for 13 years my associates and I packed ore out of the Grand Canyon and hauled it from the south rim of the Grand Canyon to Flagstaff and shipped it to the nearest smelter at that time, at El Paso, something like a thousand miles away.

I did not go into the Grand Canyon for the purpose of exploring it for a tourist proposition. I went there to seek a fortune, which all prospectors expect to make. I put my hard-earned money into the canyon mines, developed the trails, developed the wagon roads, and helped promote what is now the only railroad there, which extends from Williams, Ariz., the main line of the Santa Fe, into the Grand Canyon National Park.

Mr. President, my motive has been questioned by a Member of the House of Representatives in leading the opposition to this proposed sale, and I want the people of the United States to know, and I want the Senate of the United States to know, that I never had a motive in my life that was not honorable and aboveboard. I stand here to-day and defy any man within the confines of the United States to say otherwise, and especially do I denounce the tactics, the innuendo, the desired implication and inferences made on the floor of the lower House as to my standing, my motives, my every act in connection with this matter.

I have done as much to develop the West, possibly, as any other individual. I was exploring the Grand Canyon and pioneering the West, preaching to the world its possibilities before some of these men, so vicious in their attacks on me, ever knew there was a Grand Canyon, and when any man will go out into the country, representing the Government, and go into a meeting on the south rim of the Grand Canyon and go into collusion to try to beat a county out of its just assets and then come down here to Washington and place the matter before Congress, putting it in the light of a great public policy, clothing it with a sugar coating, it is about time that we had another investigation, to find out what is going on, and I say here to-day that if this matter goes on any further I will offer a resolution in the Senate and have this fully investigated, and I will show up the methods behind this kind of legislative procedure. It is about time that some action was taken when such a thing is attempted toward a man who has been elected by the people of his State to represent them, a man who has lived in the State for 41 years. I had the privilege of representing my State in the Congress when the forty-eighth star was put in the American flag, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], now presiding over the Senate, knows, since he was a Member of Congress at that time.

I have been elected by the people of my State to the United States Senate. I was not elected by Republicans, because there are not enough Republicans down in Arizona to elect a man to the United States Senate. I was elected by the people—Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, or whoever chose to vote for me. I am here, elected by the people of my State, and I reluctantly referred to the vicious attacks made on me and my motives in the other House, which was carried in glaring headlines in the press.

I say that my personal privilege permits me to denounce these attacks as wholly untrue and unwarranted. I helped create the county of Coconino, where I lived many years. I spent my hard-earned money and went to the legislature. I went down there as an honest citizen and had a bill passed creating the county of Coconino. The county seat was placed at Flagstaff, and I was appointed by the governor as the first sheriff of that county. Afterwards I was elected twice, and served that county, and after having served three times I was elected chairman of the board of supervisors for four years, and while I was still serving as a member of the board of supervisors I was elected on the Republican ticket as the last Delegate to Congress.

Yet when a man stands upon the floor of the Senate or the floor of the House and asks, "Who is RALPH CAMERON," with caustic gestures, desiring to have the country know me in the wrong light, I tell you it is going too far. I never intend to make a statement on the floor of the Senate that will hurt the name or character of any man or even make a suggestion that



any Member of the other body of Congress is not entitled to his views or his own ideas about any piece of legislation and entitled to fair play; entitled to the treatment that they will get from me, which will always be on the square.

I am in earnest about this matter. This \$100,000 item was knocked out, and now they come back with what I call a blanket amendment. It does not specify anything in particular. The only purpose in it is to put a club over the board of supervisors of Coconino County, in the State of Arizona. I ask every Senator, why do you want to throw away the people's money? We tried here the other day to help the farmers of the Northwest, but the bill was voted down. I am asking you to-day not to appropriate the people's money and throw it away in this manner. It is the first time, I believe, that a Senator ever had to stand on the floor of the Senate and beg the Senate not to appropriate money to be used in his own State, but I do it because the money is not needed. The money should not be appropriated, and every Member of the Senate before he votes for it I hope will give it the due consideration which I know it deserves.

I know what is behind this matter and an investigation of it would result in proving my contention, and the Senate and the people of the United States would then realize that I know whereof I speak to-day. I dislike very much to have to stand up here and make this kind of a statement to the Senate on a proposition that is so unjust. We are not legally or morally justified in appropriating one 10-cent piece of this money, and if it is appropriated and the item goes into the bill, and the bill becomes a law, I shall fight it in the courts as long as I live. I am right about this matter. The people of Arizona are behind me. The people of Coconino County are behind me. The people of the United States, when I get through, will say that I have done well; that I have done a good job. I am going to keep on fighting until I know that I am vindicated from these slurs and insinuations that have been heaped upon me without any justification whatsoever. Senators, read the RECORD of the 3d of March, pages 3489 and 3494, and you will see what a well-thought-out distortion of facts has done to my character and integrity. It had the desired effect, in fact, to color the issue. I am made out as a carpetbagger, an interloper, a meddling somebody trying to block a great Government policy just because I raised my voice in protest and said it shall not be done, because the proposition is illegal, unwarranted, unjustified, and I shall never subscribe to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report, which will be read.

Mr. ASHURST. Does the Senator desire to have the report read?

Mr. SMOOT. The report merely carries those items on which there is an agreement.

Mr. ASHURST. It carries simply the items about which there is no dispute?

Mr. SMOOT. That is all.

Mr. ASHURST. Then I ask that the motion be put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5078) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 6, 10, 34, 40, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 61, and 62, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$9,000: *Provided*, That the four inspectors shall not receive per diem in lieu of subsistence for a longer period than 30 days at any one time at the seat of government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and each of said tribal attorneys: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall dispense with the attor-

ney for the Creek Tribe not later than September 1, 1924, and the commissioner shall dispense with any other tribal attorneys at any time their services are no longer needed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That except upon the individual order of the Secretary of the Interior, no part of this appropriation shall be used for the support or education at said school of any native pupil brought from Alaska who enters after January 1, 1925"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$160,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of the money appropriated under this paragraph shall be expended for the development of electric power until the Secretary of the Interior shall have secured, subject to the needs of the Boise project, a contract with the Gem irrigation district, providing for the purchase by that district, for a period to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, of the electric power necessary for the irrigation of the lands of said district: *And provided further*, That the rates in such contract shall be sufficient to include interest at 5 per cent per annum on the cost of such power development plus a reasonable depreciation on the power plant, as found by the Secretary of the Interior, and that the contract shall provide that before delivery of power in any season the district shall furnish security satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior to insure payment to the Government of the power charges for such season, and that such contract shall be entered into only in the event that the holders of not less than 90 per cent of the face value of the bonded and warrant indebtedness of the district shall subordinate their claims to the obligations of the district to the Government under such contract: *And provided further*, That in the event power is furnished from the said power plant to more than one contractor, then the rates for power shall be fixed so that each such contractor, including said district, shall pay only its proper proportionate share of said interest and depreciation, as found by the Secretary of the Interior"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,706,482"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 36, 38, 39, 47, 58, and 60.

REED SMOOT,  
CHARLES CURTIS,  
WM. J. HARRIS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,  
FRANK MURPHY,  
C. D. CARTER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill, which will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

March 13, 1924.

*Resolved*, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 36, and 58 to the bill H. R. 5078, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes," and concurs therein;

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 47, and concurs therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert: "For the construction of trails within the Grand Canyon

National Park, \$100,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That said sum may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase from the county of Coconino, Ariz., of the Bright Angel Toll Road and Trail within said park under such terms and conditions as he may deem proper, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct an approach road from the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of said park."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 80, and concurs therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$365,000."

That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 38, and 39, and asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

*Ordered*, That Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CARTER be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, is this matter going to be taken up in further detail at this time?

Mr. ASHURST. I shall only want a few minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to be discourteous to Senators, but I do not want to have the joint resolution laid aside for the day.

Mr. ASHURST. I think we can dispose of the item in 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Now the subject matter is before the Senate for discussion.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] is, if I correctly apprehend it, that Senate amendment numbered 47 be agreed to as amended by the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that the Senator may know the situation that has just developed I will state that there is one other Senator who desires to speak upon the subject. If the Senator from Arizona desires to conclude his remarks at this time, well and good, he may proceed, but when he gets through with his remarks I shall then have to ask that the conference report be laid aside so as to proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. ASHURST. Is there another Senator who wants to speak on the same amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. So if the Senator from Arizona wants to proceed with his remarks now, there is no objection, but I shall have to ask that the conference report be laid aside at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. ASHURST. I assure the Senator that I shall be very brief. My remarks may be deep, but they will not be long.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to submit a request for unanimous consent if the Senator will yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have the unfinished business laid before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the conference report be temporarily laid aside. There are other Senators who desire to speak upon it, and I promised the Senator from Nebraska that I would not take a longer time than has already been consumed.

Mr. ASHURST. When will the able Senator from Utah bring up the conference report again?

Mr. SMOOT. At the very first opportunity.

Mr. ASHURST. Will that be this afternoon?

Mr. SMOOT. No; but I shall endeavor to call it up on Monday next.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not desire that the unfinished business shall be laid aside again this afternoon for the conference report. I will say to the Senator. If we can complete the consideration of the joint resolution to-day, then, of course, the conference report may come up; but I think we have already laid aside the unfinished business too long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the conference report will be temporarily laid aside, and the unfinished business will be proceeded with.

#### CHANGE OF DATE OF INAUGURATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) proposing an

amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President, and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is absent from the Chamber. I promised to protect him during his absence. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Fess	McKinley	Shields
Ashurst	Fletcher	McNary	Shipstead
Bail	Frazier	Mayfield	Simmons
Bayard	George	Moses	Smith
Borah	Gerry	Neely	Smoot
Brandeggee	Hale	Norris	Stephens
Brookhart	Harris	Oddie	Swanson
Broussard	Harrison	Overman	Trammell
Bursum	Howell	Owen	Underwood
Cameron	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Warren
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Weller
Caraway	Kendrick	Ralston	Wheeler
Couzens	King	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Curtis	Ladd	Reed, Pa.	
Dill	Lodge	Robinson	
Ferris	McKellar	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS]. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, when I gave way to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] to present the conference report I had remarked that not all change is progress, and that there is a good deal of confusion in the minds of legislators and in the minds of the country over that proposition.

Just as soon as somebody becomes a little bit dissatisfied because he finds that the weather, for instance, is not really congenial on the 4th of March, he starts an agitation to change the Constitution of the United States. Always there can be found somebody to second the motion. As it is a change, and as change seems to be the order of the day, we speedily find some ambitious gentleman in one or the other of the Houses who wants to be regarded as really progressive, and not only in advance of public opinion but a mile in advance of everybody else, rushing in with a proposition to change the Constitution. I undertake to say that about two-thirds of the agitation back of the proposition to change the time for the beginning of the presidential term has been occasioned by a few bad storms about the 4th day of March.

Now, we are asked to change to January. One good sleet storm in January on the day of inauguration and the cry will go forth again for another change. If we put the date over into the summer time, when the flowers are blooming and the air is balmy, if we happen to have a thunderstorm there will be another agitation for a change. And so the cry is for change, change, change.

Some man has a fight with his wife. He gets a divorce. Then somebody wants to change all the divorce laws of the country. Along comes another crowd of people who want to abolish the marital relation altogether. I have forgotten the name by which they call themselves, but they have some adherents in this country. Of course, there is an innumerable multitude of people who have always wanted to change the Bible. Now, we have some other gentlemen who want to change the rules or the discoveries of science. The old maxim that existed before Voltaire wrote one of his satires was that "everything that is right." We now have reversed that and have adopted, instead of it, "everything that is wrong."

Of course I agree, and everybody agrees, that if in the lapse of time and experience it has been found that there is some provision of the Constitution which seriously impedes the progress of the country, which constitutes an embargo upon the advancement of the country, after mature and serious consideration and an absolute determination that we are right as to our facts and that the new remedy does not carry within its womb greater evils than the provision we are about to change, then change, of course, is permissible. Here, however, is a proposition brought to us, and its nonutility and its mistake is well illustrated by the pending amendment to the proposition, which is that a President shall be elected for six years, and shall thereafter be ineligible for reelection.



What is the argument that is advanced? Let us weigh it for just a minute.

We are told that the President, when he takes his seat, becomes the head of a political party. The intimation is that he plays politics all through his first term in order that he may be elected a second time, and that this is a very bad and wicked thing; that there is something terrible about a President trying to conduct himself in the first term of his office so that the people may reelect him. Using the term "politics" in its offensive sense, and applying that to the acts of the President, they declare that we ought to have a man who, by virtue of the impossibility of his reelection, is lifted into that pure and exalted atmosphere where he will pay no attention whatever to politics.

Mr. President, if that were to be the result, if the premise is correct, then you could do nothing more undemocratic, more unrepudiable, more opposed to human liberty than to carry out that particular scheme.

For my part, as long as I live in this country I want no man to hold a legislative or executive office who does not know that if he misbehaves himself he shall answer to the people by a defeat at the next election. If he has no further ambition for himself, I want him to know that he will defeat in the next election the party and the people who advanced him to power.

What are the evils springing from a President playing politics? Let us reduce the question to what it really is. It means that in the conduct of his office the President has so conducted himself as to commend himself and his administration and his party to the good will of the people of the United States. Take that incentive away from him, and you have set up a man who will or who may proceed without regard to the opinion of the people of the United States, without regard to the wishes of others. He will follow the bent of his own mind; will gratify, if you please, his own prejudices; will satisfy, if you please, his own peculiar ambitions. Knowing that he is at the end of his road anyway, he will then proceed to set up an executive department dominated by the will of one man and responsible to nobody. That is a distinct step back toward tyranny, and the only two things which relieve it from a condition of absolute tyranny are the shortness of the term and the fact that the power of impeachment rests in Congress.

But, sirs, if you would have this office entirely independent, so that nobody's opinion is to be considered except that of the particular individual who happens to be President, why not further amend the Constitution and take away the power of impeachment? Then you would have a man who could sit in that pure, white light of selfishness and self-interest, responsible to nobody, the pure, white light wherein you are beyond anybody's touch or responsibility to anybody. A proposition of that kind answers itself. It is a monstrous thing to contemplate.

Who are these Presidents we elect? Are they supermen, are they demigods, that they should work their will unchallenged, and be responsible to no one? For the most part—indeed, I may say as to all of them—they have been men who have, I think, tried to do their duty as God gave them the light. But they have only been men. Nothing is so much to be deplored in American life as the adoration of a man who happens to get to be President of the United States. I respect that great position; but I respect the position. I do not fall down and worship the individual. I do not subordinate my judgment to his because he happened to be elected President any more than I would subordinate my judgment to that of one of my colleagues here whose opinions I respect. It is mere slavishness for any man to do that. It is contrary to the spirit of our Government. It is utterly contemptible. It does not belong under the American flag.

Let us take two examples, and let us take them in as kindly a spirit as we ought to entertain for those whom we respect. President Harding was a Member of this body for four years. He was a man of good mind, good impulses, good purposes; but did any Member of this body, or any considerable number of the people of the United States, accept a proposition as a verity, or a philosophy as the embodiment of all wisdom, because Senator Harding happened to adhere to that particular view? On the contrary, we challenged his opinions, as we did the opinions of any other Member of this body. We did not find him invincible in debate, insurmountable in logic, unconquerable, or omnipotent. He passed in and out of this Chamber as unobserved as the other Members.

The day after his election to the Presidency, however, he was followed through the streets of the city as a Roman conqueror in his march of triumph. But he was the same man;

good, amiable, honest, fair, but just a human being. The election had not changed him a bit. It had not added one cubit to his stature.

That was followed by a sentiment in this country in which the press joined, in which the pulpit sometimes joined, and in which the people joined, that the President had said this thing or taken certain positions, and it was a "Thus saith the Lord," and everybody was to accept it. But the President was just as likely to be mistaken as the Senator had been.

We had another amiable gentleman who presided over this body. We all liked him just about as we liked each other. We would not accept his ipse dixit on a point of order. We unhesitatingly challenged his rulings on points of order, and he was generally wrong. By the accident of death, a most unfortunate and deplorable accident, he became the President of the United States. Again he did not add one cubit to his stature.

What has this to do with the case? Everything. The man who happens to be President of the United States is just as selfish, just as circumscribed, just as human, just as dangerous, just as safe the day after he is elected as he was the day before, except that now he is given a very much greater power. The checks upon that power are threefold—the independence of Congress, which can always control in great emergencies; the right of appeal to the courts, and the power of impeachment. These checks in practical application do not half so well restrain the ambition or the prejudices of an Executive as the fact that there is a great and watchful constituency to whom at the end of his term of office he must report, and whose approval he must gain if he be reelected to office. If the principle now demanded as to the Executive be correct, it should be applied equally to Senators and Members of the House. The cry should go forth that these men should legislate without responsibility, because they would have no chance to continue in office by demeaning themselves in a manner suitable to the office.

So the argument would proceed, that you are playing politics constantly in the Senate, and therefore that incentive should be taken away from you, and when you are once elected here, you should be elected for a fixed term, and at the end of that term retire to private life, and thus you would be placed in a condition of independence. That argument has been made. It was urged that Senators should be elected for life, but that was defeated, for the wise framers of the Constitution knew that any body of men not responsible to a constituency might become a tyrannical body of men, and that any body of men responsible to a constituency would play politics—that is to say, they would try to so deport themselves that their people would approve of their conduct at the polls—and the wise fathers chose the latter alternative.

But if it be true that the President could be placed in a position of nonresponsibility to a constituency, if the fear of defeat or the hope of reward by a reelection should be taken away from him, and because of that condition he could rise at once to superior heights; if that be a sound argument as to the Executive, it is equally sound as to both branches of Congress. But we did not adopt that theory. We adopted the theory of direct responsibility, and, if you want to use the term, we adopted the theory that was intended to make every man who holds a public office, outside of the Federal judiciary, constantly play politics, play politics in the broad, the comprehensive, and the high sense of endeavoring to conduct himself so that he will meet the approval of his constituency at the oncoming election.

Moreover, if it be true that the President has played politics in the vile sense, not in the sense in which I just used the term, if he has in the composition of his nature that element which leads him to play cheap and vile politics in the great office to which he has been elevated—if there be such a man as that, unrestrained by the hope of reward, by the hope of reelection—he is exactly the kind of man who would abuse those powers the moment the restraint was taken off.

Mr. President, one ought not to have to talk a great while on a question of this kind. There is not much use of talking about it. The Senate is not considering it. I would say that the Senate was absent this afternoon largely because it does not want to hear me talk, but the Senate has been equally absent when other Senators have talked on the question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator will have to keep in mind that there are four or five special investigations going on. I

do not know but what we will have to provide for a special investigation in each of the four corners of the Senate Chamber and let them be conducted here, where we can have Senators close at hand.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understand that is the reason; but we are not considering the pending question. There is no personal reflection upon myself. There is a better attendance now than we have had during the day. The same thing has occurred when other Senators have tried to discuss the matter, and I am not criticizing my fellow Senators for not being here. The fact is we are about to act upon a very important question, and when the bell rings and the roll call begins our fellow Members will come in and vote.

There is another proposition to which I desire very briefly to advert—that a man can not under any circumstances succeed himself. Now, think of that. It is easy enough to imagine a great war at its very flood height, the White House occupied by the wisest and greatest man of the day, whose hand is upon the helm of the ship, guiding her through the storms and the dangers, when the unanimous voice of the American people would demand his retention in office, when there is no one to take his place; in the face of that emergency the people would find their hands tied by this constitutional amendment.

Imagine, if you please, a condition similar to that which existed in revolutionary days. Suppose some reformer had put through a resolution that a man could only command the Continental Army for four years and should be ineligible to succeed himself, and suppose in the height of that struggle George Washington's term had expired? Nor does the six-year term lessen it, because a man might be in the last year of that term when the war occurred, and there might lie ahead five or six dark and bloody years when the one great mind, best capable, not alone capable, but best capable of meeting the emergency would be relegated out of office and some inferior man placed in his stead because the Senator from Georgia had some years before offered a resolution and it had been adopted as a part of the Constitution.

I am in favor of rotation in office, but I am not in favor of saying to any man who is President that accession to the Presidency is the end of his ambition, but to hold before him every possible reward which comes from good conduct, and the ignominy and disappointment of defeat as the penalty for failure to conduct himself as best suits the American people. That is the whole theory of our Government—that the American people are capable of self-government, that this is their Government, and that it is safe to refer every question back to them frequently, and so when it is proposed that a man in office shall not play politics, by which I mean conduct himself so that he will meet with the approval of the American people, it is proposed in the same breath to say that the American people are incapable of passing upon the conduct of their officers. If that be true, then democratic government is a failure. So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment to the resolution will be defeated.

I desire now to give a few moments attention to the resolution itself. In the first place, if it be any part of the reason for the introduction of the resolution, we get very little better weather in January than we do in March; and I do not mean to say that is the reason which impelled the author of the resolution, but that is the biggest reason for the agitation. Washington wants every four years a great gala week. It wants parades, large congregations of people from different parts of the Nation. It loves the sound of brass bands. The hotel keepers love the sound of the shekels that are piled down on their counters to pay the outrageous prices which they extort from the pilgrims who journey to the Capital of the Nation. The whole performance ought to be abolished. The President of the United States ought to walk into the Supreme Court as a private citizen and hold up his hand and take the oath of office and go back to the White House, and that ought to be the end of the business; or he might appear in this Chamber or in the House of Representatives or even take the oath in the White House itself.

We instinctively run to the old aristocratic and kingly form. They once had in the early days a procession of the President down to the Capitol. Washington wore his sword and carried his cocked hat. It was a cheap imitation of the courts of kings and the parade of monarchs that even Washington had not been able to get away from. But it had no business in a republic, and Jefferson abolished it. While the thing itself is trifling, the effect of example is often far-reaching; and I question whether Mr. Jefferson ever did any other thing—save the four or five mighty projects which came from his brain—that had a more beneficial effect than when he offered the example to the great democracy of this country of a simple

private citizen taking his oath of office in a quiet and unostentatious manner and assuming the powers of that office as an officer of a republic and not as one possessed of some sort of kingly prerogative. He furnished an example, and it was adhered to until recent years. He sent his messages to the House and to the Senate in writing.

Did they lose any virility or force by virtue of that? Whose learning, whose wisdom, has been the better stamped upon the history of the country? That of the simple citizen who served his people and who retired from that service the same simple citizen.

But we have had all that changed. Now we must parade to the other end of this Capitol with form and ceremony. The two Houses of Congress must be called to order. Committees must be appointed to wait upon the great man who is about to appear. The gavel falls; a hush settles over the assembly; and a little fellow, with a piping voice, rushes up the aisle as excitedly as though he was about to announce the presence of a new god, and exclaims, "The President of the United States!"—an exact reproduction of the sickening performance that has taken place in every kingly court since medieval days and before. Then the great man appears—this ordinary man. He may be a wiser man than most people, but he is just a man. He reads his impressive document. Then the committee forms, solemnly escorts him into the corridors, where he vanishes from sight, and one would think the sun and all the stars had disappeared, and that hope for human beings had died out because the demigod had left us.

Mr. President, it may not be poetical, and it may be bad taste, to use the expression, but I want to remark, in the vernacular of old Missouri, that "it makes me tired," this tinsel and this fustian, this disposition to put on parades, to make displays, to try to elevate an ordinary man into a sort of imperial personage, whose little finger is thicker than other men's loins, whose spear is a hundredweight, when, as a matter of fact, he is just an ordinary man, and you could put him on the other side of a table from you in a lawsuit and call in any good ordinary country lawyer and test his metal to his discomfiture; or if he be a newspaper man you could call in a dozen penny-a-liners who could write as good an article; or if he be a student of the Constitution you could bring a thousand other men who could teach him the principles of our great fundamental law.

The business of a President is not to be continually interfering with legislation, is not to be buttonholing Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. It is to lay before these bodies his recommendations in a dignified and proper manner and then to concede that there may be some other men besides himself who are in earnest, and that these proper representatives of the people, having had suggested to them a line of thought or a course of conduct, will weigh the propositions wisely and without interference by the Executive. It is time to begin to understand these things. So I say I should like to see them all abolished. That is a long digression from the 4th of March and inaugural parades, but it is all part of the same thing.

Coming now to substantial objection to this proposition, under the present Constitution when an election is held there exists an organized Congress, a body that is functioning and which constitutes the legislative branch of the then existing Government. To that organized body is consigned the business of counting the electoral votes and of determining the result. When it has been determined and the 4th of March rolls round, the man who has been declared elected by that organized body—a body that has been in existence for two years—takes his seat.

What is the proposition contained in this measure? It is that the old Congress shall expire on the first Monday in January and that the President's office, in like manner, shall expire on the third Monday in January. The new Congress, which has met two weeks prior, may or may not be organized by the date fixed for the inauguration of the President. It is entirely conceivable that when this body gets together there will be an enormous number of Members whose seats are contested; that upon the face of the returns or by reason of chicanery a majority may be created which does not exist. At the same time it is conceivable that there may not be an election by the Electoral College, and this body unorganized, which is going to constitute the new Congress, is called upon to act with reference to the selection of an Executive. I am not saying that these things will occur; but they are within the possibilities.

Well organized as it was, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives at the beginning of the present session of Congress found great difficulty in getting its machinery in operation.



We found some difficulty here in the election of the chairman of a committee. Conceive the condition of the growth of a third party or of a fourth party until there is a wide diversity of political opinion; and it is entirely within the possibilities, aye, even the probabilities, that on the third Monday in January the House will be in a state of absolute disorder, with no organization then effected, and the term of the existing President expiring. All that is avoided by allowing the Constitution to remain as it is, for, as matters now stand, the old Congress, the organized body, the body which has been functioning for two years, and which is the Government at that time, in so far as the legislative branch is the Government, proceeds to the counting of the electoral votes, and we avoid the difficulties which I have just mentioned. So it seems to me the weight of the argument and the weight of the reasoning are against the change that is proposed.

Let me offer a further observation for the consideration of the Senate.

It is said, as the chief argument for this change of the term of the President and the Congress, that too long a time elapses between the election and the assembling of Congress; and I believe that to be the argument that has been most potential with Senators. Let us examine that.

In the first place, it is said that 13 months elapse before the will of the people, expressed at the polls, can find expression in legislation, and that that is too long a time, and therefore that we ought to change the Constitution so that the result of an election shall be immediately felt.

It is an utter fallacy to declare that it is necessary for the assembling of Congress to be postponed for 13 months. If I am not mistaken in my judgment, that is purely a matter of statute. Congress could by law provide for the assembling of Congress on the 4th day of March succeeding the election. Is not that the view of the Senator who introduces this measure?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, Mr. President, if the Senator wants me to answer his question; it is true that Congress could fix any day.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. But I want to suggest to the Senator that if the time were fixed by statute on the 4th of March, it would mean that every Congress would miss the best part of the year, when the best work can be done, in the wintertime, and would always be in session during the hot season.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I thought we would get back to the weather report in some way or other.

Mr. NORRIS. We would get to it there. We could not escape it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not think there is anything in it, as I shall try to demonstrate in a minute. So, now, all we have to do to provide for a meeting on the 4th day of March is to pass a statute, and then, instead of having to wait these 13 months, we should only have to wait until the 4th day of March; and I presume, as has been suggested, that we could fix it just as well on the 1st day of January if we wanted to. Then we would have a President holding over until the 4th of March and a new Congress that had just been elected going in on the 1st of January.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit an interruption there?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. In that case we would make the present short session still shorter, because every other Congress would expire on the 4th day of March on account of the expiration of the term, and instead of having from December until March we would only have until January.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly; and we would start in on this glorious new session just exactly at the time the Senator says we ought to start.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but we would have to stop on the 4th of March.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Why?

Mr. NORRIS. We would still have a short session.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Why?

Mr. NORRIS. Because the term would expire.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The term of what? Oh, the term of Congressmen?

Mr. NORRIS. The term of one-third of the Senators and of all of the Members of the House. That is the reason why one of our sessions now is a short session, because of the expiration of the term.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. If we put the date of meeting one month later, and made it January instead of December, we would only shorten the short session by a month.

Mr. REED of Missouri. However, we are discussing a hypothetical matter. Let us discuss it as it is. Congress can fix the time of the meeting of the Congress succeeding the

election as of the 4th day of March, and it is proposed in this joint resolution that the meeting shall be on the 1st day of January. Now, what is the actual difference of time? About 60 days, is it not—January and February? You make a change of 60 days in the time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an interruption there, he must not forget that by fixing it as it is fixed in this amendment it is the new Congress and not the old Congress.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am coming to that. I am talking now about the proposition of the new Congress. The new Congress, under the Senator's joint resolution, would take its office on the 1st day of January, and certainly it could not be expected to do very much until after the President had been inaugurated, which would be the third Monday in January. Now, how much time do you actually save? If you change the present statute so that Congress meets on the 4th of March, the President being inaugurated on the 4th of March, the new Congress is really delayed in its action the difference between the third Monday in January and the 4th of March. That is to say, the net gain is about 38 to 40 days. That is not worth the effort of changing the Constitution. That is all you gain. If it is desired to have the new Congress meet on the 4th of March every other year, I shall be glad to vote for that sort of a statute. Figuring your entire scheme down, now, you are going to gain about 35 days of the winter months, which you say is the best time to legislate; so you get nothing substantial out of that. It seems to me, when you come to analyze that proposition down, that there is nothing in it.

Now, I want to offer the final observation that I have to make. I know there is a theory in the minds of many splendid men, many thoughtful men, that the voice of the people should be immediately heard and the mandate of an election instantly put into effect. Therefore, they say that we should hold an election to-day, swear in the officers to-morrow, and go to work the next day, and that anything short of that is a denial to the people of the right of control. That is a fascinating argument, but that is an argument quite contrary to the one that has to be advanced in support of a joint resolution that a President can be elected only once in order to keep him from playing politics—that is, asking the good will of the people. But the fathers of this Republic, the students of constitutions and of laws are of one opinion, as far as I know, upon the proposition I am about to state, and that is that the danger to a republic lies in hasty and improvident action; that while the utmost liberty of action must be allowed to the people in the expression of their will, nevertheless we must get entirely away from hasty and improvident action. That is the reason, sir, why it was written into the Constitution itself that it could not be changed until a joint resolution approved by two-thirds of both branches of the Congress had submitted the proposition and until it had been approved by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. That is the reason, or one of the reasons at least, why we have provided for two Houses of Congress—in order that a mistake that is made, an improvident action taken, may be checked in the other House and examined, and some possible mistake prevented.

It has been argued that the fixing of the 4th day of March was purely an accident.

I am of the opinion that it had a very much sounder reason—not the fixation of that particular day, but the fixation of a day somewhat later than the election. That reason is that there is a period of reflection, of discussion, of debate, of thoughtfulness, to intervene between the day of the election, with all of its excitement and its turmoil, and the period when those elected shall assume the duties of government. It is a brake upon the car, if you please. It is better to act a little slowly and to act wisely than it is to act hastily and improvidently. There is no man in this Chamber—and there are men here of many years of legislative experience—who can point to a single instance where the people have been deprived of any substantial right because the old Congress held over for 90 days or 120 days after the election. There have arisen no emergencies of such character that they could not await consideration after the 4th of March. There have failed to pass in these short sessions some laws that would have been passed if the session had been much longer, and to which the newly elected Congressmen were absolutely opposed, and which the new Congress would not have passed, and did not pass.

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

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. In that case the old Congress would never have a chance even to consider the matter.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, yes; the old Congress would have been in just that much longer, and would have done their work.

Mr. NORRIS. The old Congress would not have had that short session. The Senator has argued that some bad laws have failed in short sessions that would have done injury if the session had been longer and they had passed. My answer is that if this amendment is agreed to, and becomes part of the Constitution, there would be no such short session of Congress; there would be the new Congress.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; under the proposition of the Senator the Congress would enter upon its duties on the first Monday in January, and it would or might continue in session for an entire two years, with a mere formal adjournment to begin a new term. Under those circumstances the character of legislation of which I speak, which I say has been frequently defeated in the short session and was not taken up by the new Congress, would have simply been started earlier in the session, and would have gone through. Frequently in my judgment the short session has been a blessing, because something that I thought was very wrong was being attempted, and the lapse of time stopped it.

I do not understand the Senator when he says that this wipes out a short session, and, therefore, wipes out that evil. It is true it wipes out the short session, but it gives us two sessions of a year each, and all of the last one to complete the bad work I am discussing.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will call the Senator's attention to an incident that happened just recently, and I do not know but that the Senator had it in mind. The Senator is saying that the short session, by reason of it being short, sometimes is responsible for the defeat of desirable legislation which would be enacted if the session were longer.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I suggest to the Senator that if this were a part of the Constitution, the Congress, which now holds a short session after the election where it has been repudiated, if it is repudiated, would not have any short session; it would be the new Congress. Now let me call the Senator's attention to an incident—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly what the Senator says is true, but the Senator must agree with me that it is not the mere matter of the election with which we have to deal. We have to deal with what the Congress may do.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that, but it is the election that takes place just before the short session in which the people speak, and I want to call the Senator's attention to an attempt that was made in the last short session—that is, the last session of the last Congress. There was an attempt made by the administration to pass the so-called ship subsidy bill, and I think the Senator and I will agree that if that had been a long session that measure might have been enacted into law, and it was defeated perhaps because it was a short session. At least, that is one of the reasons. But if this amendment had been part of the Constitution, there would not have been any short session of that old Congress. It would have been the new Congress, convened in January, who were opposed to a ship subsidy, and they would not have gotten to first base with it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is a strange style of reasoning. The Senator assumes that the ship subsidy bill was introduced after the election—

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; but there was no attempt made to pass it until after election, and the Senator knows that the people at the election repudiated the idea of a ship subsidy bill.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly. Then we might just as well abolish all Congresses which meet after election and have no Congress meeting after an election.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator will agree with me that if the President had left the ship subsidy bill for the new Congress to consider and had not tried to get it through at the short session, he could not have gotten anywhere with it, and he could not have gotten anywhere just before election, because he knew Congress would have known the result that would follow.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not agree with that at all. If there had been no short session of the Congress, if the old Congress had expired with the election, of course, then, it would have been necessary to introduce the ship subsidy bill at some time prior to the election, some time between the two biennial elections. I think it would have been introduced, and I think

it would have gotten substantially the same vote it did get. I do not know of any lame ducks who voted to help pass it, and, anyway, we beat it by virtue of the lapse of time, lame ducks or no lame ducks.

Of course, if you are going to act upon the theory that a Congress after election shall have so many defeated Members in it that they feel no sense of responsibility, and that they are utterly disregarding of the public interest, then you had better abolish Congress altogether. I again challenge any man in this body to tell me a single law that was passed at a short session that illustrates in any striking manner the evils of the short session, as we call it, or any Congress that held over after an election that, because it held over after an election, passed legislation directly opposed to the will of the people, as expressed at the election, and in such a manner that it could not be rectified at once by the new Congress.

The fact about the matter is that we have talked a great deal about those things, and there is not much in them. If it is a tariff bill which the old Congress enacts, the new Congress can change it. If it is anything in the line of legislation, it can be changed. This is an attempt to change the Constitution, and I think confusion is being produced instead of remedy.

I go back now to the one thing I was speaking of when I digressed, and then I shall cease taking the time of the Senate. I say that a time of deliberation and of repose is necessary after a great election.

In my brief experience I have frequently known of propositions advanced because of some apparent emergency, and Congress excited about them, ready to take some extreme or radical action, but in the course of 30 or 60 or 90 days, the whole problem would be solved by itself, and the country would be saved the curse of some improvident legislation.

The inauguration of a new President and the installation of a government ought to come long enough after every election so that there has been time for consideration, time for counsel, time for organization, time for deliberation. Any proposition that proposes to call together the newly elected Members of Congress at once has within it the great danger of too hasty and too inconsiderate action. The statement of that proposition ought to appeal to every man who is an experienced legislator.

One of the great fathers of this Republic urged that no law be passed until it had been pending for a year, and when it was repelled that an emergency might exist demanding immediate action, he answered that the emergency could be met by providing that a law that was to be passed within a shorter period of time should have more than a majority vote.

Bear in mind that this country has run along now for nearly 150 years. We have suffered no serious difficulties on account of our Constitution, or because of the time of election. Why abandon the beaten path, the beaten road, and go into these bypaths of experimentation?

What great evil has arisen? No illustration has been given. The one illustration that was given was that of a bill for a ship subsidy, which was not brought up before an election, but was brought up after an election. It was defeated, and the shortness of time helped to defeat it.

I would rather have a Congress restrained during the last three or four months of its existence by the vote of an election which has already been held than to have a Congress that started out for two years and proceeded during the whole 24 months unrestrained by any intermediate expression of opinion of the people. I am not alarmed by the argument that men having been defeated will then proceed to do something after an election they would not do before. I know of no instance where that has been accomplished. I am not willing to ascribe such base motives to men who hold the position of legislators.

Take the two theories and put them side by side. One is to elect immediately and install in office, and keep in office for two years in almost constant session, this body of men, without any intermediate expression of opinion by the people. The other is to put that newly elected body into office on the 4th of March, and some 150 days before they shall go out of office there is an election. That election, let us say, is against the party in power. The influence is a restraining influence. The body of men whose policies have been repudiated will be less likely to carry them out than they would be if they had been sitting there acting before the election was held at all.

Generally, Mr. President, with the exception of providing a method for amending this Constitution which will give the people of the United States something to say about it, I am opposed to changes of the instrument. Under it we have proceeded from weakness to strength, from smallness to greatness, from a position in the column of nations far removed from the front to the very head of that column. We have seen our popula-



tion increased from a little over 3,000,000 to over 110,000,000. Our wealth has expanded beyond the conception of the men of 50 years ago. We occupy a great and dominant place on the map of the world. Our good will is sought by every government of earth. Our people are prosperous and happy, save from those misfortunes which fall as the result of improvidence or of providence.

And yet we are not content. Like the children of Israel we must have a new god every day. We must change. We must tinker. There stands the old temple of liberty, its spires blazing in the sunlight of universal approbation, pillars strong, walls as steadfast as when they were cemented first in the blood of the revolution, but everybody has to change the architecture a little. Somebody every day must go in with a chisel and hammer and go to pecking at it. Somebody must do something. It is a wonder to me that this Congress does not adjourn and go out into Statuary Hall and proceed with chisel and mallet and with amateur hands to try to improve on the statuary. Somebody will think that Daniel Webster's nose is too short and be sticking a piece of putty on the end of it in order that it may conform to his own educated taste. I have no doubt there are plenty of men here, if we could imagine such a thing as a legislative Venus de Milo, who would immediately proceed to legislate arms and parts on that statue. Nothing is sacred. All must be changed. All that is wrong.

Mark you, if you do not do something every day you are not progressive. If this Congress could conceive the thought that it is not the guardian of every human being in the country, that it has a limited scope of authority which it can properly exercise, that the people of the great States of the Union know quite as well what they need as we know what they need, that local self-government is not only a principle but that it will be a fact, that our business is to pass a few simple laws and provide the revenues for the Government; if we could conceive the fact that our wisdom is quite as finite as the wisdom of the folk at home, that at best we are obliged to guess with reference to many of our acts; if we could disband about two-thirds of the bureaus of Washington, if we could turn off three or four hundred thousand of the employees who eat up the substance of the people; if we could really visualize the old thought that freedom consists in the right of the individual to live his own life, conduct his own business, think his own thoughts without let or hindrance, save that he shall not so conduct himself as to circumscribe the rights of his fellow citizens to enjoy similar liberties; if we could understand that this Congress is not the doctor for all creation, that some things have been done wisely in the past by the founders of the Republic, and that half-baked experimentation is a thing intolerable in any Government; if we could remember, Senators, that those governments exist and continue to exist where changes are slow and are thoughtfully taken, that no people has ever established itself as a great people and maintained its dominance through the centuries unless it has had within it an element of conservatism and of care, we might do better.

I see my friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON] smiling at me—I do not know whether with approval or disdain, but I hope not the latter. If he will permit a personal allusion, not intended to be uncomplimentary, he originally sprang from a country far to the north, where one of the sturdiest folk on earth ever built a civilization amidst the adversities of nature. They are not an excitable people who change every day. They build, and build securely, and when they make change it is in the nature of addition and not of destruction.

The thing that has made the British people the dominant force that they are in this world is the fact that they have clung through the centuries to one line of ideas. Slowly, cautiously, and determinedly they have proceeded on their course. When England has fixed a policy in her Government she adheres to it. If 200 years ago the British Government had concluded to acquire a certain point of land or a certain island, through the 200 years that intervened she never took her eye off that spot of earth and has continued to adhere to the policy of finally acquiring it. I make that statement merely by way of illustration of a great English characteristic, a characteristic that has made it possible for 38,000,000 Britishers to establish the dominance of the Empire over one-third of the earth's habitable surface, so that, as Webster said, her drumbeat not only followed the sun in its course around the earth but it could now be said that the English flag flutters from pole to pole and kisses alike the icy breezes of the Arctic and Antarctic and the warm winds of the Equator.

But we must change every day—whittle at the Constitution just a little. No disaster has fallen to us through the years because of the time that we meet and organize our Congress. No evil has been pointed out which has befallen us. Just let us have a change; that is all. Let us do something. Well, there are enough tasks, great tasks, that lie within the purview of our authority. We may not agree as to their solution, but it would be well to put our minds to them.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only for a few moments. The real point in this proposed constitutional amendment is that it will enable the representatives of the people of the United States to meet nearly one year earlier than they do under the present structure of our Constitution. Its real meaning is that the people of the United States, when they wish to change and do change their Government, shall have an opportunity through their representatives so changed at an election to have their will recorded through the legislative authorities of this Nation earlier than by the present method, under which the Congress elected in November meets in December a year thereafter.

I am in favor of giving the people of the United States a larger measure of opportunity to express their will through their representatives. In that respect the proposed change in the Constitution would be an improvement; in that respect it would be progressive, because the real meaning of a "progressive" in this country is one who desires to give constantly increasing power to the people. Both of the great parties profess that principle, the principle of desiring the people to rule, but both great parties are divided into those who are progressive and those who are conservative. Each one is entitled to his own opinion. I am in favor of giving a larger measure of power to the American people to enable them to express their opinion as speedily as possible. For that reason I approve this proposed amendment to the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I differ with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who alluded to the attitude of the people of this country toward those who occupy the presidential office. In my judgment there is not anything better for this country than the feeling we have for the men who occupy that high office.

Theodore Roosevelt, William McKinley, Warren G. Harding did not receive a majority of the votes of the people of my State, but every schoolboy in Georgia points with pride to, and is a better boy and will become a better man because of, the lives of the men who have occupied the presidential office and other offices of trust. Those boys never would have known what great men those Presidents were had they not occupied the presidential office and their lives are an inspiration to them.

Mr. President, I wish to say the way the people of this country feel toward Woodrow Wilson is a splendid thing for the whole United States, and every day that will be demonstrated more and more as they come to appreciate what his life and character were as exemplified by his career as President of the United States.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is regarded by both parties as being one of the ablest public men in this country. He has opposed the last two constitutional amendments which have been adopted. I wish to take only a moment of the time of the Senate to read what that Senator said about a six-year term of office for the President. I read from a pamphlet which is being distributed on behalf of Mr. UNDERWOOD for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States. It is entitled "Mr. UNDERWOOD'S Views on Living, Pertinent Issues." Mr. UNDERWOOD delivered a speech the other day in Ohio, and the entire speech was printed in the RECORD. In reference to the President's term, Mr. UNDERWOOD said:

Make the term six years or seven years, and make the Executive ineligible to reelection, and you will have removed all temptation to further personal ambition, you will have taken out of the sphere of partisanship the one man in the country who should stand above and beyond it, and you will have purified the very air of politics itself by giving it worthier motives and loftier ideals.

Mr. President, I have not criticized the men who have held the office of President of the United States. In my judgment no man can be elected President of the United States who is not a good man and an honest man. I have confidence in the

people of the United States in their selection of a President, and I think more highly of the men selected by them than do some others. I am proud of that opinion. I am glad the country feels the way I have stated about the men who occupy the position of President and about the presidential office. I am not referring to any particular President; but I do not believe anyone can contradict the statement when I say that every President as soon as he gets into office must, because of the fight which is made upon him by politicians in this body as well as elsewhere in the country, put himself in an attitude of defense. Presidents, therefore, have to play politics. If they should be placed in a position where they did not consider their reelection and should be made ineligible for reelection, Senators and others would not be trying to destroy their prestige because of political differences. The President will not have to play so much politics if his political opponents know that he can not be reelected. They would think only of the merits of measures recommended by the President.

Consider the responsibility and the power which the President has. No king, no other man on earth, has such power as has the President of the United States. Any President can renominate himself with the power and patronage he has at his command, and most of them can almost reelect themselves with the patronage they have. I think that is a danger to the country. I believe that a President should spend all of his time thinking of the good of his country and his duties and not thinking of being reelected.

Mr. President, I recognize it is late, and I hope we may have a vote on the joint resolution this afternoon, so I am not going further to take the time of the Senate.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia a question with reference to his amendment, if I may. I find his amendment, as I read it, is intended to come in at the end of section 3 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. [Mr. NORRIS].

What I have difficulty in understanding is the application of the Senator's amendment at the point. The amendment seems to me to be complete. I suppose that my own view is in some way defective; but as the Senator's amendment reads, he repeats the language of the opening part of Article II of the Constitution in reference to "the executive power being vested in the President of the United States." Then his amendment provides that the President "shall hold his office during the term of six years," and shall be ineligible to reelection; then the Senator's amendment concludes with the language that—

The President, together with the Vice President chosen for the same term, shall be elected as follows.

Nothing follows in the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, except a short paragraph providing that—

This amendment shall take effect on the 15th day of December after its ratification.

It rather seems to me that the Senator's amendment does not fit into the place where I understand it to apply. There is in the original section of the Constitution to which the Senator's amendment evidently refers the provision as to the manner of election; but the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, as I understand, comes in as an independent and new amendment. Consequently, I do not see how the reference can be made back to the section of the Constitution which we really have in mind. I would appreciate it if the Senator would enlighten me if I am in error about it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I will state that one of the ablest lawyers in the Senate, a member of the Judiciary Committee, prepared this amendment at my request. I have tried for several years to get such a proposal before the Senate. When the late Senator Watson was my colleague he offered my measure and we tried to get the Judiciary Committee to approve it at that time. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], for whom I have high regard, was appointed about two months ago upon a subcommittee of three to consider the amendment proposed by me, along with his joint resolution, but that committee did not have time to consider my amendment. That is why I am forced, in order to get it before the Senate, to offer it as an amendment to the pending joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia has not quite comprehended the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado. If he will examine the language of his amendment and follow it out literally, as the Senator from Colorado suggests, there is great doubt whether it will fit at all where the Senator proposes that the amendment shall

come in. I think if the Senator would examine it carefully he would want to change it.

Mr. HARRIS. I will examine it and consult with lawyers in the Senate in regard to it.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Georgia that I think it is perfectly clear that he intends that his amendment shall take the place of paragraph 1 of section 1 of Article II of the Constitution. If he has the Manual before him he can see where evidently it is intended to come in.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, that might be a more appropriate connection, but as the Senator from Georgia has said he will examine the matter and present the question later, I do not care to say anything about it.

Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that we take a recess, or an adjournment, whichever is preferred, at this hour until Monday. I wish to speak upon the subject at some little length, and I do not care to do so this late in the afternoon. There are very few Senators present. Most of them, in all probability, have gone to their offices, many of them have gone to their residences, and it would be difficult and very inconvenient to Senators to call for a quorum in order to reach a final vote. As in all probability we can not complete the consideration of the joint resolution this afternoon, I think it would be well, and certainly it would be an accommodation to Senators, now to take a recess.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if he desires to discuss the pending amendment or the joint resolution proper?

Mr. SHIELDS. I desire to discuss both.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, the Senator would not want the pending amendment voted on until he had an opportunity to debate it?

Mr. SHIELDS. I should prefer to discuss the entire proposition at one time. I will say to the Senator that I desire to offer an amendment as a substitute for the joint resolution, and, if it is agreed to take a recess, I shall offer it now. It would not be in order now, but, by consent, I may present it in order that it may be printed and be considered on Monday.

Mr. NORRIS. I should be very glad to have the Senator present the amendment now if he intends to offer it, and let it be printed.

Mr. SHIELDS. Out of order, Mr. President, I desire to present an amendment in the nature of a substitute which I shall read. I desire to have it appear in the RECORD in the form in which I shall read it, and to have it printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will appear in the RECORD if the Senator reads it.

Mr. SHIELDS. That is one reason why I shall read it.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the Senator is about to offer a substitute for the main joint resolution?

Mr. SHIELDS. Yes; to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. The terms of the President and Vice President of the United States shall commence on the third Monday in January following the election of presidential and vice presidential electors.

SEC. 2. The presidential and vice presidential electors, composing the Electoral College, shall assemble in the States by which they are appointed and cast their votes for President and Vice President on the second Monday in December following their appointment, and the vote so cast, duly certified, shall be filed with the President of the Senate before the first Monday in January next thereafter, and the Congress shall meet in joint session on the second Monday in January following and open and count the same: *Provided*, That Congress may alter all the dates fixed in this section, in its discretion.

SEC. 3. The terms of Senators and Representatives shall commence on the first Monday in January following their election.

SEC. 4. There shall be held two regular sessions of Congress, convening on the first Monday of January each year.

SEC. 5. The terms of said officers who may be in office at the time of the adoption of this amendment are hereby changed to conform herewith.

I ask that the proposed substitute be printed in the usual form for distribution and placed on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. SHIELDS. Now, referring to my suggestion that a recess be taken, I submit the matter to the Senator from Nebraska.

RECESS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is quite evident to me that we shall not be able to dispose of the joint resolution itself tonight, although I had hoped that we might vote on some of the amendments that are pending. Since the Senator from Tennessee wishes to discuss the amendment, however, and is not



prepared to go on to-night, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) took a recess until Monday, March 17, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 15, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We would place ourselves in all reverence at Thy footstool, O Lord, and let Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done in all our hearts. We would have the sense of our personal relationship to Thee be very keen, and may it not grow less in our lives. Let our conduct, our service, and our influence be a direct reflection of the great Teacher of men. When reviled may we revile not, when we suffer may we threaten not, but commit ourselves unto Him who judgeth righteously. God bless our country and all the traditional institutions of the land. Increase the faith of all our citizens in the wisdom and character of our central Government, and may it always receive their support and unfailing loyalty to the glory of God and for the good of our fellow countrymen. Amen.

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

### REMARKS ON THE LATE WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the speech of Joseph P. Tumulty March 3, before the Iroquois Club, Chicago, on Woodrow Wilson, as follows:

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Iroquois Club, this is a most wholesome atmosphere; it radiates good nature and friendship for one who 11 years ago turned away from modest professional duties and directed his bark toward the Capital of the Nation to play an humble part in the constructive efforts of a man who, having made his impress upon a Nation and the world, triumphantly passed from the stage of life to play an immortal part in that last home where he now lives in peace and where sorrow no longer touches him.

It is heartening and fine to know that wherever one goes the heart of America seems to respond to the idealism of the great leader, Woodrow Wilson.

If one could have been present at the bedside of Woodrow Wilson as the last faint rays of his life flashed and fluttered, he could imagine that from those lips, now silent in death, these final impressive words of advice of Edmond Dantes came:

"So live, then, and be happy, beloved children of my heart, and never forget that until the day when God will deign to reveal the future to man all human wisdom is contained in these two words—'wait' and 'hope.'"

These two words, "wait" and "hope," sum up the philosophy which underlay the humane policies and broad, constructive statesmanship of Woodrow Wilson. "Waiting and hoping" were the lodestars of his life and his career. "Waiting and hoping" for the days of sweet reasonableness when the cause of world peace for which he engaged in a deathless struggle, gave the last full measure of devotion, would be vindicated—these were the pivots around which his thoughts and his dreams of peace turned. It is, indeed, too bad, my friends, that in this hurly-burly world in which we live—a world unfortunately torn and touched by the deep passions of hatred, the inevitable aftermath of the World War—that those little men who live from day to day, whose eyes seem never to sweep the great horizons of life, fail to steer their course by these two stars—"wait" and "hope."

The present, with its thrills, its adversities, its endless controversy, its expediences, is the tonic of the politician. The future, with its uncertainty, is the stimulant of the statesman. Our trouble is, gentlemen, that we think and assess the value of everything in terms of the present hour, its effect morally, socially, and economically upon the present day. We boastfully say that great events and careers are permanently settled by election returns. Thus we fear to go forward and blaze the way for future generations. And yet no one who reads history aright, whether it be that of America or the world, can find in its great lessons any solace or comfort to sustain a theory so foolish, so puerile, so evanescent. He who bases his action upon the atmosphere of the present day finds himself struggling with the forces of shifting sands. Events in our own Nation's life demonstrate that neither great careers nor grave public questions are ever permanently settled by election returns.

Does not the career of our own beloved Lincoln and the great unifying issue of slavery, which he sponsored with his mighty voice, prove

the truth of this assertion? The adversity of elections did not permanently settle the slavery question, nor did the defeat of Lincoln by Douglas in 1856 determine the career of Lincoln. No my friends; Destiny works in a peculiar way its wonders to perform and discredits the present as a safe standard by which to guide our action. Time alone, the great solvent, in the last analysis, is the final determinator. You might as well declare that the solemn referendum of the motley crowd that met on the hill of Golgotha fixed the place in history of the lowly Nazarene, who came to advocate peace, to help the poor and the distressed, to raise the dead, to succor the miserable and the hungry. The politicians who gathered about the cross foolishly thought that that referendum of passion which decreed death to Him who came to help a distressed world was the end, the consummation, of their bitterness and scorn and hatred. But, my friends, the crucifixion of Christ was not the denouement of the tragedy. The resurrection was the vindication of the power and the majesty of the mightiest figure in the world.

Lincoln's friends thought that when, in his struggle with Douglas for the United States Senatorship in 1856, he declared that "a house divided against itself could not stand"; that "no nation could live half slave and half free"—that these declarations would result in his defeat; that this was the end of Lincoln. But Lincoln cynically smiled and said, "It is but the beginning. These declarations may defeat me for the Senatorship of Illinois, but the seed planted by these statements will inevitably elect me to the Presidency." It is a difficult thing in the world of the present, a world full of passion, emotion, and hatred, approximately to estimate or to interpret the career of a man like Woodrow Wilson. Destiny, that inscrutable nuncio of God, seems to laugh to scorn the appraisements of the present. By all the cold, logical standards of the present hour, in the cause of peace for which he struggled, fought, and died, Woodrow Wilson dared with solemnity to do a great, unselfish thing, but failed utterly, miserably. He sought to play the rôle of a Nation's interpreter and to direct the course of those who seemed to have forgotten the covenant of peace, and, like John of old, crying out in the wilderness, called the wandering flock to the right path. But, alas, he did not reach the promised land of peace—the land of his dreams and hopes. But he did not desert the cause of peace. With him peace was never a forlorn hope. He did not surrender and let die "a fire, a fire that is sacred not only now in this country but in all countries for all times."

A famous writer has said that "the prophet is the man who sees with a troubled heart, but with clear eyes, the evil which reigns to-day, the punishment which will come to-morrow, and the kingdom of happiness which will follow punishment and repentance. He speaks in the name of the mute, he is a hand for him who can not write, a defender for the people scattered and oppressed, an advocate for the poor, an avenger for the humble who cry out under the heel of the powerful. He is not on the side of those who tyrannize, but of those who are trodden underfoot. He does not seek out the satiated and the greedy, but the hungry and the wretched. He is a troublesome, importunate, and inopportune voice, hated by the great, out of favor with the crowd, not always understood, even by his disciples. Only the poor and the oppressed bless him. Like all loud truth-tellers, who disturb the slumbering majority, who unsettle the sordid peace of the masters, he is avoided like a leper, persecuted like an enemy. Kings can barely tolerate him; the rich detest him."

And so we are here to-day resolved that the dead shall not have died in vain and with burning hope in our hearts that the valorous cause of peace to which he ordained his life, fought, suffered and gave the last full measure of devotion, shall, in the providence of God working through the efforts of those he left behind, be brought closer to ultimate realization. No ideal like that of peace can be blotted out any more than the everlasting hills can be destroyed. God does not permit waste.

Yes, my friends, Woodrow Wilson is as great and as noble in death as he was in life. With the shroud drawn, partisan rancor, personal hatred, and the envy of little men are held at bay and forever silenced, and now with bared heads we stand in reverential awe before the tomb to honor him who gave his body, his mind, his soul—yes, his very all—for the sacred truths upon which our own Magna Charta was founded; and for the saving of a world from the cruel and blighting plague of war.

With Woodrow Wilson "right was more precious than peace." With him as our leader and inspiration we fought for the things we have always carried nearest our hearts, for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for an universal dominance of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

Woodrow Wilson, with a vision clear, saw the broad horizons of life and sought to interpret the feeling and aspiration of peace that came to him, hot and bloody, out of the trenches; that spirit that has cried down through the centuries for peace, for everlasting peace, the cry that he seemed to hear above the hiss of shrapnel and the roar of the cannonading. Who shall say that the seed of

peace, planted by him, freshened by his sacrifices, vitalized by his sorrows, is not again to be renewed by his pains, his sufferings, his death, and will not in God's good time come to real fruition? His vision seemed to see the things that to us were unseen. With unflinching courage he trod the hard, stony way with the hope in his heart that in his deathless struggle for peace, humanity could be saved from a renewal of this barbarous, savage, bloody thing called war. Yes, he not only sought to save the world, but he died to preserve inviolate the landmarks of Christianity and civilization.

And now that this courageous figure has passed from its temporal stage, with charity in our hearts for those whose malice and perfidy conceived unjust attacks upon him, we recall that his enemies laughed his statesmanship to scorn; called it impotent, futile, and without result; said there was no use appealing to moral force in a world in which the forces of civilization were engaged in a veritable death grapple, and yet it requires neither the vision of a seer nor that of a philosopher to understand that the mightiest blows struck at German morale and prestige were those found in the immortal preachments of Woodrow Wilson—preachments that went like shot and shell to destroy what appeared to be the impregnable fortress of German power. Von Tirpitz, in his memoirs, stressed the effect of Wilson's submarine notes.

Ludendorff declared in his book that "the Wilson propaganda that found root in Berlin and finally grew there, eventually convinced the German people that it was not they, themselves, but the Government and militarism that the United States was warring against. This was the seed of dissension that ruined morale at home." Von Tirpitz further states that "only the transmitting to Germany of the threatening notes of President Wilson, when he inveighed against 'my submarine campaign' during the latter stages of the war, prevented Japan from coming to us in a great Germano-Japanese alliance, which would have ended the war at once." The persistent note writing of Woodrow Wilson, so often the subject of song and jest, was as mighty a force in winning the war as the consummate strategy of Joffre and Foch. You recall how the javelins of political slander were hurled at what was called the miserable, puerile policy of watchful waiting. The President's traducers said it was weak, vacillating, contemptible, and yet, my friends, when Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, faced a crisis in Mexico similar to that which confronted Woodrow Wilson, his policy was essentially the same. This is proven by Government records recently brought to light by Prof. Walter L. Davis, of the history department of the College of Puget Sound. Lincoln, according to these records, watchfully waited and indicated his aversion to aggressive action by appointing as minister to Mexico the very man who had bitterly opposed American interference 15 years before. He also issued the following instructions to his new minister:

"For a few years past the condition of Mexico has been so unsettled as to raise the question on both sides of the Atlantic whether the time has not come when some foreign power ought, in the general interest of society, to intervene, to establish a protectorate or some other form of government in that country and guarantee its continuance there."

"You will not fail," continues Lincoln, "to assure the Government of Mexico that the President neither has, nor can ever have, any sympathy with such designs, in whatever quarter they may arise or whatever character they take on."

You will find in the public utterances of Woodrow Wilson on Mexico the same breadth of vision, the same human sympathy, the same magnanimity as are found in the utterances of Lincoln.

Let me read what Woodrow Wilson said on Mexico when a great crisis in that country confronted him:

"The situation in Mexico," he said, "must be given a little more time to work itself out in the new circumstances. I believe that only a little while will be necessary. . . . We must exercise the self-restraint of a really great Nation which realizes its own strength and scorns to misuse it. I am more interested in the fortunes of oppressed men, women, and children than in property rights whatever. . . . The people of Mexico are striving for the rights that are fundamental to their lives and happiness—15,000,000 oppressed men, overburdened women, and pitiful children in virtual bondage in their own home of fertile lands and inexhaustible treasure."

But in spite of this magnanimity of purpose, his enemies smugly shrugged their shoulders and said with disdain:

"Well, what's the use? What can you expect from a dreamer of dreams, a mere doctrinaire? Doesn't Wilson, the historian, know that force and force alone can bring that grizzly old warrior, Huerta, to his senses?"

Ah, my friends, it was disheartening to find bitter criticism of this policy from the outside, and depressing to find the enemies of watchful waiting "boring from within" through certain of his cabinet officers.

"And one denies, and one forsakes, and still  
Unquestioning he goes, who has his lonely thoughts."

The critics of Woodrow Wilson's broad humanitarian policy in Mexico said that the only antidote for what was happening there was force and intervention, and they honorably urged this view upon the President, but without succeeding in bringing about the consummation so dear to their hearts. But little by little, the usurper, Huerta, was being isolated. By moral pressure every day his power and prestige were perceptibly crumbling. His collapse was not far away when the President declared, "We shall not, I believe, be obliged to alter our policy of watchful waiting."

And the campaign of Woodrow Wilson to force Huerta finally triumphed. On July 15, 1913, Huerta resigned and departed from Mexico. Wilson's humanity and broad statesmanship had won over the system of cruel oppression for which the "unspeakable Huerta" had stood.

When Woodrow Wilson advocated a League of Nations, people called him a dreamer, idealist, an altruist, "ahead of his time." But he was indifferent to criticism, and in one of his western speeches said:

"If I felt that I, personally, stood in the way of this settlement, I would be glad to die that it might be consummated."

In an admirable speech on the western trip, broken in health, but indomitable in spirit, calling upon God to strengthen his hand in the battle he was making for peace, Woodrow Wilson said:

"I believe in God. If I did not, I would go crazy. If I thought the direction of the disordered affairs of this world depended upon our finite intelligence, I should not know how to reason my way to sanity, and I do not believe there is any body of men, however they concert their power or their influence, that can defeat this great enterprise, which is the enterprise of Divine mercy and peace and good will."

Woodrow Wilson hated war and dreaded it in all the fibres of his soul—he hated it and dreaded it because he had an imagination and a heart; an imagination which showed his sensitive perception of the anguish and the dying which war entails, a heart which yearned and ached over every dying soldier and bled afresh with each new-made wound.

He understood better than his critics the basis of the Nation's impatience for war, but that in no way hurried him into rash or precipitate action. At a private dinner in Washington he took cognizance of this critical situation, and, addressing a group of Senators and Congressmen and high dignitaries of State, he spoke of the impatience of the country which then manifested itself, saying:

"I wish that whenever an impulse of impatience comes upon us, whenever an impulse to settle a thing some short way tempts us, we might close the door and take down some old stories of what American idealists and statesmen did in the past and not let any counsel in that does not sound in the authentic voice of American tradition. Then we shall be certain what the lines of the future are, because we shall know we are steering by the lines of the past. We shall know that no temporary convenience, no temporary expediency, will lead us either to be rash or to be cowardly. I would be just as much ashamed to be rash as I would to be a coward. Valor is self-respecting. Valor is circumspect. Valor strikes only when it is right to strike. Valor withholds itself from all small implications and entanglements and waits for the great opportunity when the sword will flash as if it carried the light of heaven upon its blade."

They said he was cold, that he was aloof. Yes, like Lincoln, "that brooding spirit had no real familiars." It never spoke out in complete self-revelation. "It was a very lonely spirit that comprehended men without fully communing with them, as if, in spite of all its genial efforts at comradeship, it dwelt apart, saw its visions of duty where no man looked on."

Yes, there was an aloofness and an aloneness about Woodrow Wilson, but it was the aloofness and the aloneness of the mountain peak, looking down upon the valleys and seeing humanity, not as a thing of shreds and patches, a thing divided into races, religions, clans and blocs, but seeing humanity as a big, pulsating whole, made up of struggling men, women, and children of all races and creeds. That great heart of Woodrow Wilson sought to comprehend the interests of these heterogeneous elements and to understand their lives and their tragedies, far away from those artificial lines that divide men.

Woodrow Wilson was not only great, but he was human. But his humanness was made out of too fine a fiber to be used for self-exploitation, nor would he ever permit himself to be so used. The trouble with his peculiar kind of humanness was this—it did not bubble, it did not effervesce, it did not sparkle; and so they called him cold when he was only shy; they called him austere when he was only gentle. But that kind of a man will live in the hearts and thoughts of men forever.

You remember Lincoln's statement that God must have loved the poor because he made so many of them. I am reminded of the passionate devotion and love of the average man which seemed to set on fire every utterance Woodrow Wilson made. Many of



you will recall his address at the service held in memory of those who lost their lives at Vera Cruz, Mexico. On that occasion he said:

"When I look at you, I feel as if I also and we all were enlisted men. Not enlisted in your particular branch of the service, but enlisted to serve the country, no matter what may come, even though we may sacrifice our lives in the arduous endeavor. We are expected to put the utmost energy of every power that we have into the service of our fellowmen, never sparing ourselves, not condescending to think of what is going to happen to ourselves, but ready, if need be, to go to the utter length of complete self-sacrifice. As I stand and look at you to-day and think of those spirits that have gone from us, I know that the road is clearer for the future. Those boys have shown us the way, and it is easier to walk on it because they have gone before and shown us how. May God grant to all of us that vision of patriotic service which here in solemnity and grief is borne in upon our hearts and consciences."

And then, again, in the following lines, Woodrow Wilson's devotion and understanding of the problems of the average man radiates the altruism of the passionate Democrat:

"Life, gentlemen—the life of society, the life of the world—has constantly to be fed from the bottom. It has to be fed by those great sources of strength which are constantly arising in new generations. Red blood has to be pumped into it. New fiber has to be supplied. That is the reason I have always said that I believed in popular institutions. If you can guess beforehand whom your rulers are going to be, you can guess with a very great certainty that most of them will not be fit to rule. The beauty of popular institutions is that you do not know where the man is going to come from and you do not care so he is the right man. You do not know whether he will come from the avenue or from the alley. You do not know whether he will come from the city or the farm. You do not know whether you will ever have heard that name before or not. Therefore, you do not limit at any point your supply of new strength. You do not say it has got to come through the blood of a particular family or through the processes of a particular training, or by anything except the native impulse and genius of the man himself. The humblest hovel, therefore, may produce your greatest man. A very humble hovel did produce one of your greatest men. That is the process of life, this constant surging up of the new strength of unnamed, unrecognized, uncatalogued men who are just getting into the running, who are just coming up from the masses of the unrecognized multitude. You do not know when you will see above the level masses of the crowd some great statue lifted head and shoulders above the rest, shoddering its way, not violently but gently, to the front and saying: 'Here am I; follow me.' And his voice will be your voice, his thought will be your thought, and you will follow him as if you were following the best things in yourselves."

And so, my friends, who shall say that these struggles and efforts for peace of Woodrow Wilson are in vain? How beautifully and artistically does God manipulate the scenes of life and thus weave His immortal spell! Those who execrated Woodrow Wilson, those who knocked, knocked at the door of his sick room, spying upon a weary President, pursuing him like a deer set upon by snarling hounds, are now in the shadow of exile and disgrace, resting under the blight and stigma of a Nation's shame and reproach, while the great spirit of Woodrow Wilson takes flight. From his lofty eminence of fame and everlasting glory we seem to see him looking down upon us through wistful eyes and saying:

"We have begun a fight that, it may be, will take many a generation to complete, the fight against special privilege, but you know that men are not put into this world to go the path of peace. They are put into this world to go the path of pain and struggle. There are men who have fallen by the wayside; blood without stint has been shed; men have sacrificed everything in this sometimes blind, but always instinctive and constant struggle; America has undertaken to lead the way; America has undertaken to be the haven of hope, the opportunity for all men. Don't look forward too much. Don't look at the road ahead of you in dismay. Look at the road behind you. Don't you see how far up the hill we have come? Don't you see what those low and damp miasmatic levels were from which we have slowly led the way? Don't you see the rows of men come, not upon the lower level, but upon the upper, like the rays of the rising sun? Don't you see the light starting, and don't you see the light illuminating all nations? Don't you know that you are coming more and more into the beauty of its radiance? And then trust your guides, imperfect as they are, and some day, when we are dead, men will come and point at the distant upland with a great shout of joy and triumph and thank God that there were men who undertook to lead in the struggle. What difference does it make if we ourselves do not reach the uplands? We have given

our lives to the enterprise. The world is made happier and humankind better because we have lived."

Woodrow Wilson's passing calls to mind the description by Bunyan in *Pilgrim's Progress* of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth:

"Then," said he, "I am going to my Father; and though with great difficulty I am got hither, yet now I do not repent me of all the trouble I have been at to arrive where I am. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me, that I have fought His battles who now will be my rewarder."

"When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied him to the riverside, into which as he went he said, 'Death, where is thy sting?' And as he went down deeper he said, 'Grave, where is thy victory?' So he passed over and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

#### ADJUSTED COMPENSATION.

Mr. PEAVEY. Mr. Speaker, I am a friend of the ex-soldier. I am not one of those who befriends the soldiers when he wants their votes and forgets him when a measure like this is before the House. I do not wish or intend to cast any reflections upon any of my colleagues; I would be friends with them all; but I say to you that now is the time for every true friend of the soldier to show his colors. If an adjusted compensation act worthy of the name is to be passed by this Congress it will be necessary for every friend of the ex-soldier to vote "no" when a suspension of the rules is asked for on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, it is only when a friend of the soldier can no longer remain silent and be their friend that I utter these remarks. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, when Congress first convened in December the two most prominent pieces of legislation under discussion for immediate consideration by the House was the tax or revenue bill and the adjusted compensation act. There was much discussion among Members, and evidently some among the leaders in Congress, as to whether the adjusted compensation should be taken up first or the revenue or tax bill.

Friends of the soldiers felt then, and I believe still feel, that the soldiers' wage bill should have been settled first that this important feature of the country's finances might be taken into consideration when adjusting the Treasury as to the income necessary to carry on the Government. But apparently Mr. Mellon had his way, and the tax bill was given precedence. For 40 days and 40 nights we wallowed in schedules, brackets, estimates, and office propaganda. Now we are to be given, for the purpose of consideration of the second most important act to be passed by Congress, just 40 minutes for debate, without right to offer amendments.

Secretary Mellon's antisoldier, proidle rich tax bill had one whole month and 10 days consideration by this House, with numerous amendments offered before and during final consideration of the bill. Gentlemen, it is well to bear in mind that the committee that has drawn and considered this bill is one and the same that recommended the Mellon tax bill to the House. Several of its members are the avowed opponents of soldiers' adjusted compensation, as shown by their past records. I do not question them this right, but friends of the soldier should bear it in mind when considering the committee's report on their bill itself. Now, the soldiers' insurance act is given to us on three days' notice, without an opportunity to offer a single amendment and only 40 minutes for debate. Why, gentlemen, this bill was not even printed when suspension of the rules was asked on the floor of the House in order that it might be rammed through Congress. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, such procedure is an outrage not only on the ex-soldiers of this country but upon their parents and relatives, who are the people of this country. Ever since the war closed and private property and civilians had their rights due to the war adjusted by this Government the soldiers have been told by newspapers, magazines, all public speakers, and nearly every candidate for public office, including Members of Congress, that the boys who served in the war would be given an adjustment of their pay. Six or seven hundred thousand of these human derelicts who had two years before been the "pride of America" slept on park benches and again entered the mess lines to eat, objects of public charity, while the railroads and the war contractors were each paid in cash an adjustment of their claims against the Government, double the amount necessary to pay the soldiers' adjusted compensation. More than five years have passed since these men were promised an adjustment of their pay. Now it is proposed to give them a present of an insurance policy. It is no longer adjusted pay, but a present or bonus payable 20 years from now. Speaking

as one ex-soldier, I am sure I voice the will of a great majority of these men when I say to you Members of Congress as soldiers we do not seek or want charity, public or private.

We do want an adjustment of our World War wages. We want Congress to pay us that which we believe is due as a matter of justice. We do not seek political bribes for our votes, but honest pay for the time we worked in Uncle Sam's uniform. That is the basis of the soldiers' claims before this Government. That is the question we want Congress to decide. If the majority of Congress find that these boys are entitled to an adjustment of their wage contracts with the Government in the World War, then it is the duty of Congress, in my humble opinion, to pay the men as all other employees of our Government have always been paid—in the coin of the realm, in cash or its equivalent. I personally am in favor of a provision to exclude all commissioned officers by the terms of the bill and will vote for such amendment should it be introduced. Such a provision would exclude any personal interest I might have in the passage of this act.

Gentlemen of Congress, to enact this gift of insurance with 40 minutes' debate and no opportunity for amendment is, in my opinion, a gross betrayal of the American doughboy by the American Congress.

For the majority party, to which I belong, to sponsor this insurance gift to the soldiers in lieu of an adjustment of their World War wage contracts is to commit political chicanery, betray its best friends, and die under the stigma of having committed political suicide.

For 50 years following the Civil War the Republican Party was known to the people of this country as the soldiers' party, because it advocated that which was just, generous, and fair to its defenders. Now, under a gag rule, in lieu of the compensation due them it is proposed to ram down the soldiers' throats an insurance gift that can be collected only when nearly half of these men will be dead and gone.

The Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the auxiliary, and every other soldier organization in the country worthy of the name has asked for adjustment of compensation, and now Congress, through the Committee on Ways and Means, proposes to give them an Andrew Mellon bonus in the form of an insurance policy due 20 years hence in full payment of their claim. I say such a proposal is to offer the boys a stingy Yankee trade that might better remain unborn. It is a recognition of the principle of a bonus and not that of adjusted compensation. It is a milk-and-water proposition—one-tenth milk and nine-tenths water. When Congress defeated the Mellon tax, which, with its nation-wide propaganda, was designed to kill the soldiers' adjusted compensation, the people felt the soldiers had won. They did win. Secretary Mellon, by his friends on the committee, realizing that he was beaten, proposes now by this bill to give the boys a sop in order to evade paying what they know to be due. The people of the United States want the boys to have their pay. An overwhelming majority of Congress wants the debt paid, but the Secretary of the Treasury, through his friends in Congress, in protection of the rich war profiteers, would, like a hard-faced deacon, quibble and fiddle around to see if he can not strike a better bargain.

Gentlemen, this proposal is not sound nor logical in any particular. It is typical Yankee trading stock, it is a jack-knife with a pearl handle and all the blades gone but the smallest one, and that broken off half way.

In the first instance it does not adjust the pay of those who need it. The man who is content to accept a 20-year endowment insurance policy in lieu of his wage claim against the Government is not suffering or in any great need. In my opinion not one-tenth the men who were in the service will be willing and satisfied to accept this tender.

Second. The only men who are recognized as being entitled to an actual adjustment of their compensation under the terms of this bill are the men who served for 60 days or less. Their claim is recognized in full and paid in cash. Between these two classes there lies nearly 2,000,000 fighting men that went to France. Thousands of these men are in need. They may not all of them be starving just now, but hundreds of thousands of them were a short time ago. These men want what is due them with which to purchase the necessities of life, to reestablish them in industry or business—in plain words to place them in as good a position before the world as they were when the country called them.

The information has been scattered about the House that 60 or 70 per cent of the members of the American Legion favor the proposal to give the soldiers a 20-year endowment policy in lieu of compensation. I do not believe it. But even if so, what does it signify? The Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars together have less than one-third of the soldiers of the

World War in their membership. Neither organization has made a canvass or poll of their membership to find out how they stand on such a proposal as this.

I challenge every man who is using this statement to bolster up this nostrum that he have a canvass made in either one or both the veteran organizations mentioned and find out how the soldiers stand. This could have been done during January or February while we were considering the Mellon tax bill had anyone interested really wanted to know. It is claimed that National Commander Quinn and other Legion officials are in favor of this bill as the best thing that can be passed in the present Congress. My answer to this is that justice and what is right should not be compromised or sacrificed to expediency.

I well realize it is not sound or reasonable to criticize or oppose without proposing a remedy for the thing complained of; therefore, had I the opportunity to amend this bill, I would propose that Congress give to the soldiers at the rate of \$1 per day for home service and \$1.25 per day for foreign service, and that the amount due each man be paid by issuing him a Government bond due in 30 years, drawing 4½ per cent interest, and to be nontaxable only as to the income. Such bonds would, if issued, be immediately worth par and could be retained by the soldier or converted into cash as the necessity of the man's circumstances might govern him to decide.

Such bonds, when issued, could be retired by the creation of a sinking fund of eighty or ninety millions a year, and would cost the Government but little, if any, more than this insurance proposal, even should every man that was in the service elect to take a bond for the amount due him.

Give the men this option, gentlemen. If, as the contenders of this bill claim, 60 or 70 per cent of the ex-soldiers will be content to take the insurance, then the Government will issue that much less bonds.

If you are going to pay the men what is due them, then I say pay them in the form they want it paid. Do not try to inveigle them into accepting something that only a few want or will be satisfied to accept.

I well realize after what took place during our recent rules fight and again during the consideration of the Mellon tax plan that certain leaders on the Republican side will challenge those who keep faith with the soldiers with being insurgents, radicals, and demagogues; but, gentlemen, I would rather be called a traitor to my party than I would to have my ex-soldier supporters charge me with being disloyal to them.

Gentlemen, we have as leader on the Republican side of this House as distinguished, honorable, and able a man as it has ever been my pleasure to meet. He has several reputable and capable assistants, but I dare say to them, if they pass this bill as drawn, that in my opinion they are committing themselves and the Republican Party to absolute and certain ruin. I dare to predict to these gentlemen that if they persist in this course that a Democratic or third-party President and Congress will retrieve their error before we reach the time any loan money will ever be available to the soldiers under the terms of this bill.

Challenge my Republicanism if you will for making these statements, but let me say in my own defense that I was an American citizen before I ever joined the Republican Party. We in Wisconsin are Republicans as a matter of principle, not out of fear for party edict or lash. The district which I have the honor to represent is so overwhelmingly Republican that the opposing party has not had a candidate in the past 10 years. Our people in Wisconsin are Republicans for principle. They believe that human rights should be secured before property rights are considered. They contributed loyally and generously to the support of the war in both men and money. They want to be loyal and just now in support of the men who made the greater part of that sacrifice.

Let me call the attention of the gentleman on this side of the House that the Republican Party was born at Ripon, Wis.; that Wisconsin leadership has furnished more platform ideas that have been enacted into national law than any other Republican State in the Union; that if the Republican Party leaders had adhered to Wisconsin principles in legislation during the past two years their majority in the Sixty-seventh Congress would not have been reduced to less than 20 in the present House.

That Wisconsin republicanism is that kind of partyism that Lincoln would be found advocating, were he on earth to-day.

In closing, gentlemen, permit me to say that the proposal by the committee to give veterans of the World War an insurance policy in lieu of cash or something that can be easily and quickly converted into cash in lieu of payment of adjusted compensation is not republicanism. I dare say there is not a candidate here or a party to come that dares to seek an



election on such a diluted pledge. Such republicanism could only find precedent in the days of Mark Hanna, Uncle Joe Cannon, or in the mind of our present illustrious Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon.

I am an optimist by nature. I have the utmost confidence in our country's safety and its future, but, gentlemen, let me impress upon you that when 2,000,000 men who paid \$6 to \$8 per month for Government insurance over there find that they are to be given another Government insurance policy instead of adjusted compensation, you are courting trouble. Such congressional action will to thousands of these men be received as salt rubbed in an open wound.

This bill is to come up under suspension of the rules on Tuesday. May every sincere friend of the soldier be here and vote "no" on that motion.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

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

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment of expenses of delegates to represent the United States at the general assembly of the International Institute of Agriculture, to be held at Rome in May, 1924, and for the payment of the quotas of Hawaii, the Philippines, Porto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the support of the institute for the calendar year 1924;

S. 105. An act for the relief of Arthur Frost;

S. 2111. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to conduct an experiment in the Rural Mail Service, and for other purposes;

S. 2154. An act to amend the act of September 22, 1922, entitled "An act to provide for the applicability of the pension laws to certain classes of persons in the military and naval services not entitled to the benefits of Article III of the war risk insurance act, as amended";

S. 1787. An act authorizing the extension of the park system of the District of Columbia;

S. 131. An act for the relief of W. Ernest Jarvis;

S. 335. An act for the relief of John T. Eaton;

S. 648. An act for the relief of Janie Beasley Glisson;

S. 2219. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmare, deceased, and others;

S. 2220. An act for the relief of Louise St. Gez, executrix of August Ferré, deceased, surviving partner of Lapene & Ferré;

S. 2562. An act for the relief of William Hensley;

S. 514. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a right of way over the Government levee at Yuma, Ariz.;

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution in relation to a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States of America, its insular possessions, and the District of Columbia in the World War;

S. 1180. An act for the relief of J. B. Platt;

S. 1643. An act for the relief of Samuel S. Archer;

S. 2510. An act for the relief of William Henry Boyce, sr.;

S. 788. An act to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to Daniel S. Glover;

S. 314. An act concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 589. An act for the relief of James Moran;

S. 2745. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the States in which located Government owned or controlled approach roads to national cemeteries and national military parks, and for other purposes;

S. 2746. An act regulating the recovery of allotments and allowances heretofore paid to designated beneficiaries;

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the New Orleans Association of Commerce New Orleans quartermaster intermediate depot, unit No. 2;

S. 2187. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider and settle the claim of Mrs. John D. Hall, widow of the late Col. John D. Hall, United States Army, retired, for personal property destroyed in the earthquake at San Francisco, Calif.;

S. 2481. An act for the relief of John H. Gattis;

S. 1930. An act for the relief of the San Diego Consolidated Gas & Electric Co.;

S. 1941. An act for the relief of Ezra S. Pond;

S. 2764. An act authorizing the President to order Leo P. Quinn before a retiring board for a rehearing of his case and upon the findings of such board either confirm his discharge or place him on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his discharge;

S. 1011. An act for the relief of Michael Sweeney;

S. 47. An act to permit the correction of the general account of Charles B. Strecker, former Assistant Treasurer United States;

S. 196. An act for the relief of Charles S. Fries;

S. 608. An act for the relief of James E. Fitzgerald;

S. 828. An act for the relief of the receiver of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co.;

S. 2527. An act for the payment of claims for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, operation, or maintenance of the Army;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Samuel S. Weaver;

S. 969. An act for the relief of Clotilda Freund;

S. 1557. An act to give military status and discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps, organized by the War Department under authority of the President of the United States for service during the war with Germany;

S. 245. An act for the relief of Henry P. Collins, alias Patrick Collins;

S. 2431. An act conveying to the State of Delaware certain land in the county of Sussex, in that State;

S. 1982. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., its successors and assigns, of a line of railroad across the northeasterly portion of the Fort Snelling Military Reservation in the State of Minnesota;

S. 2488. An act to authorize the city of Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said city;

S. 639. An act authorizing the addition of certain lands to the Medicine Bow National Forest, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 2420. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Potter County and Dewey County, S. Dak.;

S. 2436. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

S. 2437. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

S. 2446. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Clarks Ferry Bridge Co., and its successors, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the railroad station of Clarks Ferry, Pa.;

S. 1370. An act authorizing the granting of war-risk insurance to Capt. Earl L. Naiden, Air Service, United States Army;

S. 1641. An act to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday; and

S. 264. An act for the relief of Charles H. Willey.

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

H. R. 5633. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Hinds County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5737. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, and the counties of Lake and Newton, State of Indiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River at or near the State line between section 19, township 31 north, range 15 east of the third principal meridian, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, and section 1, township 31 north, range 10 west of the second principal meridian, in the counties of Lake and Newton, State of Indiana;

H. R. 6420. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River in section 17, township 28 north, range 23 west of the fourth principal meridian in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 6925. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundred and thirtieth Street in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

#### Senate Resolution 188.

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. SAMUEL D. NICHOLSON, late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Senate Resolution 187.

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. KNUTE NELSON, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SESSION OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS IN OKLAHOMA CITY.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert the following:

A bill (H. R. 2857) to establish a term of the United States circuit court of appeals at Oklahoma City, Okla.

Mr. HERSEY. Have you anything on H. R. 2875?

Mr. YATES. The report on H. R. 2857 reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C. February 16, 1924.

Hon. GEORGE S. GRAHAM,

Chairman Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 1 with regard to H. R. 2857, entitled "A bill to establish a term of the United States circuit court of appeals at Oklahoma City, Okla."

It would seem that the creation of another term of holding court would only further inconvenience the judges of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Judicial Circuit and result in greater congestion and loss of time. Furthermore, it would necessitate the establishment of an adequate library, and under existing appropriations the department is unable to even provide law books for the library for the circuit court of appeals at Denver, Colo.

I transmit herewith a photostat copy of a letter from Judge Walter H. Sanborn, senior circuit judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. This letter is self-explanatory.

Respectfully,

H. M. DAUGHERTY, Attorney General.

(Hon. Walter H. Sanborn, St. Paul, Minn.; Hon. Kimbrough Stone, Kansas City, Mo.; Hon. Robert E. Lewis, Denver, Colo.; Hon. William S. Kenyon, Fort Dodge, Iowa, circuit judges. Hon. Willis Van Devanter, circuit justice, Washington, D. C.)

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT,  
St. Louis, Mo., February 9, 1924.

Hon. A. T. SEYMOUR,

Acting Attorney General,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SEYMOUR: In answer to your letter of February 5, 1924, requesting my views as to the advisability of the passage of the bill H. R. 2857, providing for a term of the circuit court of appeals annually at Oklahoma City, permit me to inform you that I have conferred with Circuit Judges Lewis and Kenyon, who are here, and they agree with me in the opinion that the passage of that bill would impair the efficiency, delay the work, and increase the expense of the court of appeals of this circuit.

This court is now required to sit annually at St. Paul, St. Louis, and Denver. The transfer of the court from one of these cities to another and back again practically deprives the court of a week's work. It requires a transfer of the clerks and the librarian and many of the records and briefs must be packed up and moved.

At St. Paul and at St. Louis the court has a law library in the Federal building; at Denver it has none, and the judges are compelled to postpone opinions in many of the cases argued there until they can get back to one of their libraries at either St. Paul or St. Louis. If they were required to hold an annual session of the court at Oklahoma City, they would labor under the same disadvantages there as they do at Denver.

Distances in this circuit are great. It requires days to go from Denver or St. Paul to Oklahoma City, and transportation expenses are heavy.

A stationary court is more efficient than an ambulatory one. If this court were to be required to sit annually at Oklahoma City there

might be a like call and a like reason for an annual session of it at Salt Lake City, at Little Rock, and perhaps at other cities in the 12 States contained in the circuit.

Very respectfully,

WALTER H. SANBORN,  
Senior Circuit Judge.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on the 10th day of December, 1923, I introduced this bill and am glad to have an opportunity to appear before the Committee on the Judiciary and tell you some of the reasons why the bill should be reported favorably by the committee and enacted into law by this Congress. Courts are established among our citizens for the purpose of making it as convenient as possible to settle civil disputes where they can not be otherwise determined satisfactorily, to punish those who violate the law of our land, and for the protection of society. Litigants in court have a right to have their cases determined as speedily as possible and with the least expense. It is not right to put them to great expenses, cause them to travel hundreds of miles and spend a large amount of money in order to follow their cases on appeal. The poor citizen can not afford this unnecessary expense, even though he may have a just cause, and he is therefore deprived of an equal opportunity with the man of means. The humblest citizen and the highest have the right when in court to have their cases reviewed by our appellate courts when they think an injustice has been done. They should not be denied this right by reason of great expense on appeal. Courts should be established at easily accessible places, where disputes can be settled with as little expense as possible to the litigants, and also to the Government. The judges can better afford to travel some distance for the purpose of holding court than can the litigant or his attorney. The expenses of the judges are paid, and a part of this is paid by these very litigants who pay taxes for the expense of the Government.

Sufficient courts should be established that litigants may have their cases tried without any unnecessary delay, and criminal cases should not be permitted to drag. The law is better enforced and there is more respect for the law when the defendant in criminal cases is given his constitutional right to a speedy trial. In order to foster a proper respect for the law it must be speedily, economically, and impartially administered. Judges themselves, more than any other set of men, can cause this respect by a proper administration of the affairs of the office. Judges are human like the rest of us, and are the same men, animated by the same emotions, thinking with the same brain, feeling with the same heart as before he was elevated to the position of judge.

The law gives a person in court the right of appeal, and this should not be denied to any citizen by making it impossible to have a case reviewed on account of the additional expense. Appellate courts are instituted among us for the purpose of correcting mistakes of the lower courts on further deliberation. If a person is denied the right of appeal on account of expense, that person does not have the proper regard for the Government, for we are a people who believe in equal and exact justice to all.

I believe in administering the affairs of government with the least possible expense, and I further believe that officials should work a reasonable time the same as other employees. This bill will work no inconvenience on any judge, for it is his business to hold court and to go where it is most convenient with the least expense to our citizens. Courts should certainly be established as near as possible to the center of litigation—that is, where the greatest number of cases reach the court for that district or circuit, as the case may be.

There are 12 States in the eighth circuit and 17 districts. The States are: Arkansas, eastern and western districts; Colorado, Iowa, northern and southern districts; Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, eastern and western districts; Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, eastern and western districts; South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. Court is held for the eighth circuit at the following places: St. Paul, Minn.; Denver, Colo.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; and St. Louis, Mo. Below is a statement from the Department of Justice concerning the condition of the docket in the eighth circuit June 30, 1923:

Number of cases pending at the close of June 30, 1923, in each of the judicial districts comprising the eighth judicial circuit.

Arkansas—Eastern	877
Western	647
Colorado	1,218
Iowa—Northern	1,600
Southern	936
Kansas	1,486
Minnesota	3,743
Missouri—Eastern	1,451
Western	2,149
Nebraska	1,870
New Mexico	344
North Dakota	802
Oklahoma—Eastern	2,615
Western	1,037
South Dakota	1,139
Utah	586
Wyoming	498



*Number of cases decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.*

Fiscal year—	
1921.....	203
1922.....	281
1923.....	322

A report from the Clerks of the United States District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma show the following cases pending:

WESTERN DISTRICT.	
Law and equity cases.....	367
Bankruptcy cases.....	330
Criminal cases.....	748
EASTERN DISTRICT.	
Law and equity cases.....	564
Bankruptcy cases.....	965
Criminal.....	871

It will be seen from this statement that but one State has more cases pending before this court than Oklahoma. That State is Minnesota, and the circuit court holds sessions at St. Paul. Oklahoma litigants must travel even from Oklahoma City about 500 miles to the nearest court, at St. Louis, and hundreds of miles more from the southern and other portions of the State.

Oklahoma has made great strides since the advent to statehood, November 16, 1907, and, like any other new State, has much litigation. Oklahoma is essentially an agricultural State, ranking fourth in the production of cotton in 1923, and sixth in the production of winter wheat, and produces more broom corn than all the other States combined. In 1922 she produced 149,571,000 barrels of oil, more than any other State. This was one-fifth of the amount produced in the United States and about one-eighth of the total output of the whole world for that year. During that year Oklahoma was second among the States in the production of lead, and first in the production of zinc. In addition to this she has millions of tons of coal resting on seas of untouched oil. With her thousands of acres of rich oil land, her wealth of other minerals, and her Indian questions, there will necessarily be much litigation. Oklahoma is divided into two Federal court districts, with the old Indian Territory comprising the eastern district, and old Oklahoma Territory the western district.

Three tribal attorneys are employed by the Government, one each for the Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Creeks, and eight probate attorneys in addition. It is the duty of these attorneys to look after the affairs of certain members of the tribes in the State and Federal courts. The committee can see the cause of so much litigation, and the necessity of having the circuit court hold sessions at some more convenient place.

*Resolution of the Oklahoma State Bar Association.*

"Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States H. R. 2857, a bill to establish a term of the United States circuit court of appeals at Oklahoma City, Okla.; and

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma furnishes more cases in the eighth circuit than any other State, and it is a great expense to Oklahoma litigants to be compelled to follow their cases to either St. Louis or St. Paul: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Oklahoma State Bar Association, assembled in Oklahoma City, That the Congress of the United States is hereby most respectfully memorialized to pass said law and make it possible for a term of the United States circuit court of appeals to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla.

"Adopted by the Oklahoma State Bar Association December 28, 1923.

"MONT F. HIGHLEY, Secretary."

Mr. Chairman, permit me here to say a few words concerning Oklahoma City, the place where the sessions of the circuit court is proposed to be held under this bill. I will not burden the record with an extended statement, for it would take too long to tell it all.

I saw this "wonder city" before the opening of the Territory to settlement, April 22, 1889, and have witnessed proudly its magic growth from a bald and barren prairie to its present greatness and grandeur. In less than 35 years it has grown to a beautiful city of 134,000 intelligent, law-abiding, liberty-loving, Christian citizens. In 1890 the population was 4,151.

The schools of Oklahoma City have attracted the attention of the Nation. The school-bond appropriations for the school year 1923-24 amounted to \$1,900,000, and the regular budget for this school year amounts to the sum of \$1,796,412. Forty-two school buildings have been used during the year, and in addition there are in course of construction and soon ready for occupancy two new junior high schools costing \$450,000 each, two ward schools costing \$35,000 each. One junior high school will be constructed into a central high school at a cost of \$200,000, with additions to two other junior high schools costing \$100,000 each. Additions to ward schools will cost an additional \$347,280. The enrollment in all the schools of the city amounted to 26,202 during the year 1922-23, and will exceed 30,000 the present school year. This is ample proof that Oklahoma City is

a school town. Building permits for 1923 amounted to \$8,000,000. More than 320,000 head of cattle were received at the stockyards last year.

The value of her industrial products is estimated at \$150,000,000 in 1923 and the number of industrial concerns in the city at about 385, which is an increase of 25 over the previous year. The city enjoys approximately 40 per cent of the entire manufacturing output of the State. The value of Oklahoma City's manufactured products for 1923 approximated the enormous sum of \$425,000,000. The annual pay roll of these industries amounts to more than \$12,000,000 to 6,750 employees. The packing industries of Oklahoma City do a business of \$70,000,000 annually. The automobile assembling plants in the city in 1923 did a business of about \$30,000,000, with about 700 employees.

Some of the leading industries and volume of business are as follows:

Packing plants.....	\$12,000,000
Flour and grist mills.....	12,500,000
Bakeries.....	3,500,000
Printing, publishing, etc.....	4,675,000
Lumber and planing mills.....	1,300,000
Confectionery and ice cream.....	1,250,000
Foundry and machine shops.....	1,110,000

More than 1,200 new homes were built in Oklahoma City last year, and she has 2,300 acres of public park land, with more than \$150,000 being spent annually in developing these parks. She is headquarters for more than 130 leading oil companies. Three million two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars were spent last year on municipal improvements. She has five trunk lines of steam railways, 70 miles of interurban lines, 75 miles of street railway, 279 miles of cement sidewalks, and more than 280 miles of paved streets. She has a great Masonic temple in course of construction, costing \$1,250,000, a \$450,000 Federal reserve bank building, 1 State and 8 national banks, 5 daily papers, 50 other publications, tourists' park conveniently located, finest hotels in the Southwest, a great public library with four branches, and State fairgrounds worth more than \$625,000.

The great University of Oklahoma, with more than 5,000 students annually, is 18 miles south, at Norman, and the Central State Teachers' College at Edmond, 15 miles to the north, with more than 2,700 students. The Oklahoma City College of the Methodist Church is located here, with an enrollment of 1,463, and there are other numerous private schools and business colleges. She has 102 churches of all denominations, representing an investment of more than \$3,500,000, whose ministers are men with national and international reputations. The Y. M. C. A. has a membership of 2,300 and a building worth more than \$300,000. The Y. W. C. A. owns its building, worth more than \$175,000, and has a membership of more than 1,000, with annual receipts of more than \$224,000.

*Other Oklahoma City figures for 1923.*

Bank deposits, Dec. 31.....	\$56,725,799.47
Bank clearings.....	1,165,341,665.77
Property value.....	117,000,000.00
Postal receipts.....	1,234,347.26

The two packing plants have property in the city worth more than \$3,000,000, and to secure these two industries Oklahoma City raised \$300,000 in less than one hour. The Oklahoma Livestock Exchange consists of 15 commission firms employing about 200 people, handling annually an average of \$40,000,000, with an annual pay roll of \$415,137.

These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the leading features of the city where sessions of this court are proposed to be held. It is centrally located for all the south, southeast, and southwest portions of the eighth circuit, and is easily accessible from all points.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I believe that it has been made clear that it would be a great convenience to a large number of people to have this court established, and that it will be no additional cost to the Government. I sincerely trust that this committee will report the bill favorably, and that Congress will enact it into law.

As stated before, there is but one State in the eighth circuit that has more cases before the circuit court of appeals than Oklahoma. Minnesota has 3,743 cases pending, or did have June 30, 1923, and Oklahoma has 3,652 cases pending.

Mr. YATES. In the circuit court of appeals?

Mr. SWANK. Yes, sir; on the 30th of last June. These litigants or their lawyers have to go all the distance to St. Louis or St. Paul to follow their cases on appeal. This is a great and unnecessary expense when you consider the business before this court from Oklahoma.

Mr. MAJOR. The witnesses and clients are not supposed to go to the court of appeals.

Mr. SWANK. No; but the lawyers have to go and this is expensive to the litigants.

Mr. MAJOR. The clients have to pay lawyers for additional expense?

Mr. SWANK. Yes, and that is quite an expense, too.

Mr. HERSEY. What do you have to say to the position one of the judges takes on this bill, that the court of appeals, if changed to the

place mentioned in your bill, would not have an adequate library there for the judges of the court of appeals?

Mr. SWANK. The library in the Federal building at Oklahoma City seems to be sufficient for the district judge who holds court there. In addition to that library, there is a complete law library at the State capitol, near the Federal building, and many private law libraries in the city as well. I am sure that any law report can be found in Oklahoma City.

Mr. HERSEY. How is your practice in Oklahoma among lawyers? Do they charge clients up with fees for the length of the travel, or simply the expense of travel?

Mr. SWANK. The distance would not make any difference in the fees, but would make a difference in the expense.

I will state that Mr. DYER has a bill, which has been reported favorably by the committee, for the appointment of two new judges in the eighth circuit. Is that correct?

Mr. DYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SWANK. That bill has not been enacted, but it is on the calendar and is a good reason for a favorable report on this bill.

Mr. HERSEY. Another term of the court of appeals where there are two judges appointed?

Mr. SWANK. I do not say that this bill should be enacted just for the reason that the bill for two more judges has been reported favorably, but that report would be some indication of the volume of business.

Mr. HERSEY. They would sit with the other judges of the court of appeals.

Mr. SWANK. There is a statement about these judges traveling around so much. They can better afford to travel some than can the litigants be required to pay large extra expenses in traveling to the judges. It will not require much additional expense, if any, if this bill is enacted, but will be a great saving to lawyers and litigants.

Mr. HERSEY. That is, perhaps, an indication that the business is important enough to warrant your term of court in Oklahoma. I move that the letters be made a part of the record.

Mr. YATES. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SWANK. I thank you for the hearing.

#### HARDING MEMORIAL ADDRESS OF MR. HUGHES.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania presents a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be compiled, printed with illustrations, and bound, as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, 25,000 copies of the oration delivered by the Hon. Charles Evans Hughes in the House of Representatives during the exercises held in memory of the late President Warren G. Harding on February 27, 1924, including all the proceedings and the program of exercises, of which 8,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 17,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

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

#### APPROPRIATIONS—NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6820) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and myself, without agreement as to time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the time of general debate be divided equally between himself and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6820.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6820, with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 6820, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, before attempting to undertake an analysis of the naval bill I wish to acknowledge for my own satisfaction the obligation that I owe to those gentlemen who have been detailed to cooperate with me in the hearings and in reporting the bill you have before you for consideration, all of them men of the greatest capacity, men who are indefatigable and industrious and who have a thorough comprehension of the problems of the Navy.

I am under deepest obligation to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee, a man whose ability is known to all in this body and to our country—faithful, studious, and whose mind is as keen as a Damascus sword; [applause] to my colleague from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], who, prior to his detail to the Committee on Appropriations, had seen several years of service upon the naval legislative committee, profound in his knowledge of the Navy, earnest student and scholar, and one who has contributed, in a manner which can not be measured, to the bill before you; to the new members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HARDY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], men of outstanding ability and men who have thrown that interest and enthusiasm into the work of shaping this bill which men ought to give to a great subject when they are charged with the responsibility of its consideration by this body.

Then there is another name I ought to mention to this House, not only on my own behalf but on behalf of the subcommittee. There are those in the employ of the House, and have been for years, whose names are not well known throughout the country and yet who, by reason of their great service to committees and to the Congress, contribute annually in the saving of millions of dollars and contribute to the orderly procedure of government.

Such a person was Mr. Courts, who for years was clerk to the Committee on Appropriations; such a person was Daniel Roper, who for years was clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means; such a person is Marc Shield, the clerk to the Committee on Appropriations to-day [applause]; such a person is Mrs. Donnelly, for years associated with our late colleague, Representative Mann, of Illinois, in the distinguished service which that Member rendered to this Congress and the country. I want to mention in connection with those names the name of John Pugh [applause], who has been assigned to the naval subcommittee, an efficient clerk who, like a bank account, works while you work and while you sleep. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask first to have the opportunity of proceeding with the bill without interruption, thinking that I can make a general statement that will probably cover most of the points in which gentlemen would be interested in a general way, with the thought that we shall be liberal in debate and with the thought that when we shall reach the bill under the five-minute rule we shall take the time necessary adequately to consider the different subjects contained in the measure.

The task that was assigned to your committee was the task of providing a naval bill which would carry an appropriation that would be adequate and at the same time safeguard the Treasury of the United States. The bill which we have brought before you to-day carries a direct appropriation of \$271,942,867, plus an indirect appropriation of \$22,500,000, or a grand total of \$294,442,867. The Budget estimates were \$298,895,794. Last year the Congress made a direct appropriation of \$294,967,200 and an indirect appropriation of \$35,450,000, or a grand total of \$330,417,200. Thus the bill we are asking you to consider is less by more than \$35,000,000 than the appropriation for the current year and it is less by more than \$4,450,000 the amount recommended by the Budget, though some of the items that are excluded were excluded because the Committee on Appropriations did not have authority to give them consideration.

At this time I am going to invite the attention of Members of the House to a brief consideration or survey of the appropriations made and moneys expended for the Navy during the years passed, including the fiscal year 1916.

I have prepared a table which indicates the matter graphically and which I shall insert in the Record at this point:



## Statement of appropriations, expenditures, etc., fiscal years 1916 to 1924, inclusive.

Year.	Unexpended balances at beginning of the year.	Appropriated.	Amount of re-appropriations.	Total available (exclusive of re-appropriations).	Expended.	Unused—turned back into Treasury.	Balances carried forward to next year.
1916.....	\$52,639,283.16	\$157,184,567.46	\$2,219,581.57	\$209,843,850.62	\$152,036,765.98	\$4,446,581.91	\$51,140,921.16
1917.....	51,140,921.16	1,350,502,037.07	132,871.71	1,401,643,018.23	228,787,671.03	3,184,534.53	1,169,537,949.91
1918.....	1,169,537,949.91	751,367,203.62	341,239,620.50	1,920,905,144.53	1,130,994,912.30	6,260,001.80	442,380,603.84
1919.....	442,380,603.84	2,322,654,865.13	185,401,233.03	2,765,035,474.97	1,953,581,791.38	328,009,005.63	297,983,444.93
1920.....	297,983,444.93	676,063,785.47	24,052,391.78	974,047,230.40	768,917,338.50	.....	181,077,509.12
1921.....	181,077,509.12	815,788,286.84	2,500,703.29	996,865,786.96	703,748,582.93	4,577,348.94	286,039,145.80
1922.....	286,039,145.80	450,674,821.82	53,550,122.79	739,713,967.62	484,462,645.74	17,738,538.12	180,962,660.97
1923.....	180,962,660.97	477,587,963.33	.....	658,550,624.30	492,294,205.67	120,282,476.69	145,973,940.94
1924.....	145,973,940.94	294,072,000.00	.....	440,045,940.94	1248,492,221.92	.....	191,553,719.02
1925.....	191,553,719.02	1,272,000,000.00	.....	363,553,719.02	.....	.....	.....
Total.....	.....	7,567,895,590.74	609,066,530.76	.....	26,263,316,136.50	384,588,487.62	.....

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.<sup>2</sup> Does not include 1925 expenditures.

No institution as large as is the Navy, having to do the work that the Navy has to do, can close its business upon the 30th of June every year with all accounts paid, all materials used up, and start upon the beginning of the new fiscal year to purchase everything that will be needed for the coming year. There are ships being constructed, munitions being manufactured, buildings, yards, and wharves and other establishments being constructed, involving such large amounts of expenditure that there must be materials and supplies on hand so that the work can be carried forward economically and efficiently at all times.

You then will be interested in knowing that for the fiscal year 1916 there was appropriated, outright, approximately \$157,184,000. In addition to this, approximately \$52,639,000 was carried forward from prior appropriations. The total, then, of approximately \$210,000,000 was available for the fiscal year 1916. During this year the Navy expended \$152,000,000, having a balance of money aggregating approximately \$58,000,000, which was carried over to 1917.

This was the year in which the war was declared. That year we appropriated \$1,350,000,000, but you will recall that war was not declared until April, so the Navy functioned less than 90 days in a war status before the beginning of the new fiscal year. Accordingly, in 1918 the direct appropriations were scarcely more than one-half what they were in 1917, although the money on hand coming forward from the previous year represented a vast amount; and the total amount of money for 1918 necessarily was larger than the total for 1917.

The fiscal year 1919 witnessed the high mark of appropriations. That year \$2,322,000,000 was provided in direct appropriations, and \$442,000,000 was brought forward from the preceding year.

The armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, and in spite of the fact that half of the fiscal year had not run, the responsibilities connected with the Navy were such that expenditures above normal could not instantly and appreciably come to an end. Immediately all work was stopped wherever it could be stopped advantageously, but we had 2,000,000 boys in Europe who had to be brought home.

We had supplies that had to be carried to those boys while they were there. We had a great construction program of yards, docks, and bases at different places that had to be carried on in order to prevent losses. We had ships of all kinds under construction, some under contract and some under construction in the naval establishments of the United States, and while work was stopped wherever it could be economically, nevertheless the great expenditures that had to be assumed by reason of the war carried on almost to the end of the fiscal year, with the result that for that year we used the stupendous amount of \$1,953,000,000, representing the greatest amount that ever was expended in any year by the United States Navy.

With the end of the war, however, certain large expenditures could be eliminated. We turned back into the Treasury about \$328,000,000.

In 1920 the war was over, but we had the burden of expending moneys upon ships and establishments that were in progress of building and that either had to be scrapped or the work carried forward. We did not know that an arrangement could be made such as was made in the Limitation of Armament Conference. Therefore we continued our work upon the battleships, upon the cruisers, upon much of the craft that we had upon the ways, and upon certain construction work at naval stations. The same thing applies to 1921, but that year you will notice we had to appropriate a larger amount of money, because the unexpended balance had to some extent diminished.

For 1922 and for 1923 you will notice substantial decreases when you compare the years with 1920 and 1921. The year

1923 was the fiscal year immediately following the Limitation of Armament Conference, and the effects of economics determined upon there were beginning to bear fruit.

Let me say that one of the first things, or the first thing, that is done with a ship when it is brought out of a navy yard is to send it on what is called its "shakedown" trip. It is for the purpose of testing the engines, for the purpose of testing machinery, for the purpose of seeing how the ship will perform, whether it will function as was designed. After the end of the war the Navy of the United States may be said to have been sent out on its "shakedown" trip.

A good many factors entered into the question of shaping a policy that would be regarded as a permanent policy of our country looking to some years ahead. One of these matters was the relationship of the United States to the world powers of to-day, which embraces the question of the man power of the different nations of the world, industrial possibilities, latent resources, and whether or not war is imminent. All such things as these were taken into consideration. Another matter had to deal with what we had assumed under the limitation of armament treaty and what other nations had assumed.

Again, there were elements that I shall refer to a little later on that entered into the equation. At any rate, let me sum it up by saying that as a result of the treaty that followed the Limitation of Armament Conference we were able, while we scrapped approximately \$330,000,000 of ships, to call a halt on new structural work and to save outright approximately \$200,000,000 or \$225,000,000. Not only that, but the cessation of work along certain lines that had been begun and was planned to be continued saved our country the expenditure of approximately \$200,000,000 or \$250,000,000 annually for a number of years to come for the maintenance and upkeep of the Navy. What I have just said does not have relation to the fortification program that had been suggested and that appealed to the people of our country. What I have said has relation to the Navy itself. It does not refer to Guam, where it was estimated it would cost \$85,000,000 to produce fortifications that would be adequate. It does not refer to building up one stronghold in the Philippine Islands, where it would cost probably another \$85,000,000 or \$100,000,000. It refers to the Naval Establishment alone and its upkeep had there been no Limitation of Armament Conference.

Accordingly then, we find that in 1923 we were able to reduce the amount of the appropriations to \$447,000,000, plus \$180,962,660, carried over, in 1924 to \$294,000,000 direct appropriations with \$140,000,000 indirect or coming over from preceding years. For 1925 the estimates of the Budget were \$272,000,000, and I have already indicated that we have been able to go below that figure, and at the beginning of the fiscal year 1925 in addition we shall have probably an unexpended balance coming forward of around \$81,000,000. The unexpended balances referred to are in the nature of a working capital and may be nearly as large at the end of the year as at its beginning.

Probably I should say at this point that I expect the Naval appropriation bill for the next year to carry a larger direct appropriation than the present bill carries. Likewise, I think the same thing will be true for the years 1927 and 1928, and probably for years to come, and why? I said awhile ago that any establishment as large as the Navy must have immense stores of materials on hand, and during the World War we purchased excessive amounts of stores—not excessive from the standpoint of the needs at that time, but excessive for an establishment of the size to which the Navy was reduced, following the armistice.

We could sell some of the material and we did where it could be done with profit to the Navy, but it would have been

a foolish thing to have sold materials one year when we would have had to go into the market the next year and purchase similar materials and at higher prices. The result was that while we did sell materials that could not be used at an early date or that was obsolete, on the other hand we carried millions of dollars of materials forward and have continued to carry them forward, disposing of them, however, wherever it may appear advantageous to do so. In this bill we are making available, out of the proceeds from the sale of some of those materials, to supplement the direct appropriation, \$22,500,000. We have reached the point now, however, where the materials that were purchased during the war have been largely used up. You can not draw upon them to any great extent next year or the year following. You will need to make direct appropriations, and the result is going to be that your Navy bill will probably carry a larger amount during each of the next several years, assuming that the factors touching labor, personnel, and cost of materials continue approximately the same as they are to-day.

Considering what the program will be for another few years, you want to have in mind that we have several new ships coming in, that we will have several cruisers, and also have in mind that there are several types of ships, the construction of which is being considered by the legislative committee, and, of course, those ships, if they should be laid down, will entail greater appropriations from the Congress.

For the coming fiscal year I wish to call attention to three factors that your committee could not control. First of all, there are the appropriations necessary by reason of the reclassification law, applicable to some 2,000 employees in the District. First you must consider their basic salaries, to which must be added the bonus, and you must still add another 4 per cent by reason of the classification act in order to account for the appropriation for the civil establishment within the District of Columbia during the next fiscal year. This item of increase is approximately \$167,000. Go to the navy yards and consider the wages that are paid there. We have, under a general law, provision for a wage board. To fix the wages in the different naval establishments upon what basis? The basis paid for similar lines of work in private industry.

In other words, the Government does not attempt to establish higher wages than are paid outside nor does it feel that it is right for the Government to beat down the wages paid employees in comparison with wages that are paid in establishments that are not under Government control. The wages to-day are as high approximately in the Naval Establishment of the United States as they were during the highest wage period during the World War. Whether they will be lower within the next 10 years is a problem that I can not speculate upon at this time.

Another thing that we could not control, which had an effect upon the shaping of the bill, is the compensation to officers and men. The pay and allowances for officers aggregate approximately 35 per cent more than prior to the passage of the pay bill a couple of years ago. The pay bill also carried an authorization for pay and allowances for enlisted men aggregating 50 per cent above the old pay rate of the Navy. These things, then, are the factors that enter into shaping the policy of the Navy and the appropriation bill, not alone for this year but probably for several years to come, two of the elements tending to drive the amount down and other of the elements tending to keep the amount of the bill rather large.

In preparing our bill we had to consider the effect of the Limitation of Armaments Conference upon the program. What are other nations doing? The treaty, as you will recall, fixed the number of capital ships. It fixed to some extent the size of guns and the number and tonnage of the other ships needed to round out the Navy. It has been agreed to by all the powers signatory to the arrangement, the last nation signing the treaty on the 28th of August last year. We checked up on the question of the fidelity with which the nations entering into the treaty are carrying forward the obligations that they as well as ourselves have assumed. We found those obligations are being respected absolutely. The ships that it had been agreed should be put out of commission have been put out of commission. Ships that had been understood should be scrapped are being scrapped, and the nations are exchanging memoranda showing the progress of the work going on along that line among the nations. Respecting the number of ships, the size of the guns, and other factors, there is every reason to assume that perfect fidelity is being paid to the obligations assumed.

Another matter we considered had reference to the building programs of other nations along lines that were not limited by the treaty. There is something of a building program going on,

especially in Japan and France, in the way of cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. In France this is largely new work. In Japan it is largely a modification of still larger programs voted before the limitation conference. The United States has something like 30 ships under construction, ships which were authorized and begun before the treaty. There may be absolute assurance and confidence on the part of our country that all of the nations that are parties to the treaty are respecting their treaty obligations, and we may look forward with confidence to the great results which were expected to flow from the consummation of that epochal compact.

#### PERSONNEL.

Having then agreed upon these factors, we considered shaping the bill itself. Two years ago when we brought a bill before you you will recall it was the first bill that had been prepared following the Conference on Limitation of Armament. At that time we took the number of battleships as 18, as fixed by the treaty. We then consulted with the Navy Department as to the other ships that would be adequate or necessary to round out the fleet. We checked up fairly well on what other nations signatory to the treaty or parties to the conference proposed to do. We brought in a bill providing for 18 battleships, 103 destroyers, 84 submarines, cruisers, and auxiliary ships, and we brought in a bill providing for 67,000 enlisted men. The House, after the fullest consideration on that subject, modified the figures touching the enlisted personnel. No debate, I think, in recent years has been more illuminating or held closer to the point at issue than the debate at that time.

Prior to the limitation conference the Navy Department had recommended a personnel of approximately 120,000. Following the conference it was recommended that the number be 106,000, as I recall, and then 100,000 and 96,000. Finally a compromise proposition was agreed upon, placing the figure at 86,000, which was adopted by the Congress and which seemed to meet with the approval very generally of the country. That figure was adhered to a year later. We have not attempted to change that figure. We accepted it as part of our naval policy. Let me say it was demonstrated for two years that the Navy has been able to function admirably on the basis of that number of enlisted men. We have every reason to believe that it can continue to function. Given a reasonable number of enlisted men, the difference between that number and a larger number of enlisted personnel is not so much a matter of efficiency in keeping up the ships of the Navy or the Naval Establishment but is a matter of keeping men trained and standing by to help in the event of a national crisis. You could increase the number to 96,000 or 100,000, and you then would provide for 10,000 men or 14,000 men who we would all agree could be trained and would be considered highly efficient but who would not be needed for the proper functioning of the Navy.

Having then agreed upon the number of men to make up the enlisted personnel we have part of the problem solved—for the amount necessary for provisions, for supplies, for training stations, and a great many other items immediately take shape.

This leads me to the officer personnel. We have an authorized enlisted personnel of approximately 137,400. The law provides that the officer personnel may be 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted personnel. Personally I do not see the value of the percentage of the officer personnel being based upon the enlisted personnel, and I will tell you why. In the first place, you take a great ship like a battleship. You need a large number of enlisted personnel to handle the ship. You do not need a relatively large number of officers. There is an establishment where your officer personnel can be low, but your enlisted personnel must be high. You go to the other extreme and take a submarine, an institution that is largely one of machinery, that requires men who are absolutely trained, who are technical and can handle almost every part of the work, and there you find an institution that requires a relatively large officer personnel and comparatively a smaller enlisted personnel to handle that piece of machinery, because a submarine is just one mass of machinery.

Then you can take the other ships all the way in between, your destroyers, your cruisers, your auxiliary ships, and you will find that in each class you will have a different ratio of officers to the enlisted personnel. The thought was in the mind of the committee that the peace-time officer personnel should be larger in proportion than the peace-time enlisted personnel. Why? Because you can train enlisted personnel in a comparatively short time. These men are being trained in large numbers to-day. Where? In the industrial plants of the country, in the garages in every community, in electrical establishments, in manufacturing plants. Men are being trained in such a way as to become men of the highest efficiency as



soon as they may receive a comparatively short training in the technique of the naval machinery itself. But as to the officers, that is not the case. The officer must be trained for years. Great responsibility rests upon him.

Therefore we have felt that in reporting this bill we ought to report something of a larger personnel than 4 per cent of officers on the basis of 86,000 men, and we have done so to the extent of an extra number of officers, or approximately 960, as I recall. But having fixed the number of officers, other features of the bill were matters of mathematical calculation. The number of midshipmen at the academy, the amount of money to be appropriated for traveling expenses, pay, allowances, matters that have immediate relation to the number of officers that you have in the Navy.

#### NAVAL RESERVE.

We now come to the Naval Reserve, and on this subject there seems to be some confusion. I believe I can clear up the matter with a brief statement.

The Naval Reserve is made up of officers and men drawn from two sources, first, the Fleet Naval Reserve, and second, civilian life.

The Fleet Naval Reserve is made up of four groups. The first two groups are officers (Class 1A) and men (Class 1B) who have served, in the case of officers, for any period, and in the case of men more than 4 years and less than 16 years in the United States Navy, and who to draw pay must train and drill with the Naval Reserve. The third group (Class 1C) and fourth group (Class 1D) are men who have had 16 years' and 20 years' service, respectively, in the Navy. These two groups do not need to train or drill to receive retainer pay. However, when called into active service they receive additional pay for such service. All four groups are paid out of "Pay Navy." For 1925 our bill carries for these four groups \$5,309,180, and the officers and men in these groups, as of November 1, 1923, were as follows:

Class 1A, 319 officers; class 1B, 1,403 men; class 1C, 3,204 men; and in class 1D, 2,444 men.

The second source from which the Naval Reserve is fed is civilian life, and here we draw officers and men who have had limited service in the Navy, or in the merchant marine, or in the Coast Guard, or, maybe, no service whatever, and, based upon their experience, they are placed in the several classes—2, 3, 4, and 5.

As classes 1A and 1B in the Fleet Naval Reserve must train and drill in order to be paid from "Pay Navy," so here, classes 2, 3, 4, and 5 must train and drill in order to be paid from Naval Reserve funds. We call this "retainer pay," and it is based upon not less than 36 drills and two weeks' active duty for each year of active enrollment.

We then have class 6 made up of volunteers from all the foregoing classes and who simply "stand by," as it were. Members of class 6 do not drill and do not receive retainer pay. They may, however, participate in the two-weeks' annual cruise, and if they do they are paid for this service.

In these several classes, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, were 2,778 officers and 12,157 men on November 1, 1923. Of this number on that date, 826 officers and 3,715 men had qualified to receive retainer pay from the amount provided under the appropriation for the Naval Reserve. In addition to retainer pay, this item carries money for rentals, travel for officers and men, and active service pay for those who have a part in cruises.

For the current year we appropriated \$3,595,000. For the year 1925 the department, through the Bureau of the Budget, has asked for \$4,000,000. The committee felt, however, that since the number of officers and of men is so far below what the current law would care for, we should not increase the appropriation for 1925. The current law was based on estimates for retainer pay for 1,840 officers and 5,400 men. But I have pointed out that only 826 officers and 3,715 men have qualified.

So by giving current law there may be an expansion of nearly 100 per cent in officers and nearly 50 per cent in men between now and the end of the next fiscal year.

#### FUEL AND TRANSPORTATION.

For "Fuel and transportation," which defrays the cost of all fuel consumed by vessels, the committee is proposing \$14,500,000, the amount recommended by the President in the Budget. The department was allowed \$16,000,000 under this appropriation head for each of the fiscal years 1923 and 1924. Of the 1923 appropriation, however, only \$13,279,476.57 was expended, notwithstanding the fact that the joint fleet maneuvers conducted in the latter part of that fiscal year have been described by the Secretary of the Navy as "the most extensive maneuvers our Navy had ever conducted." During

the current fiscal year, in fact, at this time, joint fleet maneuvers are being conducted on an even greater scale and yet the expectation is that the expenditures will not run for the year in excess of \$14,400,000. Of course, it should be stated that the estimated expenditure of \$1,600,000 below the appropriation this present fiscal year is because of more favorable fuel prices than were figured upon in the preparation of the 1924 estimate.

If it should become necessary to pay higher prices for next year's fuel requirements than during the present fiscal year the appropriation proposed allows but a leeway of \$100,000 for a comparable amount of steaming; but the committee submits that the amount proposed is a generous allowance in these times of financial stringency and that if there should be an advance in fuel costs it should be absorbed in reduced mileage generally or in fleet exercises of less magnitude than projected, attention again being directed to the Secretary's description of the 1923 maneuvers when expenditures for the fiscal year ran about \$13,280,000 and fuel oil was costing \$1.53 per barrel as against \$1.39 at present.

There will be found on page 30 of the bill two new provisos which the committee is proposing in connection with this appropriation. Their purpose is self-evident.

#### PUBLIC WORKS.

The Budget estimates call for a total appropriation of \$4,000,000 for betterments at navy yards and naval stations, and the committee is proposing a total of \$1,916,500. Many of the items embraced by the Budget total represent objects for which the committee has no authority to provide under the rules unless previously authorized by law, which explains by far the greater portion of the reduction which the committee is proposing.

The major portion of the sum proposed is distributed by yards and stations, as follows:

Boston Navy Yard	\$175,000
Mare Island Navy Yard	728,000
Puget Sound Navy Yard	100,000
Pearl Harbor Naval Station	178,000
Cavite Naval Station	141,000
Great Lakes Naval Training Station	115,000

#### AVIATION.

The committee is proposing for naval aviation an appropriation of \$14,590,000, which is \$410,000 less than recommended in the Budget estimates and \$57,174 less than appropriated for the current fiscal year. The reduction proposed in the Budget figure is wholly on account of a development program recommended to be undertaken at the air stations at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and Coco Solo, Canal Zone. This work is not authorized by law, which explains the committee's action in excluding appropriations therefor from this bill.

#### MARINE CORPS.

The appropriations proposed on account of the Marine Corps are on a basis of 1,002 officers and 19,500 men. The authorized officer strength of the Marine Corps is 1,096. There were in the corps on November 30, 1923, 983. The enlisted force for which provision is proposed corresponds with the number provided for the fiscal years 1923 and 1924. The distribution of the force is shown in the tables commencing on page 710 of the hearings.

In connection with the appropriations administered by the Quartermaster's Department it will be noticed that they have been entirely rephrased. They are better expressed and much more concise. The new language was drafted, at the request of the committee, in the General Accounting Office, and that office has assured the committee that there is nothing in the modified paragraphs which either gives or takes away any appropriation authority carried for this branch of the service in the current appropriation act.

#### INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

For completing vessels under construction the committee is proposing a direct appropriation of \$7,500,000 and an indirect appropriation of \$22,500,000, or a total of \$30,000,000. The indirect appropriation is explained elsewhere in this report.

On November 30, 1923, the following vessels, the construction of which is permissible under the treaty growing out of the Conference on the Limitation of Naval Armament, were in various stages of completion:

Battleship	1
Airplane carriers (originally designed as battle cruisers)	2
Scout cruisers	6
Submarines	13
Fleet submarines	3
Gunboat	1
Destroyer tenders	2
Submarine tender	1
Repair ship	1
Total	30

All of these vessels, the committee has been informed, will have been completed during the fiscal year 1925, except the two airplane carriers, three of the scout cruisers, and the three fleet submarines. It is estimated by the department that a further appropriation of \$6,526,500, to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1926, will finally and fully complete the 30 vessels now building, including aircraft and their accessories for the airplane carriers.

The committee was not called upon to consider the question of providing appropriations for commencing the construction of ships not heretofore authorized. The committee did, however, elicit the information that the department is committed to a program of ship construction of types permissible under the limitation of armament treaty, which, in conjunction with a program for modernizing certain of the vessels we now have, would impose upon the Treasury an added expense of approximately \$35,000,000 annually for the next 10 years.

A year ago the committee proposed, and it finally became law, a request by Congress that the President take appropriate steps looking to the consummation of a supplemental treaty to limit the construction by the leading naval powers of ships of the types to which the existing treaty did not extend or only controlled as to tonnage and gun power. Up to this time no formal conference has been held looking to such a supplemental treaty, though no light appraisalment can be made of the influence of the expression of the Congress of the desire of our country. So far as the committee has been able to ascertain, neither Great Britain nor Japan has voted the construction of any treaty exempted or permitted craft since the conference was concluded. America certainly should not be the first and should exert its influence to prevent the necessity arising to commence at all.

#### FLEET SUBMARINES.

There are several other items, however, to which you should have your attention called at this time, because we have made rather vital changes as we have reported the bill to you over the estimates and plans that were recommended by the Budget Bureau. The first one of these changes has to do with the submarine program. You will recall that in 1914 we provided that one fleet submarine should be built. In 1915 we provided for two fleet submarines. In 1916, in connection with the program for the Navy that was laid down, we provided for 9 more, making a total of 12 fleet submarines that have up to the present been authorized. Of this number 3 have been completed, and 3 are in process of construction. The Navy Department through the Budget Bureau recommended that 3 more fleet submarines be laid down during the next fiscal year, which would cost a total of \$18,450,000, and that \$2,850,000 be made immediately available in this bill for the beginning of the program.

Now, let us see what the situation is. In 1920, in January, one of the fleet submarines authorized in 1914 was completed. In December of the same year another was completed, authorized in 1915, and in January, 1922, the third one was completed that was authorized in 1915. Where are those three fleet submarines at this time? They are tied up at Hampton Roads, out of commission. Why? Because their engines will not function properly. Let me read a statement that was made by the Chief of the Office of Naval Operations in his last annual report, which was a confidential document, when the committee began its hearings on the pending bill 90 days ago.

It is now a public document, and this is what was said:

The performance of the three fleet submarines, T-1, T-2, and T-3, was of such an inferior character as to make it inadvisable to retain them in commission longer. These vessels were also sent to Hampton Roads and decommissioned.

And in another part of the report in referring to these three ships we are told that the engines do not function:

The tandem-type engines of these vessels have proven costly failures, and these three submarines are useless unless they can be reengineered. It is understood that provision for the installation of two German 3,000-horsepower engines on one T boat has been requested in the next Budget. The engines have shown up well on the test stand, but information as to their behavior in a submarine is urgently needed, or else it may be necessary to install them as an unknown quantity afloat in later submarine cruisers designed. The failure of the S-48 to S-51 engines points a warning against accepting test-stand results on Diesel engines as conclusive.

A statement which was a confidential statement at the time our committee began its hearings is necessarily important as bearing upon the immediate problem.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. I would like to inquire as to who is responsible for securing engines so unfit for this service?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me say this: Since we have been building submarines we have attained very high success in the construction and design of engines suitable for the ordinary type of submarine, most of which we have to-day being of that type. There is no nation in the world that to-day has a satisfactory engine for a fleet submarine, which requires the ship to be driven 25 or 30 knots an hour. Germany does not have one, nor France, nor Italy, nor Japan, and Great Britain has not one that we know of up to the present time.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, as I understand the gentleman, these are merely experimental engines which have been used and found not to be adequate for the work?

Mr. FRENCH. When they were designed it was supposed they would be adequate, but it has been found that they are not adequate and that the problem is still one that is not beyond the laboratory; that it is still in an experimental stage. I think if the gentleman will allow me to come to that, I will answer the question he has in mind.

Let me say, since the question has been asked, that the British Government has not succeeded, apparently, any better than our own engineers in the development of an adequate type of engine for a fleet submarine. Some years ago the K type of engine was developed by the British Admiralty as a type which it believed would be suitable for a fleet submarine or for a mine-laying submarine, but it was discarded.

Only one ship of the K type was finally carried to completion. This submarine is driven by a steam engine, a thought which surprises you, but by reason of certain devices that have been worked out during the last few years it is now believed by the British engineers that that old type can be worked over into a type which will be most efficient for fleet submarines. Within the last 30 days the ship that has been fitted with the latest devices in the modification of the earlier engine of the K type has been put to her tests in the North Sea. Those of you who have been following that subject have been reading that the tests appear to be satisfactory, but the British Government is not ready yet to say that the tests are final and that this fleet submarine is wholly adequate. Our own Bureau of Engineering has been working upon this problem and it is deserving of no criticism whatever, because here is a new subject and it is a new thought.

The engineers believe that they have to-day the choice of two types of engines that would be adequate for a fleet submarine, but they do not know. The three that have been completed within the last four or five years have failed to measure up to expectations. Now, then, what did we do to meet the situation?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. What was the total cost of the three submarines which are tied up?

Mr. FRENCH. The total cost was approximately \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000, although the problem of final readjustment has to be met. The three proposed submarines would cost \$18,450,000.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. What is the necessity of three experimental submarines? Why not try out one and if it fails find out what the defects are and then try out another? What is the need of three failures at one time?

Mr. FRENCH. The question which the gentleman has just asked is the question which addressed itself to the members of the committee. We met the problem in this way: We found we had certain hulls which we thought would be suitable for test purposes. We called the officers of the Engineering Bureau before us, and we asked with regard to the matter, and we were told very frankly that such was the case. We asked what it would cost to install in one of these hulls an engine which the Bureau of Engineering believes would be adequate for a fleet submarine, and we were told that could be done for \$600,000. If so, then, instead of authorizing one of the three fleet submarines recommended by the Budget Bureau, we have brought in a provision in our bill appropriating \$600,000 for the purpose of giving the Bureau of Engineering authority and the means to test out, not in the laboratory but to test out in a fleet submarine an engine which it believes would be adequate.

Mr. MADDEN. It is to be tested out in one of those already constructed, is it not?

Mr. FRENCH. We did not tie down the department, because contracts have not been adjusted.

Mr. MADDEN. But that was the intention of the committee?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, yes.

Mr. MADDEN. To use one of those that were found inadequate?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.



Mr. MADDEN. And the money was made immediately available?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; we have made the money immediately available.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Is it the gentleman's opinion, if this bill is passed as reported, that it provides for a Navy which will come up to the 5-5-3 treaty?

Mr. FRENCH. There is no question in the minds of the members of the committee that the Navy of the United States is adequate under the basis of the treaty ratio. We have our allotted number of ships, to start off with, of the capital type; we have an excess number in some other types, as to which the number is not limited; other nations have excesses in some other lines. We are not well rounded out in some types. We shall need as we go along, probably, to modify the number of ships of different types, and other nations will need to do the same. But there is no question in the minds of the members of the committee that our Navy is second to none in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. One further question, please. What has the Navy Department finally decided to do relative to the appropriation made to increase the range of our guns on battle-ships?

Mr. FRENCH. A year ago, after the naval subcommittee had concluded its hearings, the Navy Department recommended an appropriation of \$6,500,000 for that purpose, upon the assumption that the guns of the British ships could outshoot our guns on probably 13 of our ships by 4 or 5 miles. It was found after the bill had been passed and after the adjournment of Congress that the premises were not accurate.

The greatest disadvantage it was ascertained would possibly be to the extent of 2 or 3 miles. Under the circumstances, the Navy Department did not feel it should go ahead and expend money that had been appropriated on the basis of an entirely different assumption of facts, and so the money has been carried in the Treasury as an unexpended item until to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. We repealed that appropriation yesterday.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; we were told by the officers of the department it was not planned to expend the money until Congress should so authorize, and as the chairman of the committee [Mr. MADDEN] has said, the item was repealed yesterday; so the whole question will come up as a new proposition should it arise again.

Mr. LAZARO. Then this is the result of the judgment of the Navy Department and not on account of pressure brought from other nations, parties to the treaty.

Mr. FRENCH. You mean the action the House took yesterday?

Mr. LAZARO. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. I would not say that. I think the Navy Department feels that if our guns can be outshot 2 miles, that that is quite a serious consideration, if not as serious as though they could be outshot 6 miles; but the position of the department was that it did not want to expend the money it had asked for on one basis when, as a matter of fact, it was shown to their satisfaction that their advice was erroneous. Therefore the officers of the department told the members of your committee that they did not propose to expend the money unless the Congress should authorize it. The simple thing to do seemed to be to repeal the appropriation entirely, let the whole thing go to the legislative committee of this Congress for consideration, to determine whether or not the changes can be made under the treaty, and, if so, whether or not there are compensating advantages that our ships have that could be weighed against any disadvantages that it is alleged exist here. The whole thing becomes a new question to be considered by the Congress.

Mr. LAZARO. One more question, please. How do we compare when it comes to carriers for hydroplanes?

Mr. FRENCH. We have at this time completed the *Langley*, which can be said to be a very complete and a very adequate airplane-carrier ship. It is largely experimental, and it is, you might say, in the way of a model for the airplane carriers that we are permitted to have under the treaty. Under the treaty, the gentleman will recall, we can have airplane carriers with a total tonnage of 135,000 tons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I think, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude in a short while.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for an additional hour.

Mr. FRENCH. Under the treaty it is provided that two of the six battle cruisers that were under construction at the time the limitation conference was held could be converted into airplane carriers, and the work of converting these two vessels is progressing at this time. We have not wanted to progress too rapidly in that type of work, for the reason that this is a problem that is in its experimental stage.

The *Langley* is telling us constantly what should be done, what should not be done, and we are obtaining valuable lessons from the experience of the Navy in the matter of that great ship. Let me say that the ship *Langley*, in my judgment, is a triumphant success.

Mr. LAZARO. I will say to the gentleman I have been on the *Langley* and I agree with him about it, but you admit that we have only one real carrier.

Mr. FRENCH. That is the only one.

Mr. LAZARO. In the event of war, if it should be necessary to have part of the fleet on the Atlantic and the other part on the Pacific, what would become of one part of the fleet without a carrier?

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, what the gentleman suggests is true. We need to round out our fleet by way of completing the airplane carriers provided for under the treaty, and those things are doubtless met by the department and by this Congress upon the basis of the imminence of war.

Mr. LAZARO. Of course, the gentleman remembers that when the Panama Canal was built, the idea was that it was not necessary after that to keep all the fleet together.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. And to-day, with the progress that has been made in aviation, it is absolutely necessary to have at least two carriers.

Mr. FRENCH. I think the gentleman is correct; but, on the other hand, I think it has been a very desirable thing to hold back construction work upon the airplane carriers that are to be part of our Air Service until certain problems could be worked out upon the *Langley*.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman inform us how many airplane carriers Great Britain has of the same commodious type and with the same accommodations as the *Langley*?

Mr. FRENCH. Great Britain has two completed and two building, one of which is a small one. So we are not at so great a disadvantage, especially since the whole subject of aviation is in a rather experimental stage, although experiments are rushing fast upon each other and have done so during the last five or six years.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. May I ask the gentleman another question, if it is not an inappropriate place to ask it, assuming the gentleman is about to conclude his remarks? Is there any provision made in this bill for a fleet of river boats for the Yangtze River in China?

Mr. FRENCH. The committee did not have authority to consider those items. As I understand, the legislative committee has had the consideration of those items, and it will require legislation in order that the items may be taken care of. And let me say right here that your committee tried very hard to follow the rules of the House and not bring into this bill items that we did not have jurisdiction over.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. May I ask one further question? Was that matter brought to the attention of the committee by the Navy Department?

Mr. FRENCH. Not in the way of an estimate. The item has been referred to in the Secretary's report.

Mr. MADDEN. It did not come to us in the Budget, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FRENCH. No.

Mr. MADDEN. And it properly should not be in the Budget.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me say that if the item had been in the Budget it would have been the duty of the committee to have declined to consider it and to have referred it over to the legislative committee.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The reason I asked the question is that, having been in that vicinity during last summer, there was brought to my attention the great disadvantage we were subject to by reason of not having suitable vessels to maintain the necessary patrol of the Yangtze River for the protection of American interests.

Mr. FRENCH. There is no question as to the importance of the Yangtze patrol. Our trade alone over there aggregates in money approximately \$145,000,000 or \$150,000,000 a year.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I would state to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] who made the inquiry that there is pending before the legislative committee—the Naval Affairs Committee—a new building program which includes gunboats for the river to which he refers, the Yangtze.

Mr. BUTLER. Those estimates before the committee aggregate nearly \$98,000,000.

Mr. FRENCH. Not for the purpose of the gunboats on the Yangtze.

Mr. BUTLER. No; but for everything.

Mr. FRENCH. I think for the purpose the gentleman had in mind it is \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct on that.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am quite sure that will afford relief and satisfaction to a number of American citizens who have reasons to be in that part of the world.

#### ENGINEERING ECONOMIES.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, there are two other items I think I ought to refer to briefly, where we have made vital changes in the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget. One of them has to do with the Bureau of Engineering. Gentlemen will recall that the war resulted in the development of many engineering devices, means for saving fuel, and so on, and these suggestions have been assembled since the war, and we have now come to the point where the engineering department believes that many or most of our ships ought from an economical standpoint to be overhauled in part and to have certain types of machinery removed and other types put in place of them for several purposes: First, to safeguard human life; second, to gain efficiency; third, to obtain economies in such lines as fuel consumption, the storing and preservation of goods, provisions, and so forth.

The statement was made, not in the Budget, but it came up incidentally, that if an appropriation of \$3,000,000 were available for bringing our ships up to date along lines that would be recognized by the best business houses, there would be a saving, after the installation of the machinery, of \$3,000,000 every year. That interested the members of the committee. We immediately called for further information on the subject, and we had to draft the officers to tell it because they could not volunteer it. The result of extensive hearings, however, and the consideration of the problem was that we asked the officers to divide that \$3,000,000 budget into a list that would indicate one-third of the most important, another third of the second in importance, and the last third of the least importance. We went over the several items and we were so impressed with the importance of the first two-thirds from the standpoint of the protection of human life and the promotion of efficiency and economy that we included in this bill in excess of the Budget for engineering purposes \$1,960,000, giving the department the authority to carry on the work I have referred to, and gentlemen will find in the hearings all the items touching two-thirds of which it was believed the appropriation of necessary funds therefor would result in much saving and efficiency to the Navy.

#### MANUFACTURE OF TORPEDOES.

There is another change in the Budget recommendation to which I would refer and that has to do with torpedoes. The Budget Bureau recommended \$1,200,000 for the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes. The current law carries \$450,000. We have at this time the number of torpedoes recommended by the General Board for all the ships in active commission, including the reserve supply. In addition, we have 80 per cent of enough to care for all of the ships that are out of commission. Had we granted the appropriation of \$1,200,000 for this purpose, it would have been necessary to increase the number of employees in the establishment manufacturing torpedoes. We did not think in this time of peace, with the number of torpedoes we have on hand, that it was a wise thing to do. Changes are constantly being made in torpedoes. Torpedoes that at the beginning of the war would have exploded upon the first impact were changed in two or three years, until they would not explode until they had reached the second impact. Changes are constantly being made.

These are instruments that cost from eight to twelve thousand dollars each, depending upon the amount of usable material on hand. We thought we had an adequate supply, and that we would better keep the establishment running, keep our hand in, keep a trained force at work and maintain the art rather than build up additional stores of torpedoes for the Navy at this time.

Let me say this in conclusion about the Navy: We believe that the Navy is an institution of which this Congress and this country can well be proud. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in speaking of guns and ships and navy yards and armament conference and the other matters to which I have referred, we think of the Navy as an institution of war. Let me remind you that the Navy, powerful as it may become as an agency of war, is essentially an instrument for peace. The record of our Navy is a proud record, and from the day the Navy was first organized in our Government until the present that arm of our Government service has reflected glory and honor upon its officers and men and upon our common flag. It was that Navy that brought an end to the impudent piracy of the Barbary States in the early days of our Republic. It was that Navy that enabled the United States to make a treaty with France in dignity and honor after we had been flouted by the French Government when we had no navy. It is that Navy that has added luster to the history of American Government in every war into which our country has been forced in the past 100 years. But the Navy of the United States stands for peace. It was because of the fact that our Navy was strong and that as a nation we were powerful that two years ago our Government could take the lead in the movement for the limitation of naval craft. It was our Navy, including the Marine Corps, that was called upon to bring peace and order in Haiti and Santo Domingo within the last 10 years.

The Navy of the United States as an agency for law and order has immediate relation to our success as a Nation. It costs us something like \$3,000,000 per year to patrol, as it were, the West Indies. The trade with the West Indies aggregates more than \$50,000,000 annually. It costs us \$3,000,000 per year to maintain the Yangtze patrol in Chinese waters, and by means of law and order upheld by the Navy our trade with China aggregates approximately \$150,000,000 every year. There are other by-products in the institution of the Navy that are close at hand. Through the engineering service of the Navy, tests that are made in laboratories and in boiler room, tests that are the result of discipline and intensive study, it is a modest estimate to say that the industries of our land in the consumption of fuel saved annually not less than from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 on account of naval devices and methods that have originated in the Navy. The Navy is an institution that means relief and helpfulness, and if it is Chile whose people have suffered by disaster, the ships of the Navy carry relief. If it is Smyrna in Asia Minor, the ships of our Navy are called upon for aid. If it is disaster in Japan, our Navy is the first to carry not only good will and sympathy, but food and clothing and medical supplies, that the people of Japan may not suffer. And, Mr. Chairman, the attitude of our Congress toward our Navy, as it shall be reflected in this bill, will be helpful in holding the good will of the nations of the world.

The committee believes the appropriations we have suggested are adequate. We believe that no extensive construction program is necessary or desirable, and certainly no program is called for in building of ships not limited by the limitation of armament treaty in such numbers as would arouse suspicion or endanger the friendliest relationships upon the part of other great and proud world powers.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. First, I shall apologize for not being here when the gentleman began his speech; and, not that my constituents may know where I have been, but in order that the gentleman may understand, I would say that I have been engaged over in the Naval Affairs Committee all day.

Mr. FRENCH. I know that the gentleman's committee is one of the busiest in the House, and I also know that hearings are at present going on on most important subjects before his committee.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman answer me two or three questions, so that I may get the knowledge and carry it over to the committee. What provision has been made for the repair of six of our battleships which need repairs very badly, and what will be expected of the Naval Affairs Committee in the way of authority to bring our ships up to date or up to as good a state of repair as the American people would be glad to have?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman, I suppose, refers to the four battleships, especially, that broke down during the fleet maneuvers a few weeks ago?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman is referring to the coal burners?



Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRENCH. Last year the appropriation bill carried approximately \$2,500,000 for upkeep work, repair work on the 18 battleships. It will be interesting to this House to know that \$1,400,000 of that amount was expended on 14 ships, including 2 of the best coal burners, the other 12 being oil burners, and that \$800,000 was expended on these 4 ships—coal burners—which broke down during the maneuvers a few weeks ago. In other words, \$800,000 was expended on the upkeep work and repair work on 4 ships that broke down a few weeks ago, as against \$1,400,000 on 14 other ships of the same general class.

Mr. BUTLER. How does the gentleman account for that?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, in this way: When the 1916 program was begun we commenced the laying down of a large number of battleships of the oil-burner type, looking forward to the ultimate decommissioning of the coal-burning ships. Even had we desired to do so, we could not have changed those ships during the World War from coal to oil burners. In the war they had the severest of usage, but they made good. After the war it was expected that the ships that had been authorized in 1916 would gradually take the place of the coal burners, and it would not be well to expend large amounts of money upon them for replacing machinery. It was expected that as ships would be completed which were authorized, those ships would be put in the second line, and gradually those ships would be taken out of commission and scrapped. Now, when the Limitation of Armament Conference was held two years ago we were limited to 18 ships, and instead of scrapping those 4 ships that broke down the other day during the maneuvers they were put in as part of the 18, and we scrapped 11 ships which were on the ways which were planned to be oil burners and ships that would be comparable to the best in any navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Would it not have been advisable under the agreement to have maintained two of the ships scrapped of about equally the amount of tonnage of these four ships on which the gentleman said we spent this large amount of money?

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, the gentleman will recall there was authority to replace two old ships with two ships which were about completed, but which were not completed when the limitation conference was held. Now, I have no doubt within the confines of the chamber in which the Limitation of Armament Conference was held there was much negotiation. We had trouble to have Japan agree to the scrapping of some of her ships. We had to arrange with Great Britain with respect to carrying on certain of her program. We agreed to maintain those four and to replace two others with new ones, and so they became part of our quota of 18 capital ships, and I assume it was the best arrangement that could be made at the time. Now, let me say this in conclusion on this subject.

Mr. BUTLER. How much will it cost? How much authority does the gentleman ask? Mr. VINSON of Georgia, the ranking minority member on our committee, has asked some questions. How much authority and how much money will be needed? The gentleman probably has the knowledge and we have not had an opportunity to consider it because we are considering one measure, and have been for 40 days.

Mr. FRENCH. I will answer in three ways. In the first place it will take approximately \$35,000 to purchase materials for those four ships to-day and approximately \$70,000 for labor and incidental expenses, or with approximately \$100,000 we can put those four ships back in the Navy and make them able to function. That is, we still retain them as coal burners though not comparable to modern coal-burning ships. Now, a second plan can be adopted. It would be this, to continue them as coal burners with a replacement cost of approximately \$375,000 apiece.

Mr. BUTLER. That is not desirable.

Mr. FRENCH. That would mean to continue those ships as coal burners, and it would mean to take out the old parts and replace them with new parts and make them comparable to ships that are in first-class condition but still coal burners. There is still another alternative, and that is to take out the coal burners and install oil burners.

Mr. BUTLER. How much would it cost?

Mr. FRENCH. It would cost approximately, I think, around \$3,400,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Convert them over to oil burners?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That will have to be authorized by the legislative committee before you can make any appropriation for it.

Mr. FRENCH. Well, the limit that has been followed has been \$300,000, although I do not believe the question has ever been determined by the House whether when an estimate comes

down in excess of the amount it would be necessary for it to go to the legislative committee or not. However, I do not care to meet that question.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, of course I will say the Appropriations Committee would cooperate with the legislative Committee on Naval Affairs as much as we could.

Mr. BUTLER. We have not had an opportunity to get this information, and we are here to obtain knowledge. So far our hands have been tied.

It matters not whether the authority comes from the Committee on Appropriations or from the legislative committee; it would cost from \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 to convert these ships into oil burners.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; that is the situation as to the four oldest ones.

Mr. BUTLER. That money must be provided.

Mr. FRENCH. To provide a Navy that may be adequate and yet to safeguard the treaty—that has been our problem; that is your problem. I remember one evening during the hearings, when the hour of adjournment had come, Admiral Robison, of the Bureau of Engineering, had just concluded his testimony for the day. The official reporter had been excused and the members of the committee were indulging in an unofficial interview with this naval officer.

I remember Admiral Robison said:

Gentlemen, it is a tremendous responsibility to be charged with the administration of the money that is contributed by our people for the expense of the Government. This responsibility has borne so heavily upon me as the head of a bureau that I have been compelled to think of the moneys that I am authorized to expend in terms of more than money. I have gotten to thinking of these expenditures in terms of human life.

And then he said:

You take a man and estimate not the value of all the kind deeds, the love, the amenities, his service to his home and community, but his earning capacity in a lifetime, and you can estimate his value at approximately \$75,000.

Now, said Admiral Robison—

If that is the value of a human life, I have tried to think of the limitations upon any intelligent expenditure of money as expending a human life every time I expend \$75,000 that you furnish.

Gentlemen, I want to say that this metaphor made a deep impression upon me. I have tried to have it control me as I thought of my duty on the items of this bill. I want it to make an impression upon you and help to control the expenditures of Government, and I want you to think of it in considering the bill now before you; the value of the dollar, not reckoned in so many cents but the value of the appropriation made on the basis of the human lives that will be spent, assuming that each human life is worth economically what was suggested, \$75,000. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I know that after the speech of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] you will readily accept as true my statement that in all my experience I have never known any Member of this House to give to an appropriation bill the time and thought that has been given to this bill by my colleague from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. He has devoted months to it and has made as detailed an investigation of the affairs of the Navy as ever has been made by a Member of Congress, and in consequence of that investigation he is to-day one of the best-informed men in the country on the affairs of the Navy.

I want to talk for a few minutes, not of the details of this bill—because after the discussion by the gentleman from Idaho it would be irksome to you—and then it is true that between us there is no difference, certainly no material difference, as to the provisions of the bill. I want to talk first about the organization of the Navy Department, because I think it exceedingly important that just at this time some one should call attention to a situation which is of vast importance to the future of the Navy.

For years there has been an effort on the part of some officers of the Navy to substitute military for civilian control of the Navy. It was attempted during the administration of President Arthur, during the administration of President Roosevelt, during the administration of President Wilson, and during the administration of President Harding. In later years the effort has been to concentrate power in the Chief of Operations. Gradually power has been vested in that office, but not until the last six months did it acquire the power "they long had sought, and mourned because they found it not."

Let me read the statute governing regulations:  
Section 1547 of the Revised Statutes provides—

The orders, regulations, and instructions issued by the Secretary of the Navy prior to July 14, 1862, with such alterations as he may since have adopted, with the approval of the President, shall be recognized as the regulations of the Navy, subject to alterations adopted in the same manner.

This section has been construed as follows:

The authority of the Secretary to issue orders, regulations, and instructions, with the approval of the President, in reference to matters connected with the Naval Establishment, is subject to the condition, necessarily implied, that they must be consistent with the statutes which have been enacted by Congress in reference to the Navy. He may, with the approval of the President, establish regulations in execution of, or supplemental to, but not in conflict with, the statutes defining his powers or conferring rights upon others. The contrary has never been held by this court. (U. S. v. Symonds, 120 U. S. 46, 49; Glavey v. U. S., 182 U. S. 595, 603.)

Now, here is the law governing the office of Chief of Operations. The naval act of March 3, 1915, provided that—

There shall be a Chief of Naval Operations, \* \* \* who shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be charged with the operations of the fleet and with the preparation and readiness of plans for its use in war.

The naval act of August 29, 1916, provided that—

All orders issued by the Chief of Naval Operations in performing the duties assigned him shall be performed under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and his orders shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary, and shall have full force and effect as such.

Under this law regulations governing the office of Chief of Operations have been made from time to time. In 1920, during the administration of Secretary Daniels, regulations were adopted providing that the Chief of Operations should advise as to the matters pertaining to fuel reservations and depots and other matters, but this was only for advice; it did not confer power to act in all the matters enumerated. But on August 30, 1923, the regulations were amended so as to give the Chief of Operations the power to "coordinate all repairs and alterations to vessels and the supply of personnel and the material thereto, so as to secure at all times the maximum readiness of the fleet for war."

The Navy Department has a Chief of the Bureau of Navigation to control the personnel of the Navy and the supply of the personnel to the ships. We have a Chief of the Bureau of Engineering, and of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, to control repairs and alterations of ships. The only purpose of this regulation was to make the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, the Chief of the Bureau of Engineering, and the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks subordinate to the Chief of Operations. The regulation continues that "all orders issued by the Chief of Operations in the execution of his assigned duties shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary of the Navy and have full force and effect as such." Under this regulation the Chief of Operations can, as to practically every activity of the Navy, issue orders to the Chiefs of the Bureau of Navigation, Engineering, and Yards and Docks, and all other bureaus of the department, without submitting such orders to the Secretary of the Navy for his approval. And so far as the new Secretary of the Navy is concerned, if the President of the United States is going to be fair to him, he ought to telegraph to Mr. Wilbur, of California, that if he accepts the appointment as Secretary of the Navy and comes to Washington, he ought to bring with him his golf sticks, because, outside of entertaining visitors, attending banquets, making speeches, and signing his name on a dotted line, there is little left for him to do.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How long has that been the law?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is the result of a regulation adopted August 30, 1923.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. A regulation made by whom?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. By the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That was Secretary Denby.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Under the administration of Secretary Denby.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did he issue the order?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Well, the order I have is signed "Theodore Roosevelt, acting"; but I am satisfied this is an order that was sent to the officers and to the fleet, and it was issued under regulations adopted with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

But my contention is that under the statute, which specifically limits the duties of the Chief of Operations to the operations of the fleet afloat and to the making of plans, that Secretary Daniels was right when, in his annual report for 1920, he said this, speaking of the Chief of Naval Operations and his powers:

These limits are by no means narrow. There is a world of work incident to the operation of the fleet, requiring of its administrative agents, responsible to and under the Secretary, a very high order of professional ability. The preparation and readiness of war plans is a function no less important and one that calls for deep study and most careful consideration of campaigns, past and future, there being in fact no field of naval activity which offers greater inducement or affords more incentive for professional effort.

But important and far-reaching as these two legitimate and authorized lines of work are admitted to be, the fact must also be borne constantly in mind that the fleet is afloat, not in Washington, and that the "operation" of the fleet has consequently to do with the finished product itself and not the production thereof, the work of "preparation and readiness" pertaining solely to plans and not to ships or navy yards nor yet the Navy Department.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Did I understand the gentleman to take exception to the Chief of Operations having authority over the location of reserves and depots for fuel for the Navy?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; the Chief of Operations under the law has no power to do so. That is the duty of the Secretary of the Navy. But under this recent order, the Chief of Operations has the power to assign ships to any dock he wants to; he has the power to say what ships shall be repaired regardless of what the Chief of Engineering shall say or regardless of what the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks shall say; he has the power to say what fuel depots shall be established and, so far as I can see, make every other decision with reference to the conduct of the Navy.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. My colleague will notice that my question was directed entirely to the question of the location of the reserves, and the thought occurred to me—and I want to ask my colleague whether he will not agree with me—that the question of the location of the reserve, especially under conditions of modern warfare, is very germane to the war plans for the Navy.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. When the law says "preparation of plans," it did not contemplate the power to locate reserves. My friend must realize that the Chief of Operations like all other officials, must be governed by law. If the gentleman is of the opinion and if Congress should be of the opinion that the power to locate those reserves should be placed in the Chief of Operations and not in the Secretary of the Navy, then by law the power should be taken from the Secretary of the Navy and given to that officer, but until that is done that officer can have no right other than to advise the responsible head of the Navy Department, the Secretary of the Navy.

And any effort on the part of the Secretary to transfer to any officer the right to locate the reserves or to do any other act which by law is placed on the Secretary is an effort to abdicate functions specifically placed in him by law. I would not approve it because I believe this Government must remain, as it has remained, under civilian, and not under military control. I hold this view regardless of who may, for the time being, serve as Chief of Operations.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Could not the new Secretary of the Navy change these regulations?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly, and that is the only reason for my remarks to-day. As a Member of the House I know that the Secretary of the Navy must assume all responsibility for the conduct of the Navy, and he should not do that unless he has hold of the reins of power. If he does not retain absolute control in his office and yet assumes responsibility, then his lot in life is apt to be a very unhappy lot.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Does not the law authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make these regulations?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; he can make regulations provided they are not in conflict with the law, and when the law says that the power of the Chief of Operations shall be limited to these two functions, then any regulation which gives to him additional power is in conflict with the law.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Does not the law give him those functions, but not limit him to those functions?



Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I contend it is in conflict with it, because it gives to him power vested in the Secretary of the Navy and not vested in him by law. If the Congress wants to vest such power in him, it can amend the law.

Mr. TABER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the regulations which have been issued are in conflict with the law?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I contend they are.

Mr. TABER. Then they are invalid of themselves, without any further action, are they not?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They are invalid in law, but in fact they are not, because the Navy is operating under them to-day.

I have called attention to this because I want the new Secretary of the Navy, whoever he is, to know that they are invalid and to limit the power of the Chief of Operations to the functions provided by law. The gentleman and I will agree that they are invalid, but I want the Secretary of the Navy, whoever he is, to know that they are invalid and to insist upon compliance with the law. Service as Budget officer does not come under the power to operate the fleet or to prepare plans for war; but the Chief of Operations has been acting as Budget officer for the Navy; he has been preparing the estimates, providing for the appropriations for the department. Every man knows that duty in itself is enough to demand the entire attention of an officer of the Navy. Up to a few months ago Admiral Coontz, one of the most efficient men in the Navy, a splendid officer, who loves the service, was Budget officer, as well as Chief of Operations.

The Chief of Operations must direct the operations of the American fleet afloat and prepare plans for use in time of war, and I do not care who he is, he can not perform these duties and act as Budget officer and do justice to himself.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Who is the Chief of Operations now?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Admiral Eberle. But you must understand that Admiral Eberle is not acting as Budget officer, but Admiral Strauss is. Admiral Coontz was Budget officer while he was Chief of Operations. He served well in that capacity, but the Chief of Operations should not be the Budget officer.

Having called attention to this matter, let me make a few remarks about the appropriations. I hold the same views as the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. I regret we have to report a measure carrying as much money as this bill does.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Recurring to what the gentleman has just said about the transfer of power to a naval officer, has that naval officer, in charge of operations, authority under that order to make contracts binding the Government for supplies and material or for the manufacture of anything?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am satisfied the Secretary of the Navy would have to approve contracts of that kind.

The position is simply this: The civilian Secretary of the Navy coming into the Department without technical knowledge ought to have the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, of Engineering, and of Yards and Docks reporting directly to him and under his control, as a cabinet, so to speak, from whom he can secure various views as to the policy of the Navy, as well as having the views of the Chief of Operations. Concentrate all power in one officer and inevitably, as he has the power and is the ranking officer of the Navy, the only officer with whom the Secretary of the Navy will come in contact, it will be but a short time before the Secretary of the Navy, unless he is a most extraordinary man, will have only the views of the Chief of Operations. I would prefer to have the civilian Secretary receiving the views of the chiefs of the various bureaus, as well as the Chief of Operations, and forming his conclusions after listening to these experts, because sometimes it is good for a man to hear several experts before reaching a conclusion.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; and it is fundamental, is it not, in our theory of government, that the Navy Department and the War Department and all other departments shall be under the control of civilians and not under Army officers or Naval officers.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. And that control should not be nominal but should be actual control.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman in his statement.

In reference to appropriations, let me say that this bill, as the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] has said, appropriates

\$298,000,000, or approximately \$300,000,000. Let us stop and see how we have progressed. For the fiscal year 1916, after the beginning of the war but before we entered it, when rumors of war were in the air, we appropriated only \$157,000,000 for the Navy.

Almost twice as much will we appropriate for the next fiscal year. We have had a limitation of armament conference limiting expenditures for the Navy. After that conference we are called upon to appropriate \$300,000,000 for the Navy of the United States, and it makes us wonder what amount we would have to appropriate had we not held the conference for the limitation of armaments.

Mr. HARDY. How much would we have to appropriate?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I say the realms of imagination are open as to what we would have to appropriate.

Mr. HARDY. Five or six hundred million dollars at least.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. One man's guess is as good as another. Let us look at appropriations for the Army. In 1916 approximately \$101,000,000 was appropriated, and for the next year we will appropriate for military activities of the Army \$254,000,000, or two and a half times as much as was appropriated in 1916, just prior to the war.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You mean 1925?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. For 1925; yes. Two hundred and fifty million dollars, or practically the same as last year.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. The gentleman speaks of the necessity and regrets it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. What is that necessity predicated upon—upon legislation pending or upon some imaginary danger?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am frank to say to my friend from Wisconsin that I think it is necessary because we have as a result of the conference a 5-5-3 program. No two naval officers will agree as to the exact meaning of this 5-5-3 program.

But under the treaty there is no limitation of the cruiser strength, other than that the cruisers shall not exceed 10,000 tons. There is no limitation of aircraft. Great Britain, for instance, to-day has 48 cruisers with a total of 252,000 tons, while the United States has 10 of 75,000 tons and Japan has 25 of 157,000 tons. If we are to maintain such a Navy as was contemplated at the time of the armament conference, we can not under present conditions appropriate less.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. That is what I was getting at.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We really ought to provide for aircraft and cruisers that would put us on an equality with any other nation. I have been an advocate of economy in Government, but when it comes to the Navy I do not want a Navy superior to any other power, but I do not want a Navy that is inferior to any other power on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. The reason, then, is competitive?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; it is competitive. With resources that would permit us to construct and maintain a Navy stronger than any other power, we willingly surrender that right. I believe the Limitation of Armaments Conference performed a great service, because it demonstrated, first of all, that the representatives of the nations could gather around a conference table and make an agreement; but it did not go far enough. It changed the form of competition but did not eliminate competition. Competition is proceeding to-day in cruisers, in submarines, in aircraft, and if we are to maintain what the American people expect us to maintain, I am sure, a Navy equal to any other, we have got to appropriate this \$300,000,000 to compete with the other two naval powers—Japan and Great Britain. But I am going to offer an amendment calling on the President again, as the last naval bill called upon the President, to request the other naval powers of the earth to once more meet in conference and make an effort to limit the number and tonnage of auxiliary vessels under 10,000 tons, and the strength of aircraft, so as to put an end to this naval competition.

Tell me it can not be done! Why, men thought you could not limit armament as to capital ships. Why anticipate failure? Conditions may have changed, and certainly the American Congress ought to put itself on record as saying, "Before we pass the bills now pending before the Naval Affairs Committee authorizing additional cruisers and gunboats we want to say to Great Britain and to Japan that as far as we are concerned we are willing to further curtail this competition in armament; we are willing to stop now before we go to the expense of building other cruisers, and then be placed in the position we

were in as to capital ships—of canceling contracts and incurring an enormous expense and loss incident to the cancellation of such contracts."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was interested and somewhat surprised at a statement made before another subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations some weeks ago in discussing a matter connected with the Navy, where, in explanation of his appropriation, the officer made the statement that we had a greater number of ships in the Navy now than we had before the limitation of armament conference, or as many, I believe he said. Is that true or not?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We have in commission now many less ships than before the conference. We may have more ships, but not in commission. Of course, we have not as many capital ships.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then, as a matter of fact, there has not been any such reduction in ships, except the capital ships, as the public has been led to believe?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The treaty specifically limited the capital ships and aircraft carriers. It does not affect cruisers or auxiliary craft and does not affect the aircraft. That is why I want the Congress to go on record as favoring another conference and again ask the President to call on other powers so as to end this competition. The treaty applies only to ships of more than 10,000 tons. Inevitably the naval powers will proceed to develop fighting units not prohibited by the treaty. And as they are developed the ratio of 5-5-3 is destroyed. If we have capital ships of equal strength with Great Britain—but Great Britain is overwhelmingly superior in cruisers of 10,000 tons or less, and in submarines and in aircraft, manifestly, there is no equality in fighting strength. Provide a Navy of equal strength, manned by American seamen, and we need have no fears.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Does it not seem a surprising situation that this Government is loaning through private individuals \$150,000,000 to Japan, and that at the same time Japan is engaged in this same race of building cruisers and other vessels?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have no information as to Japan except from newspaper sources. I may say that I have read somewhere that there has been a curtailment in Japan's program since her recent disaster. Prior to that time Japan was doing the proper thing. Japan announced that she was canceling contracts for the building of some cruisers, and made a favorable impression, but what she did was to cancel contracts for cruisers of small tonnage and immediately prepare to build larger cruisers of greater tonnage. The competition under the Limitation of Armament Conference results in this: Every nation is going to build cruisers up to the limitation of 10,000 tons. They will build them of nine or ten thousand tons, as many as they can, so as to make their navy the most effective, and they are going to compete for supremacy in aircraft and in submarines, which are not affected by the treaty.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. In the gentleman's judgment, how does our inferiority in the number of cruisers and in aircraft matériel affect us, in so far as maintaining a parity of naval strength with Great Britain?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That question answers itself. We have only 10 cruisers built and building and Great Britain has 48 built and building, Japan 25. We are deficient in submarines of an effective type. When it comes to these most effective units, I believe that we are deficient, and this Government will adopt and must adopt a policy of matching fighting unit with fighting unit. It can not do less; and the American people will say that, notwithstanding what the experts had in mind when they said 5-5-3, they thought that meant not only strength in capital ships but strength in fighting weapons, and that they believed that our Navy should be the equal to that of Great Britain.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I quite agree with the gentleman that that question answers itself.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I have been interested in the appropriations for aircraft of late. Can the gentleman give the total appropriations for aircraft—military, naval, and postal?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not do that.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. What does the Navy carry?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Fourteen million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that considerable competition in naval armament by the different countries is inspired by private contractors, who reap rewards in obtaining rich contracts?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am frank to say that I am unable to answer as to the exact motives which inspire men or by which they are actuated. The gentleman is in better position than I am to answer that question.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Has the gentleman's committee taken any action to eliminate that in this country?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. There is nothing carried in this bill which would have any bearing on contractors.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. As a matter of fact, we are giving contracts out to these private contractors which we could perform in our own navy yards, are we not?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not think that is correct. I hope that is not true, because I believe the other policy is the better policy. I can not yield further to my friend, but when I get through, if the gentleman has that information, I should be glad to yield to him and he can make a speech about it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman tell approximately the number of airplanes used by the Navy?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Approximately 500. Let me proceed now along the line that I was speaking of when I was interrupted. I believe that we ought to have an effective limitation of armament and that the President ought to call for another conference. There can be no harm in asking for such a conference.

The reason such a request is not contained in this bill is because it is legislation and would be subject to a point of order. The committee did not want to violate the rules by including a provision that would be subject to the point of order and which ought to be presented by the Committee on Naval Affairs. But I believe in it and I believe, too, that it is exceedingly unfortunate that the President of the United States has seemingly become indifferent to a proposal which had the enthusiastic support of his predecessor, and which the people of America thought would enlist the hearty support of President Coolidge, namely, insisting on action by the Senate upon adherence to the world court. So far as the people are concerned I believe that they are in favor of the court, because they believe it a step toward the settlement of international disputes by arbitration instead of by the sword. Last fall before Congress convened the churches of America set apart a week, during which week throughout the entire Nation Christian people asked for favorable action by the Government upon this proposal, but nothing has been done. We find armament competition continues. We find the Congress appropriating again \$300,000,000 for the Navy and \$250,000,000 for the Army, and surely we ought to stop, look, and listen. We are drifting and have been drifting helplessly, aimlessly, doing nothing to accomplish that which is most desired by the people, not only of America but of the world, of promoting peace by the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. Investigations may be necessary, Congress may devote itself to other measures, but there is no proposal more calculated to promote the happiness of the people of America and of the world than the proposal to have the United States adhere to the World Court. [Applause.] This proposal was submitted to the Senate by President Harding. Leaders of the Democratic Party declared themselves in favor of it. Yet nothing has been done. Nothing will be done unless the President of the United States will take a more positive stand in favor of it. A mere announcement that he favors it will never bring about favorable action by the Senate. In his message at the opening of this Congress he commended it to the Congress and announced that he favored the proposal, but since that time I have not heard of any activity on his part to secure its adoption by the Senate. And as we drift, five years after the armistice, without making any progress toward peace, we can not blame the thoughtful women of the Nation who ask whether the cradles of to-day will be called upon to fill the trenches of to-morrow. No man here can answer that question in the negative. Competition in armament continues. Nothing has been done by this the most powerful Nation in the world to promote the settlement of disputes by arbitration. But the time has come for action, and my sincere hope is that as these bills with their large appropriations for military purposes are brought to the attention of



the President he will follow the example of the soldiers of the Nation and fight for that which he says he believes to be right. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Would the gentleman from South Carolina like to use some more time now?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes. Will the Chair inform me how much time I have used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 45 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box].

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

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

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, my purpose is to make a connected statement, and I request that I be not interrupted until I shall have finished the statement.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read a section from the President's message, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the matter designated.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### IMMIGRATION.

American institutions rest solely on good citizenship. They were created by people who had a background of self-government. New arrivals should be limited to our capacity to absorb them to the ranks of good citizenship. America must be kept American. For this purpose it is necessary to continue the policy of restricted immigration. It would be well to make such immigration of a selective nature, with some inspection at the source, and based either on a prior census or upon the record of naturalization. Either method would insure the admission of those with the largest capacity and best intention of becoming citizens. I am convinced that our present economic and social conditions warrant a limitation of those to be admitted. We should find additional safety in a law requiring the immediate registration of all aliens. Those who do not want to be partakers of the American spirit ought not to settle in America.

Mr. BOX. I would like to ask that the Clerk read a section from the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] in the Senate, section 10, page 14.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the matter indicated.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 10 (a). When used by this act the term "quota" when used in reference to any nationality means 200, and in addition thereto 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such a nationality resident in the United States, as determined by the United States census of 1890.

Mr. BOX. The section read is essentially like the corresponding section in the Johnson bill reported to this House. Bills containing this provision have been introduced by Members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and other Members of the House and Senate during the last three or four years. I have had a bill containing a similar provision pending for some years. This idea has been developed by the best thought which students of this problem could give to it. The President's message declares that sentiment, not without consideration, but doubtless upon mature consideration. The proposition had been long considered and discussed at the time the President read his message to the Congress. The proposition, however, has developed a very sharp issue.

I read from resolutions adopted by the Grand Council of the Order Sons of Italy of New York in opposition to the Johnson bill:

*Resolved*, That the Grand Council of the Order Sons of Italy of the State of New York hereby strongly protests against the enactment into law of the aforesaid measure and of any legislation the purpose of which is to discriminate in the apportionment of American opportunity.

The Patriotic Order Sons of America are on the other side of the question. With them are the Sons of the American Revolution, from whose statement supporting the same legislation I now read:

We favor a policy of restriction with an annual quota of 2 to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of each nationality resident in the United States, as shown by the census of 1890, not more than 10 per cent of the annual quota of any nationality to be admitted in any month.

The Johnson bill develops a sharp issue between the Sons of Italy and the Sons of the American Revolution. On that issue I propose to speak to the House and the country.

When an issue arises before the American Congress it is important to know who is aligned on each side of the question. I shall try to show you not all but some of the groups and influences aligned on each side as this question comes to issue:

Order Sons of Italy of the State of New York.  
Order Sons of Italy of the State of New Jersey.  
Order Sons of Italy of the State of Connecticut.  
Order Sons of Italy of the State of Rhode Island.  
American Jewish Conference.  
Polish political organizations of New York and New Jersey.  
Ukrainian Democratic Club of New York.  
Italian Evangelical Ministers' Association of New York.  
Immigrants' Protective League.  
Slovak League of America.  
Independent Order B'nai B'rith.  
Czech National Alliance.  
Sicilian American Club.  
Polish National Union of America.  
Selective Immigrant Aid Society.  
Italian Naturalization Club.  
Italian Social Republican Club.  
Italian Republican League.  
The Mazzini Club (Inc.).  
Societa di M. S. Cittadini Calabro Americani (Inc.).  
Societa di Maria Santissima della Carita.  
Societa Fratena Italian of Cosenza.  
Union of Orthodox Rabbis of America.  
The Women's Zionist Organization.  
National Catholic Welfare Conference, acting by its bureau of immigration.

Local lodges of Order Sons of Italy, as follows:

Loggia Gabriele D'Annunzio, No. 22, Paterson, N. J.  
Pittsburgh Lodge, No. 74 (Pennsylvania).  
Williamsport Lodge, No. 138 (Pennsylvania).  
Loggia Fratelli Compatti, No. 150, Albany, N. Y.  
Loggia Annita Garibaldi, No. 184, Danbury, Conn.  
Loggia Perseveranza, No. 212, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
Lodge Roma Intangible, No. 215.  
Lodge Giosue Carducci, No. 242, East Boston, Mass.  
Loggia Italia, No. 263, Providence, R. I.  
Pietro Micca, No. 291.  
Loggia G. D'Annunzio-Oltre l'Oceano, No. 321, of Schenectady, N. Y.  
Loggia Iolanda Margherita, No. 342, Westerly, R. I.  
Lodge Augusto Aubry, No. 367, Oneida, N. Y.  
Loggia Sante Furnari, No. 413.  
Loggia Partenope, No. 453, Peacedale, R. I.  
Loggia Vedova Regina Margherita, No. 415, Natick, R. I.  
Loggia Italo-American, No. 469, Natick, R. I.  
Loggia Pietro Metastasio, No. 539, Bristol, Pa.  
Lodge Savoia, No. 570, Homer City, Pa.  
Loggia Ellwood City, No. 608, Ellwood City, Pa.  
Loggia Vittorio il Vittorioso, No. 609, Cokeburg, Pa.  
Loggia Monte Civita D'Itri, No. 710, Cranston, R. I.  
The Italian Citizens' Club-Lodge, No. 716, Weirton, W. Va.  
Loggia Giordano Bruno, No. 875, Farrell, Pa.  
Loggia Nuova Giovane Italia, No. 881, New Kensington, Pa.  
Loggia Nuova Plave, No. 890, McKeesport, Pa.  
Loggia J. M. B. Nuova S. Resnati, No. 892, of Kearny-Arlington, N. J.  
Loggia Riunite del North End, No. 908, Providence, R. I.  
Loggia "Il Risorgimento Italiano," No. 953, Osceola Mills, Pa.  
Loggia "Arditi," No. 979, Sag Harbor, L. I.  
The Lodge Fiume and Gloria of Italy Sons and Daughters of Italy, No. 985, Naugatuck, Conn.  
Ordine Figli D'Italia Loggia, No. 992, Duluth, Minn.  
Loggia Umberto I, No. 1040, Indianapolis, Ind.  
Loggia Operaia Italiana, No. 1050, Westerly, R. I.  
Milano Lodge, No. 1090, Conifer, Pa.  
Loggia Vita Nuova, No. 1198, San Francisco, Calif.  
Loggia "General Diaz," No. 1139, Fairmont, W. Va.  
Loggia Victor Em. III, No. 522, New Britain, Conn.  
Saint Joseph Loggia, No. 1032, New Britain, Conn.  
Lodge Monte Carmels, No. 1161, New Britain, Conn.

#### SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS.

Abuzzi Society, East Boston, Mass.  
Alcarese Society, Cleveland, Ohio.  
American Citizens' Club of Polish Descent, Newmarket, N. H.  
Associated Jewish Organizations of Massachusetts.  
Associated Y. M. & Y. W. H. A. of New England.  
Bella Sicilia Society, South Boston, Mass.  
Corte Generale Errico Cialdini, No. 50, Foresters of America, Westerly, R. I.  
Congregation Kodimah.  
Caltano Bruno Society, Boston, Mass.  
Chicopee, Mass., Polish Citizens' Club.  
E. A. Manzoni Club, Natick, R. I.

Council of Jewish Women, Pawtucket, R. I.  
 Circolo Sociale Caserta, Natick, R. I.  
 Gotthold Ephraim Lessing Lodge, No. 37, Independent Order B'rith  
 Abraham, Cleveland, Ohio.  
 Giovane Italia Club, Natick, R. I.  
 General Jewish Committee, Providence, R. I.  
 Gemilath Chesed Hebrew Free Loan Association, Providence, R. I.  
 Ligurian Auxiliary, Boston, Mass.  
 Mazzini-Garibaldi Republican Club of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.  
 Society Cesare Batesti of Eagle Park, Providence, R. I.  
 Saint Calogero Society, Thompsonville, Conn.  
 Societa Mutuo Soccorso Grazzanise, Natick, R. I.  
 Sisterhood Temple Beth El, Dorchester, Mass.  
 State Committee of Polish-American Citizens, Providence, R. I.  
 Women's Italian Club, Boston, Mass.  
 Federazione Italiana, Pennsylvania.  
 Loggia La Vittoria, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Maria SS. Consolazione, Pennsylvania.  
 Loggia Castelbuono, O. I. F. d'I, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa di M. S. San Leonardo di Colle al Volturo, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Unione e Fratellanza, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa San Pasquale Bailon di Bisenti, Pennsylvania.  
 Tailors' Club, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Sarti Italiani, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa San Rocco, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa San Nicola di Bari, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa M. S. Fara San Martino, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa San Biagio, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Sant' Antonio, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Filippo Palizzi, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa di Norristown No. 1, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Mutuo Soccorso No. 1, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Maria S. S. di Bisaccia, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Marchegiani, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Guglielmo Oberdan, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Immacolata Concezione, Pennsylvania.  
 Legione Umberto I, Pennsylvania.  
 Circola Progressive Idernalano, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Circerone, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Chietina, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa San Camillo de Lellis, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Caccamo, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa di M. S. Cittadini di Fossacesia, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Sant' Agata dei Goti, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Cavalieri di Santa Rita, Pennsylvania.  
 Congrega Maria SS. Addolorata, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Messer Raimondo, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa di M. S. S. Franc. Di Paola SS. di Constantinopoli, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa M. S. San Silvestro Abruzzi, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Sannitica M. S. San Rocco di Montaquilla, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa San Pietro Celestino, Pennsylvania.  
 Loggia Tripoli & Cerene O. F. D., Pennsylvania.  
 Societa M. S. Maria SS. del Carmine, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Acquavella Cilentio, Pennsylvania.  
 Court Americo Vespucci, Pennsylvania.  
 Felice Cavallotti No. 361 F. of A., Pennsylvania.  
 Court Umberto I No. 359 F. of A., Pennsylvania.  
 Circolo Cattolico del Buon Consiglio, Pennsylvania.  
 P'ia Unione Figlie di Maria, Pennsylvania.  
 Congrega Maria S. S. del Rosario, Pennsylvania.  
 Circolo Cattolico di San Nicola, Pennsylvania.  
 Unione Sante Cicilia, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Maria SS. del Carmine, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Beniamino Gigli, Pennsylvania.  
 Camera di Commercio Italiana, Pennsylvania.  
 L'Opinione Italian Newspaper, Pennsylvania.  
 Circolo Dante Alighieri, Pennsylvania.  
 Cenacolo Leonardo di Vinci, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa M. S. S. del Ciento, Pennsylvania.  
 San Nicola Rectory, Parochial Church, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa San Stefano, Pennsylvania.  
 Lady of Good Counsel Parish Church, Pennsylvania.  
 Italica Gente, Pennsylvania.  
 Y. M. Columbus Association, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa Siracusa Provinciale, Pennsylvania.  
 Loggia Fiume I. S. of I., Pennsylvania.  
 Loggia La Vittoria I. S. of I., Pennsylvania.  
 San Michele Arcangelo Societa, Pennsylvania.  
 Tailors' Club Beneficial Societa, Pennsylvania.  
 Fraterna Raffaele Pagliacetti, Pennsylvania.  
 Societa M. Soccorso Atessani, Pennsylvania.  
 Kingdom Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.  
 Royal Italian Government.  
 Royal Japanese Government.  
 Rumanian Government.

## FOREIGN LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS.

If time and space permitted, I could fill many pages of the RECORD with quotations from the foreign-language press in opposition to the Johnson bill.

Hungarian newspapers.  
 Polish newspapers.  
 Italian newspapers.  
 Russian newspapers.  
 Yiddish newspapers.

## MANUFACTURING ASSOCIATIONS.

National Association of Manufacturers of the United States.  
 National Founders' Association.  
 California Manufacturers' Association.  
 Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut (Inc.).  
 Manufacturers' Association of Wilmington (Delaware).  
 Associated Industries of the Inland Empire (Idaho).  
 Indiana Manufacturers' Association.  
 Iowa Manufacturers' Association.  
 Associated Industries of Kansas.  
 Associated Industries of Kentucky.  
 Associated Industries of Maine.  
 Merchants & Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore.  
 Associated Industries of Massachusetts.  
 Michigan Manufacturers' Association.  
 Associated Industries of Missouri.  
 Nebraska Manufacturers' Association.  
 Associated Industries of New York State (Inc.).  
 Ohio Manufacturers' Association.  
 Oklahoma Employers' Association.  
 Manufacturers & Merchants' Association of Oregon.  
 Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association.  
 Employers' Association of Rhode Island.  
 Manufacturers & Employers' Association of South Dakota.  
 Tennessee Manufacturers' Association.  
 Utah Associated Industries.  
 Associated Industries of Vermont.  
 Virginia Manufacturers' Association.  
 Federated Industries of Washington.  
 West Virginia Manufacturers' Association.  
 Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association.  
 American Cotton Manufacturers' Association.  
 American Electric Railway Association.  
 American Hardware Manufacturers' Association.  
 American Malleable Castings Association.  
 American Paper & Pulp Association.  
 American Pig Iron Association.  
 Electrical Manufacturers' Council.  
 Institute of Makers of Explosives.  
 Manufacturing Chemists' Association of the United States.  
 National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.  
 National Association of Farm Equipment Manufacturers.  
 National Association of Finishers of Cotton Fabrics.  
 National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America.  
 National Association of Sheet & Tin Plate Manufacturers (Inc.).  
 National Association of Wool Manufacturers.  
 National Automobile Chamber of Commerce.  
 National Boot & Shoe Manufacturers' Association of the United States (Inc.).  
 National Electric Light Association.  
 National Erectors' Association.  
 National Founders' Association.  
 National Industrial Council.  
 National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.  
 National Metal Trades Association.  
 Railway Car Manufacturers' Association.  
 Rubber Association of America (Inc.).  
 Silk Association of America.  
 Tobacco Merchants' Association of the United States.  
 United States Rubber Co.  
 Labor Department, Michigan Sugar Co.

An alien discordant note sounds in the words of many of those who line up with the Sons of Italy against the Sons of the American Revolution. But the Sons of America and Sons of the American Revolution are not alone. I now give you the names of a few of those who declare in favor of the bill:

Sons of the American Revolution.  
 American Legion.  
 American National Grange.  
 American Defense Society.  
 American Federation of Labor.  
 Accepted Scottish Rite Masons.  
 Allied Patriotic Societies.  
 Immigration Restriction League of New York.



Daughters of the American Revolution.  
Native Sons of the Golden West.  
Patriotic Order Sons of America.  
Junior Order of United American Mechanics.  
Fraternal Order of Eagles.  
Immigration Restriction League of Princeton University.

American newspapers and magazines, too numerous to name, but composing a great part of the press, published outside the great cities populated largely by foreign peoples.

Let us, gentleman of the committee, examine the cry that this legislation will be unjust discrimination against certain peoples. Let us examine that for a minute. The word "discriminate" has different meanings. One is "to discern differences between"; another means an unjust exercise of discretion or an unjust choice, in which case the term "unjust discrimination" would be an apt one.

If alien people, if European people, if Japanese people, have vested rights in America, vested rights to a dwelling place, vested rights to employment; if they, living over there, have acquired rights here, and it is proposed to deny them what is theirs, then this legislation is "unjust discrimination." If America has the gift of citizenship, home, and opportunity to bestow as she chooses upon the worthy alien people whom she may select, no Government and no group in or out of America has the right to question the exercise of America's discretion in making such a choice. [Applause.] All of this talk that you hear about "unjust discrimination" means that our liberality has gone to such an extent that they think they own sections here. They said, "You will make Bolshevism worse." They said, "You will make our foreign-born people feel more dissatisfied, and it will be harder to get along with them, and you will have more trouble with them."

The hearings are filled with warnings by the representatives of racial groups that we are increasing unrest and the danger of Bolshevism among the foreign born by the proposed legislation. Gentlemen, that is to say that we already have admitted among us large, dangerous elements, and that we must admit more of them to keep them in a good and orderly humor. [Applause.]

The President's message suggests two bases for immigration quotas. One is a prior census. The other is the record of naturalization. Both tend to reduce immigration from southern and eastern Europe and to maintain those stocks which colonized here and came as our earlier immigrants, whose aspirations and views of individuality, home, religion, and government, and all of life have found expression in American institutions. Peoples have their own racial traits and characteristics, their own instincts, their own traditions, and our Government and civilization are born of what our fathers believed in, loved, and lived for. [Applause.]

The crux of the President's message is that we should maintain that which is good that we now have and to bring in less that will imperil it.

I have figures here respecting naturalization and its results. The "prior census" had the preference of first mention in his message, but that and the "record of naturalization" are based on substantially the same purpose. The prior census gives a smaller proportion of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe. Basing it on the record of naturalization gives the same result in varying but striking degree. By far the largest percentages of naturalized foreign born are from the countries of northern Europe, and the smallest from central and eastern Europe. I give you the 10 European countries whose people run highest, and 10 of those running lower in American naturalization:

The 10 highest by countries.		Per cent.
Germany	72.8	
Denmark	69.2	
Sweden	69.0	
England	63.1	
Scotland	60.9	
Wales	72.9	
Ireland	65.7	
Norway	67.3	
Luxemburg	72.5	
France	56.7	

Ten of the lower by countries.		Per cent.
Russia	40.2	
Rumania	41.1	
Austria-Hungary	33.4	
Italy	28.1	
Poland	28.0	
Greece	16.8	
Bulgaria	12.1	
Turkey in Europe	20.2	
Portugal	16.4	
Spain	9.9	

(Abstract 1920 census, p. 338.)

Our choice of immigrants based on the record of naturalization will give the smallest quotas of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe and the largest from northern Europe. The President's message suggests these two plans, and a reading of it in the light of the known facts can leave no doubt that his recommendation is based on this very reason and purpose.

Who has any right to say that the President has changed his mind after the drive of these foreign groups against his recommendations?

In writing his recent letters in opposition to the basing of immigration quotas on a prior census, which reduces the quotas of certain countries, the Secretary of State is apparently in conflict with the views of the President as expressed in his message to Congress.

My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] said, in speaking to the House yesterday, that the very low percentages of naturalization among immigrants from southern and eastern Europe was because the new immigrants were so new. He said that the reason they stood so low in naturalization was because they had not been here long enough to increase the percentages of naturalized citizens among them. But I call your attention to the fact that the great bulk of this immigration started in the nineties. I have the figures from 1899 to 1919, inclusive. They came from those countries in large numbers during the nineties, then from 1900 to 1910, and from then up to 1915, when the World War checked them. The figures from Italy are typical. But I include several other southern and eastern European countries in the following tables:

Number of immigrants from Italy, Turkey in Europe, Greece, Bulgaria, Portugal, and Spain, by fiscal years, from and after the fiscal year 1899 down to and including 1919.

[Many thousands came during each of the years from 1890 to and including 1898, but they were not counted by race or people prior to the fiscal year 1899.]

Year.	Italy.	Turkey in Europe.	Greece.	Bulgaria.	Portugal.	Spain.
1899	77,419	80	2,333	52	2,054	385
1900	100,135	285	3,771	108	4,234	355
1901	135,996	387	5,910	657	4,165	592
1902	178,375	187	8,104	851	5,307	975
1903	230,622	1,529	14,090	1,761	9,317	2,080
1904	193,296	4,344	11,343	1,325	6,715	3,996
1905	221,479	4,542	10,515	2,043	5,028	2,600
1906	273,120	9,510	19,489	4,666	8,517	1,921
1907	285,731	20,767	36,580	11,359	9,608	5,784
1908	128,503	11,290	21,489	10,827	7,307	3,899
1909	183,218	9,015	14,111	1,054	4,956	2,616
1910	215,537	18,405	25,888	4,737	8,229	3,472
1911	182,882	14,438	26,226	4,695	8,374	5,074
1912	157,134	14,481	21,449	4,447	10,230	6,327
1913	265,542	14,128	22,817	1,753	14,171	6,167
1914	283,738	8,199	35,832	9,189	10,898	7,591
1915	49,688	1,008	12,592	1,403	4,907	2,762
1916	33,665	313	27,034	764	12,259	5,769
1917	34,596	152	23,974	151	9,975	10,232
1918	5,250	15	1,910	19	2,224	4,295
1919	1,884	10	386	22	1,222	1,573

Report Commissioner General of Immigration, 1923, pp. 119-120.

Number of foreign born from each of the above-named countries in the United States in 1900, 1910, and 1920.

Year.	Italy.	Turkey in Europe.	Greece.	Bulgaria.	Portugal.	Spain.
1900	484,027	9,910	8,515	( <sup>1</sup> )	30,608	7,050
1910	1,343,125	32,230	101,282	11,498	59,360	22,108
1920	1,610,113	5,284	175,976	10,477	69,981	49,535

<sup>1</sup> Not reported separately for 1900.

(Abstracts census 1910, p. 188, and 1920, p. 318.)

When these figures of the 1920 census on naturalization I have quoted were published the bulk of this population had been in this country for from 10 to 20 years, much of it for 30 years, and some for 40 years or more. More people came from Italy alone during two-year periods of that time than is shown by the total number of naturalized of those races at the end of a period of 40 years ending at the beginning of 1920, showing that their interest in American citizenship is not great.

During the extended hearings held by the House committee many of the foreign groups named appeared in opposition to this legislation. Their great partiality for the people of Europe and other non-American interests must have impressed the membership of the committee. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY], a member of the committee, after hear-

ing one or two of these witnesses, began to ask each one of them substantially the following question:

In case of conflict between the interests of the United States and the interests of the people of Italy, Rumania, Poland, Russia, and other European countries, which interests should prevail in the American Congress?

They often avoided answering the question by saying that they could not conceive the possibility of such a conflict. The strong partiality toward alien peoples which these foreign groups revealed, and their nonattention to or disregard of American interests, made the gentleman's question appropriate. Their attitude and argument raised the same question in my mind; and their demand that America furnish a place of domicile and employment for the unhappy millions of Europe, and their denunciation of America's proposed refusal to do it in an unlimited way, caused me to ask the question whether or not the people of Europe had any vested right to a place of domicile and employment here. The question seemed to excite and irritate them.

The arguments which these groups advanced in favor of the free admission of European aliens to America were a revelation of the viewpoint of America's foreign bloc. The protest of the Government of Rumania, which will be found on page 2841 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1924, shows that it is based largely on a dollars and cents consideration, as the following words from it disclose:

Further, it should be considered that the adoption of the census of 1890 would not only deeply wound the pride of the Rumanian people but also strongly affect their material interest, inasmuch as Rumanian immigrants by their savings increase the amount of stable currencies available for commercial and financial purposes in Rumania. This in itself would not fail to have a detrimental effect on the chances of Rumania to speedily attain its goal, economic recuperation.

I read again from the statement made by Justice Cotillo, of the Supreme Court of New York, who, however, appeared not in the capacity of an American judge, but as the grand master of the Order of Sons of Italy of the State of New York:

A severely restrictive immigration legislation will within a few years reduce greatly the emigrant's remittance, and it can be estimated that such reduction will amount from \$50,000,000 to \$70,000,000; that is, from one-fourth to one-third of the invisible flow of gold.

A severe restriction on immigration will be a severe economic blow to Italy, that is endeavoring so strenuously and so pluckily to do her share in the reconstruction of Europe and in bringing back peace and order.

This argument that we are wrongfully impairing the economic strength of Italy, Rumania, and other afflicted European countries, stated in plain English, is that America owes to the ruined countries of Europe the duty of providing homes and employment for their people so people will have money to be spent not in building up America but in rebuilding Europe. Such money is not to be taken from the wealth of the rich or the competency of the prosperous but from the jobs and wages of America's working people.

The charge made by the Sons of Italy that our refusal to continue to receive their surplus population in great numbers is unfair, unjust, and discriminatory has no sound basis. Because we have generously bestowed on Italy the gift of furnishing a dwelling place and employment for its surplus population, Italy now says that we owe them a duty to provide a dwelling place and employment for their surplus and unemployed population. The Italian commissioner of immigration actually contended that because the war had temporarily stopped the flow of Italian immigrants we owed them the admission of 1,500,000 of their surplus at the end of the war to make up for the places they had lost up to that time. (Hearings, pp. 82 and 86.) Then they wanted the stream to flow steadily after that. Representatives of other European groups indicated the same attitude. This attitude caused me, as a member of the committee, to inquire of them whether they understood that the overcrowded and unemployed population of Europe had any vested right to a domicile and employment in America. Their contention that we can not justly deny them a place of domicile and employment is, of course, based on the assumption that it is our duty to furnish them, which is preposterous and outrageous, and shows the un-American viewpoint of the foreign blocs already assembled here.

The argument of manufacturers, represented by Mr. Emery as counsel for the committee on immigration of the National Association of Manufacturers, shows in and of itself that the desire for labor in such abundance as to make it cheap is the mainspring motive of their efforts. There are many quibbles

and criticisms of this bill and of existing law, but evidently the plan is to object to whatever is proposed and to propose nothing that will really tend to reduce the supply of labor.

The same view was presented by Mr. Klump, head of the labor department of the Michigan Sugar Co., who frankly declared that he was interested in procuring labor for his people. The chairman asked him:

Do you think about 6,000 would be all you would need?

Mr. KLUMP. That is about the usual number we need each season. Of course, there are quite a number of other sugar companies in Michigan. I would judge that the sugar companies of Michigan alone need from 20,000 to 25,000 people. (Hearings, p. 121.)

Mr. Emery, representative of a great number of manufacturers, admitted that he was before the Senate committee in 1921, claiming that there was a shortage of about 3,500,000 laborers, and in the same connection admitted that there was an oversupply of labor during that very year and constant unemployment in the United States, and that the doors should have then been closed against immigration. (Hearings, pp. 477-478.)

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman put in the RECORD who Mr. Emery was and whom he represented?

Mr. BOX. Yes; I have it here. He represented the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States and some dozens of other manufacturers' associations among the names which I have read, as will be shown on page 444 of the hearings, serial 1-A.

As the vital interests of our own people, as represented and declared by our great patriotic societies, such as the Sons of the American Revolution, the Masons, the American Legion, and the National Grange, come to issue with the interests of foreign peoples, as declared by the Sons of Italy, the Polish National Union, the Italian Government, the Japanese Government, and the Rumanian Government, let us remember that the cause is being tried in the American Congress. No other forum has or will have jurisdiction of it until this body becomes so weak and derelict that it fails to meet the high responsibility which the Constitution places upon it.

At some early appropriate time I shall seek an opportunity to discuss the question whether the Congress shall control this domestic question, or whether we shall permit the treaty-making power or the Executive or State Department to usurp the power and handle it by agreements not even submitted to the Senate. Just now the issue is made before Congress. This consolidated Von Hindenburg drive of manufacturers, whose patriotism is subordinated by greed; of foreign-language newspapers, societies of foreigners, and millions of foreign voters, against the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, and the interests for which the latter organizations all stand, raises the question whether the American Congress is too weak to hold the line and protect the country's dearest interests. This one big question divides itself into two phases:

First. Are Americans able to enact the immigration laws which they know the country wants and needs?

Second. Are Americans able to enforce such laws as they have, in spite of the interests, enmities, and opposition of those whose hearts are in their pocketbooks, or in Europe more than in America?

The legislative side of it arises first, and the first responsibility is upon the committee, and a double portion of responsibility is on the chairman as the leader of the committee. Let there be no misunderstanding. Fourteen or fifteen of the members of the committee signed the report supporting the Johnson bill. The rank and file of the membership of the committee signed. Five of the seven minority members sought the opportunity to sign individually and share the responsibility for themselves and their party associates, so that nobody could make a party question of this life-and-death American issue. The chairman has the support of an overwhelming majority of the committee—more than four-fifths of it. Moreover, this House wants to act on this question. The only thing which can keep the legislation from coming before the House for its disposition is the chairman and the party "powers that be." Even the steering committee and the Rules Committee probably can not prevent the consideration of this question if the chairman and majority members lead the way. If they are afraid to take the brunt of the fight, let them say the word and fall in behind. The minority are not afraid of the Sons of Italy, nor the Polish Union, nor the foreign-language newspapers.

In a recent newspaper statement the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the committee, denounced the report that the bill is dead. I congratulate him. We all stand ready to help him enact it into law. We are ready to



help him show the country whether the Sons of Italy are stronger than the American Legion and all the rest. I have heard from many sources and have repeatedly read in the press that the groups of the foreign born of New York have notified our Republican friends that they will punish the Republican Party if this legislation is passed. I have seen evidences that such threats are inspiring fear. I hope the evidence is misleading. Time will tell. I have heard that New England politicians are saying that there should be legislation, but that since the Italian and European sentiment rules, or has the balance of power, it will ruin the Republican Party to pass the Johnson bill. Persistent rumors and press reports have it that the intention to enact this bill into law has been abandoned. I earnestly hope that these rumors do not bring a true prophecy; that these press reports misrepresent the prospects; yet these reports are disturbing.

In connection with recent exhibitions of the political power of these groups I am reminded of what the late Viscount Bryce, long ambassador to the United States, world traveler, student of world problems, and especially of America's great problems and prospects, author of such works as *Studies in History and Jurisprudence, The American Commonwealth, and Modern Democracies*, said in his *Modern Democracies*. I now read from that work:

The people—

Referring to the American people in colonial times—

were nearly all of English or (in the Middle States) of Dutch or Scotch-Irish stock, stocks that had already proved themselves industrious in peace, valiant in war, adventurous at sea. All were practically English in their way of thinking, their beliefs, their social usages, yet with an added adaptability and resourcefulness such as the simple or rougher life in a new country is fitted to impart. In the northern colonies they were well educated, as education was understood in those days, and mentally alert. The habit of independent thinking and a general interest in public affairs had been fostered both by the share which the laity of the northern colonies took in the management of the Congregational churches and by practice of civil self-government, brought from England, while the principles of the English common law, exact yet flexible, had formed the minds of their leading men. Respect for law and order, a recognition both of the rights of the individual and of the authority of the duly appointed magistrate, were to them the foundations of civic duty. (Vol. 2, pp. 4-5.)

In speaking of New Zealand, Mr. Bryce says:

The country has grown steadily and not overswiftly in wealth, and has preserved the purity of its stock without that inrush of ignorant immigrants which North Americans have reason to regret. (Vol. 2, p. 331.)

Speaking of the practice of local self-government as the best training of a citizenship for a democratic government, he says:

The New England States of the North American Union, until they were half submerged by a flood of foreign immigrants, taught the same moral. (Vol. 1, p. 78.)

In discussing the forces which weaken the traditions of free government, such as Americans have up to this time cherished, he says:

Various have been the causes that have weakened or destroyed old traditions. Sometimes the quality of a population is changed; it may be, as happened in Rome, by the impoverishment of the bulk of the old citizen stock and the increase in the number of freedmen; it may be by the influx of a crowd of immigrants, ignorant of the history of their new country, irresponsible to sentiments which the old inhabitants have cherished. The English stock to which the farmers and artisans of Massachusetts and Connecticut belonged has now become a minority in these States. (Vol. 1, p. 140.)

These are not the words of a new Member of Congress, but speak the experience, observation, and ripe scholarship and philosophy of this great world observer, declaring a fact which is disturbing American students and alarming the American people. I wonder if this sinister power now apparently headed by the Sons of Italy is already strong enough to prevail against the Sons of the American Revolution and all their kind, including the American Legion, whose membership knew no defeat in open warfare? I wonder whether they are to see themselves and their loved America sniped to death by opponents unrecognized because wearing the garb of friends? Time will tell. Shall we allow the Sons of Italy to get the best of our honored compatriots, the Sons of the American Revolution?

A bill introduced in the Senate providing for the basing of the quota on the census of 1890 was recently viciously attacked by an assembly of foreign-born groups gathered in Philadel-

phia. I quote from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Monday morning, March 3, 1924:

REED ASKS FAIRNESS IN IMMIGRATION BILL—SENATOR CALLS QUOTAS BASED ON FOREIGN-BORN CITIZEN CENSUS DISCRIMINATORY—PENNSYLVANIAN TELLS ITALIAN GROUP CONFERENCE HE FAVORS RACIAL STRAIN PLAN.

After receiving the delegation of the 15 representatives of Italian groups in Philadelphia, led by their president, Eugene V. Allesandrini, Senator REED opened the conference with a brief résumé of the present immigration situation in Congress.

CALLS JOHNSON IGNORANT OF EUROPE.

"Congressman JOHNSON, who lives all the way out in Washington, doesn't know anything about Europe or Europeans. He has an idea all European peasants are diseased. The anti-Japanese idea is wrong too. We're on a friendly footing with that country now. It is ridiculous to raise irritation again."

Here Mr. Allesandrini broke in:

"We objected to your bill, too, on the basis that it was also discriminatory, Senator REED."

"Well," answered the Senator, "I do not approve of the Johnson bill; nor do I approve of my own bill in its present form."

This incident aptly illustrates the drive now on in the United States by alien groups against this legislation.

The men of the American Legion turned the tide in one great life-and-death struggle. They know that this, too, is a life-and-death struggle. Let us hope that the Sons of Italy will not get the best of this momentous struggle. A great American journal recently truly said that the effect of the passage or defeat of this legislation will be felt in America for centuries.

The second phase of the question pertains to the enforcement of the immigration laws, to which I now invite your attention.

Laws and regulations produce results only in proportion to their enforcement. The immigration policy of the United States during recent years has been only partially successful. A large measure of failure which has attended our efforts to regulate immigration is due to a failure to enforce the laws made. Therefore I shall use the remainder of my time in an effort to present to the House that side of this very important question.

During recent years America has been the victim of the vicious habit of disregarding its laws. This attitude on the part of people and public officials has most ruinous tendencies.

Widely prevalent and persistent is our disregard of the laws against violence and murder. The American Bar Association, an organization well qualified to speak on the subject, found that America has more crimes of violence than any other civilized country in the world. The comparative figures submitted seem to prove the charge.

The overwhelming majority of our people, whose deliberate and fixed views caused the adoption of the eighteenth amendment and the enactment of the statute based on it, have been disappointed and disgusted because of the widespread and continuous disregard of that part of our Constitution and laws. The extent to which violations of these laws goes is distressingly great. The fact that this results from the activities of the most lawless element in the country, and that fundamental disloyalty to the Constitution and laws is involved, only aggravate the gravity of the evil.

I speak to-day in an effort to help the Congress and the people understand that our immigration laws are treated no better than are other restraining statutes made for the Nation's protection. A large measure of failure attends our handling of this question through the nonenforcement and disregard of the laws already made. It seems almost vain to write new statutes when such as we have are, to a great extent, failing because we do not enforce them.

Violation of these laws is, of course, not wholly new. I find proof of this in the records of Congress, in official reports, and in the history of our dealings with this question since the early eighties. I find distressing proof of the same fact in the bad results springing from the widespread disregard of the law.

To restrict the number of immigrants and regulate their kind are two of the main purposes of all these laws. Both of these purposes are defeated to the extent to which the law fails in enforcement.

Smuggling or bootlegging of nonadmissible immigrants is carried on in several distinct ways.

Smugglers come over the Canadian border, over the Mexican border, and from Cuba and the West Indies. They come in great numbers as deserting seamen.

A perhaps smaller number get in through the corruption of immigration agents and guards at the ports. At New York, where most of our immigrants enter, there have been several prosecutions and some convictions based on corrupt practices among Government employees in the Immigration Service. Considerable numbers come in spite of the quota law and other restrictions because foreign-born groups, industrial interests, and politicians representing such groups put such pressure upon the department charged with the enforcement of the law as to greatly impair its efficiency.

Great industrial interests often not only oppose the enactment of immigration laws necessary for the protection of the country, but they engage in wholesale and insidious violation of them.

Mr. Alexander Jackson, who was in the employ of the Rock Island Railroad Co. and appeared before the Senate Committee on Immigration in 1920, among other things, said:

In 1906 I was sent over to Europe by the Rock Island Railroad in charge of immigration, freight, and passenger business, with the title of general European agent. My district extended from St. Petersburg to Palermo, from Russia to Sicily, including all of the Scandinavian countries; everything, in fact, except the Balkan States. I didn't have anything to do with the Balkan States, because we considered that the immigration from these States was not worth bothering about.

My proposition was to try and develop good immigration that we could classify as assets instead of liabilities. We were after assets for our territory and not liabilities.

\* \* \* If you get down to bedrock, you will find that a large percentage of these people have perjured themselves in that particular. A large per cent of these foreign immigrants perjure themselves in their declaration that they are not coming to this country under any promise of work or employment or anything else. I have observed this situation for 10 years, \* \* \*

Mr. Roberts, a reliable witness, residing in the vicinity of the Mexican border, familiar with conditions there and participating in the desire to have Mexican labor imported, testified before the House committee on January 26, 1920 (hearings, pp. 50 and 316), that great numbers had entered the country from Mexico illegally. He said:

\* \* \* Sometimes we get them cheaper. Last year I made an arrangement with a man that he would get them for \$3. He made that proposition, and that he would take them, haul them up the railroad to a station 18 miles away (from the border) for \$1, making it cost me \$4.

\* \* \* They cross at night and bring them up to the next station. We do not care how they get them there as long as they get them there. He put 57 there at \$4 a head.

The same witness estimated that there were not less than 200,000 such surreptitious entries per year about that time.

The result of all this is that tens of thousands, probably scores of thousands, more immigrants are coming than is shown by the official reports. The number of deserting seamen and the numbers smuggled in must be added to those shown in the official figures before we have the total number of immigrants coming.

An unascertainable number of aliens get into the country as deserting seamen. In his report of 1922 the Commissioner General of Immigration said:

Attention was invited in last year's report to the multiplied temptations of aliens to seek admission through the wide-open door presented by the seaman's occupation. For years, as it is well known, inadmissible aliens have entered the country in the guise of seamen, who promptly deserted their vessels upon arrival at American ports, and to the illiterate and criminal classes who formerly monopolized this open door has now been added the large class of aliens from countries the quotas of which have been exhausted (p. 151).

Secretary of Labor Davis has been repeatedly quoted by the press as estimating the number of aliens illegally smuggled into the country at 1,000 per day. That estimate may be too large. I called on the First Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Henning, who is conservative and informed about immigration matters, for the estimate of his department as to the number "bootlegged" into the country. In his reply Mr. Henning said:

I think the most conservative estimates around the Immigration Service set the figures at 50,000 a year.

There were 522,919 immigrants who came into the United States during the last fiscal year through the ports, notwith-

standing the restriction imposed by the quota law. In addition there were 150,487 who entered as nonimmigrants, some of whom remained. But if we count only those coming through the ports as regular immigrants and add to their number the estimated number of illegal entries, ranging between 50,000 and 350,000, we get a total of between 572,000 and 872,000. This is a large volume of immigration, and a large part of it confessedly is made up of those who avoid the guards and ports of entry and violate the law in the very act of coming.

But our failure to restrict the number of immigrants resulting from the violations of the law, serious as it is, does not adequately present the extent of our failure to regulate immigration. The admission of great numbers of those excluded by the laws presents a grave menace to the national welfare. Many of the illegal entries are made by excluded people. Communists and dangerous revolutionists are said to slip in mainly as deserting seamen, though doubtless many of them get in through other channels.

The extent to which the Department of Labor and the Immigration Service violate the law by admitting those excluded and in failing to deport those whose deportation the law requires is appalling. A Member of Congress proposed to impeach Hon. Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor under the former Democratic administration. I had become a member of the committee shortly before that, and was much disturbed to find that great numbers of warrants of arrest and deportation were being canceled and the deportations prevented, even after that same official had approved the orders of deportation. While the Rules Committee of this House was considering the impeachment resolution against Assistant Secretary of Labor Post, I stated to that committee, as will appear in its hearings, that Mr. Post did not appear to me to be in sympathy with the law and that he was not a suitable person to be charged with its enforcement. I had seen photostatic copies of a great number of these canceled deportation warrants and was dissatisfied with Mr. Post's action. I then believed, and now believe, that lack of sympathy with the law prompted some of his actions, and that many such aliens were not, in fact, deported because the service did not have the funds with which to deport them. I have not seen the official record made by the present Department of Labor in the cancellation of warrants such as Mr. Post canceled, but I am convinced, and upon my information and belief I state, that great numbers of such warrants are being canceled by the present Department of Labor much as Mr. Post canceled them. I do not know whether the number is greater or smaller than the number canceled by the former Assistant Secretary.

The two leading causes for the cancellation of such warrants and the failure on the part of this administration to deport those whose deportation the law requires, even after their deportation is legally ordered, is lack of funds and political pressure upon the department by Representatives and Senators and other influential political personages, mainly from the cities filled with the foreign born. The same causes promote many other miscarriages of the law. Hear it, Members of Congress! Hear it, American people! Lack of funds necessary for the enforcement of the law and unholy political pressure are defeating the accomplishment of the purposes of your immigration laws.

Those illegally admitted and those whose deportation the law requires but does not accomplish are of the most undesirable classes. Many of them are dangerous communistic social or political disturbers. Many are idiotic, feeble-minded, or insane. Others have dangerous and loathsome diseases.

In a survey recently made by a thoroughly competent man with abundant facilities at his command it was found that American jails, prisons, charitable institutions, and asylums are filled and overflowing with the insane, feeble-minded, and other classes of social inadequates.

I quote extracts from the testimony of Dr. Spencer L. Dawes, medical examiner of the New York Hospital Commission and also president of the Interstate Conference on Immigration, representing the States of California, Washington, Illinois, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New York:

Mr. RAKER. Are we so helpless that they can pile these people in on us here from everywhere?

Doctor DAWES. Yes, sir. After they get in here. The trouble is that the law is not enforced at the ports of entry to-day. That is the secret of the whole game.

The CHAIRMAN. That is to say, it was not enforced this year or last year or the year before that?

Doctor DAWES. No, sir. And when I say that, understand that in particular I am not criticizing the officials at the ports of entry. There are not enough of them there. There are not the facilities there for examination of aliens at the various ports of entry.



I quote an extract from the testimony of Commissioner Curran, in charge of the immigration station at Ellis Island.

Mr. CURRAN. \* \* \* This request here is based on the desire to have uniformity of immigration traffic for the sake primarily of decent inspection, so that we can sort them, really sort them, and we can't do it when they are going by at the rate of one a minute, as they have done for days and days at Ellis Island, and I have stood there with the inspector and watched them—an immigrant a minute. That is not inspection or examination; that is just counting them off and waving good-by to them as they go ashore. That is just what you get when your traffic is bunched.

Mr. BOX. Right there—I am sorry to interrupt you—but your health officers, the Health Service, who give them a preliminary examination; don't they have to examine them in much the same way?

Mr. CURRAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOX. And isn't what you say of the work of the inspector very largely true of the work of the Health Service?

Mr. CURRAN. Yes, sir.

In a later statement Commissioner Curran said:

That will bring about two results: First, an inadequate inspection. Last summer, when we took over 2,000 a day to Ellis Island for inspection, we had to examine them at the rate of an immigrant a minute. That is not an inspection; that is counting them as they go by; and is almost, to my mind, an abdication of the protection to the country that is required, or any proper and adequate inspection. \* \* \*

Mr. CURRAN. Yes, sir; they wanted to land 3,000 or 4,000; and we said "No; that 2,000 was the limit. But we do not call that inspection; we call that counting them as they go by and detecting the gross inadmissibilities."

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would be well to put in the report of the committee on State affairs of the National Republican Club of New York, which deals entirely with the cost of alien defectives, the alien insane in the State of New York, and the desire of that State to collect from the United States \$17,000,000 for their expense.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish to insert it because it is much more concise than a pamphlet and more appropriate than the statement of Dr. Spencer L. Dawes. It carries this statement:

"On June 30, 1923, there were on the books of the State hospitals for the insane 41,302 patients, of whom 10,440 are aliens. Thus, over 25 per cent of the total population of the civil State hospitals are aliens."

Another excerpt from the report reads as follows:

It is high time that the State of New York, which is the greatest sufferer by reason of this condition, as well as the entire country, should vigorously insist upon the enactment of an immigration law not only defining what aliens shall not be admitted but also providing for effective administration and methods, particularly along the line of competent medical inspection and examination. The welfare and the rights of the State and of the Nation should be conserved, and neither the greed of steamship companies nor the desire of properly excludable aliens should be allowed longer to sweep over or around our immigration safeguards.

I quote from a statement made by the Interstate Conference on Immigration, held in New York City on October 24, 1923:

The chairman discussed at length laxity of enforcement based on a study of the records and on personal observation. He stated that he had seen immigrants passed as mentally and physically fit to enter the United States at the rate of eight a minute. He cited the testimony of a reporter of the New York Tribune who had seen 540 aliens passed at that same rate.

Passing to "bond cases" he said "that during the last fiscal year there were admitted under bond to the United States at Ellis Island 4,724 defective aliens who were excluded under the immigration law." This means that a bond was given, frequently with a false surety, which can never be prosecuted. The records of the Federal Government show that 95 per cent of those bonds are violated; these cases are spread all over the United States. They land in New York State—the Board of Charities takes care of them, the Commission for Mental Defectives, etc.; they get to the State of Washington, to Illinois—they were admitted mandatorily—Washington, D. C., said they should be admitted.

During the same year, 2,712 defective aliens were allowed to enter without bond; Ellis Island said they must not come in—they were defective. Of 12,976 other aliens found to belong to the excluded classes by medical officers at Ellis Island, 12,305 were permitted to enter by direct order from Washington—nearly 20,000 in all of the mandatorily excluded classes were permitted to enter the United States during the year.

This same deplorable failure in the enforcement of the laws excluding inadmissible people is shown by the official reports

of the Commissioners General of Immigration. I insert tables made by me from the official tables covering the number of those classes admitted according to the showing made by the official reports during each of the last six fiscal years:

Tables showing numbers and percentages of aliens admitted and deported after certification by surgeons of the United States Health Service which examines immigrants as mentally and physically defective, for fiscal years ended June 30, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, and 1923, with illustrative specifications covering certain diseases and defects among those certified.

1918.

Immigrants.	Number.	Approximate per cent.
Certified as mentally and physically defective.....	6,153	.....
Admitted of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	4,558	74
Deported of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	1,595	26

EXAMPLES OF DISEASES AND DEFECTS CERTIFIED AND PROPORTIONS OF EACH ADMITTED AND DEBARRED ENTERING INTO ABOVE TOTALS.

Disease or defect.	Admitted.	Deported.
Imbecile.....	1	6
Feeble-minded.....	16	20
Insanity.....	7	65
Veneral disease.....	102	135
Senility (from age).....	998	148
Malignant tumor.....	14	7
Deformity, malformation, ankylosis, cicatrix, permanent injury.....	355	81
Paralysis, atrophy.....	81	27
Undersized.....	13	1
Alcoholism.....	4	28
Admitted after hospital treatment.....	907	.....

(Annual report, Commissioner General Immigration, 1918, p. 201.)

1919.

Immigrants.	Number.	Approximate per cent.
Certified as mentally and physically defective.....	6,060	.....
Admitted of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	4,487	74
Deported of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	1,573	26

EXAMPLES OF DISEASES AND DEFECTS CERTIFIED AND PROPORTIONS OF EACH ADMITTED AND DEBARRED ENTERING INTO ABOVE TOTALS.

Disease or defect.	Admitted.	Deported.
Imbecile.....	2	8
Feeble-minded.....	1	28
Insanity.....	4	44
Epilepsy.....	5	21
Veneral disease.....	21	115
Senility (from age).....	703	131
Malignant tumor.....	21	8
Deformity, malformation, ankylosis, cicatrix, permanent injury.....	502	93
Paralysis, atrophy.....	91	48
Undersized.....	3	3
Alcoholism.....	.....	10
Admitted after hospital treatment.....	683	.....

(Annual report Commissioner General Immigration, 1919, p. 237.)

1920.

Immigrants.	Number.	Approximate per cent.
Certified as mentally and physically defective.....	13,279	.....
Admitted of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	11,541	87
Deported of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	1,738	13

EXAMPLES OF DISEASES AND DEFECTS CERTIFIED AND PROPORTIONS OF EACH ADMITTED AND DEBARRED ENTERING INTO ABOVE TOTALS.

Disease or defect.	Admitted.	Deported.
Imbecile.....	3	18
Feeble-minded.....	3	52
Insanity.....	6	52
Epilepsy.....	3	27
Veneral disease.....	52	161
Senility.....	5,524	110
Paralysis, atrophy.....	157	39
Malignant tumor.....	13	6
Deformity, malformation, ankylosis, cicatrix, permanent injury.....	755	89
Undersized.....	21	7
Alcoholism.....	1	7
Admitted after hospital treatment.....	903	.....

(Annual Report Commissioner General of Immigration, 1920, p. 252.)

Tables showing numbers and percentages of aliens admitted and deported after certification by surgeons, etc.—Continued.  
1921.

Immigrants.	Number.	Approximate per cent.
Certified as mentally and physically defective.....	33,295	.....
Admitted of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	20,953	93
Deported of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	2,342	7

EXAMPLES OF DISEASES AND DEFECTS CERTIFIED AND PROPORTIONS OF EACH ADMITTED AND DEBARRED ENTERING INTO ABOVE TOTALS.

Disease or defect.	Admitted.	Deported.
Imbecile.....	19	28
Feeble-minded.....	27	71
Insanity.....	13	83
Epilepsy.....	4	11
Veneral disease.....	46	311
Senility.....	14,734	116
Malignant tumor.....	9	3
Deformity, malformation, ankylosis, cicatrix, permanent injury.....	2,500	118
Paralysis, atrophy.....	286	33
Undersized.....	109	3
Alcoholism.....	.....	11
Admitted after hospital treatment.....	1,372	.....

(Annual report Commissioner General of Immigration, 1921, p. 131.)  
1922.

Immigrants.	Number.	Approximate per cent.
Certified as mentally and physically defective.....	21,316	.....
Admitted of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	19,113	90
Deported of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	2,203	10

EXAMPLES OF DISEASES AND DEFECTS CERTIFIED AND PROPORTIONS OF EACH ADMITTED AND DEBARRED ENTERING INTO ABOVE TOTALS.

Disease or defect.	Admitted.	Deported.
Imbecile.....	5	33
Feeble-minded.....	7	80
Insanity.....	11	73
Veneral disease.....	45	263
Epilepsy.....	1	15
Senility.....	7,421	111
Malignant tumor.....	14	5
Paralysis, atrophy.....	196	41
Deformity, malformation, ankylosis, cicatrix, permanent injury.....	1,839	133
Undersized.....	121	8
Alcoholism.....	.....	3
Admitted after hospital treatment.....	979	.....

(Annual report Commissioner General of Immigration, 1922, pp. 126-127.)  
1923.

Immigrants.	Number.	Approximate per cent.
Certified as mentally and physically defective.....	23,969	.....
Admitted of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	21,136	88
Deported of those certified as mentally and physically defective.....	2,833	12

EXAMPLES OF DISEASES AND DEFECTS CERTIFIED AND PROPORTIONS OF EACH ADMITTED AND DEBARRED ENTERING INTO ABOVE TOTALS.

Disease or defect.	Admitted.	Deported.
Imbecile.....	1	16
Feeble-minded.....	3	76
Insanity.....	4	62
Veneral disease.....	30	341
Epilepsy.....	1	15
Senility.....	5,623	112
Malignant tumor.....	16	4
Paralysis, atrophy.....	241	54
Deformity, malformation, ankylosis, cicatrix, permanent injury.....	2,430	145
Undersized.....	168	15
Alcoholism.....	1	2
Admitted after hospital treatment.....	550	.....

(Annual report, Commissioner General Immigration, 1923, pp. 142-143.)

A great many of the cases included in the tables and totals for these six years were disposed of by the Labor Department on appeal, but the greater number seem to have been decided by the primary inspectors and other immigration authorities at ports of entry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] asked me in his absence to yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. BOX. It must not be inferred that all these admissions were wrongful, though I believe the greater part of them were. In an effort to get the simple truth, without concealment and without exaggeration, I personally copied the figures given in these tables and submitted them to the Commissioner General of Immigration, from whose reports I had taken them, and requested him to point out any inaccuracies or wrongful inferences. He replied in writing that the figures harmonized with his records. In the same connection he wrote a long letter undertaking to show why the nonmedical inspectors, boards of inquiry, and the officials at the ports and at Washington were justified in admitting some tens of thousands who, according to the certificates of the Public Health Service, were of the classes excluded by law. In order that his explanation may be read in connection with my remarks I shall insert his letter at the conclusion of these remarks.

Many of these admissions were made by the Department at Washington "on appeal" to the Assistant Secretary of Labor by or in behalf of the excluded aliens. As illustrating the number of these appeals from excluding orders made at the ports for all causes to the Assistant Secretary of Labor, I give the following figures from reports of the Commissioners General of Immigration for the fiscal years 1918 to 1923, inclusive:

For 1918: Number of appeals, 3,618; number debarred, 2,555; 70 per cent; and number admitted on bond or otherwise, 1,063; 30 per cent. (Rept. 1918, p. 158.)

For 1919: Number of appeals, 4,121; number debarred, 3,109; 75 per cent; and number admitted on bond or otherwise, 1,012; 25 per cent. (Rept. 1919, p. 194.)

For 1920: Number of appeals, 4,812; number debarred, 2,950; 61 per cent; and number admitted on bond or otherwise, 1,862; 39 per cent. (Rept. 1920, pp. 204-205.)

For 1921: Number of appeals, 7,422; number debarred, 3,541; 48 per cent; and number admitted on bond or otherwise, 3,881; 52 per cent. (Rept. 1921, pp. 124-125.)

For 1922: Number of appeals, 12,828; number debarred, 5,244; 41 per cent; and number admitted on bond or otherwise, 7,584; 59 per cent. (Rept. 1922, p. 121.)

For 1923: Number of appeals, 14,506; number debarred, 6,247; 44 per cent; and number admitted on bond or otherwise, 8,259; 57 per cent. (Rept. 1923, p. 137.)

This summary of the results of appeals from excluding orders made at the ports shows an increasing percentage of admissions on appeal, running from 30 per cent and 25 per cent for 1918 and 1919, respectively, up to 59 per cent and 57 per cent for 1922 and 1923, respectively. These appeals are usually ex parte proceedings in the absence of both the alien and the physician who certifies that he is defective or diseased. In fact, about all that the department assistant usually has before him when he reviews the excluding decision is a brief paper record and a foreign bloc representative or a politician "with a pull."

In the same connection, and as showing some of the results of this serious failure to exclude or deport excludable or deportable aliens, I quote further from the statement of the National Republican Club of New York, appearing in the hearings.

Your committee recommends as follows:

1. That the Federal Government (a) through Congress by the enactment of law and the appropriation of sufficient funds, and through its proper officers in the adoption of methods and regulations, provide for and secure an adequate and competent medical examination of immigrants before entry, and a more efficient and rigid enforcement of the immigration law, particularly as regards the exclusion of excludable aliens and the deportation, without delay, of aliens legally shown by the authorities of the State of New York to be deportable.

(c) Regarding cancellation of warrants of arrest, that the Secretary of Labor, or such other officer as shall have the power to cancel such warrants, shall give due notice, with an opportunity to be heard, either in person or by letter, to the department or officer issuing the certificate, before a warrant, either of arrest or of deportation, is canceled.

<sup>1</sup> Approximate percentage.



The result of this miscarriage of our laws—of this folly in our failure to enforce them—is that we are enlarging to an alarming extent the proportion of our people who are mentally, morally, or physically defective. In support of this proposition I call your attention to the following:

The Abstract of the Census of 1920, page 97, shows that 65.3 per cent of our population is native born of native parentage and 34.7 per cent of the population is foreign born or of foreign-born or mixed parentage. Yet Doctor Laughlin, who made a survey of all the State and Federal institutions of the United States, found that the 65.3 per cent native born of native parentage furnished only 55.1 per cent of the inmates of institutions for those who are so defective or derelict as to require their being kept in custody, while the 34.7 per cent of foreign-born or mixed parentage furnished 44.9 per cent of the inmates of these institutions. (Hearings, 67th Cong., serial 7-C, p. 751.)

The same bad tendency is shown by kindred figures from the State of New York, whose population is 72.8 per cent native born and 27.2 per cent foreign born, but this 27.2 per cent foreign born furnishes 43.1 per cent of the inmates of the institutions for the insane, while the 72.8 per cent native-born population of that State furnishes only 56.9 per cent of the inmates of its insane asylums. (Abstract of Census of 1920, p. 103; testimony of Doctor Dawes, Hearings, 68th Cong., serial 1-A, p. 497.)

The number of the mentally diseased in care of public institutions throughout the United States has increased enormously during the last 40 years. I quote an excerpt from a statement by Dr. Walker L. Treadway, surgeon, medical officer in charge of the Public Health Service at Boston:

The rate of mental diseases under care in public institutions has increased during the past 40 years from 81.6 per 100,000 to 220.1 per 100,000 in the general population. This enormous increase in the number of persons requiring care in public institutions has entailed a great outlay of public funds for buildings and equipment and an increased yearly expenditure for their care. \* \* \*

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. BOX. That foreign groups, industrial interests, and politicians have borne with hard unholy political pressure against the enforcement of the 3 per cent quota law, as they have against other portions of the law, is shown by the testimony of Assistant Secretary of Labor Henning, who, speaking of appeals for the admission of excess quota immigrants, said:

Just as I was trying to get out some Congressman's stenographer came in with an armful of them and I went through them hurriedly. (Hearings December 19, 1921, p. 224.)

And by the statement of Chairman JOHNSON, as reported on page 235 of the same hearings:

\* \* \* ; neither do I think we are justified in leaving conditions as they are, with Members of Congress working for their constituents, with Senators working for their constituents, further pressing the department.

The enforcement of the 3 per cent quota law has been discreditable and subversive of its purpose. Repeatedly great groups, numbering thousands, have been admitted in plain violation of its terms. Congress has twice during the last three years stultified itself by pretending to validate these lawless acts months after they were done. On one Christmas occasion the gift of illegal admissions was generously bestowed on some 1,200 or more in the following language:

To officers of the United States Immigration Service:

By direction of Secretary, aliens now being held in detention all sea-ports solely because in excess of quota, and those who may arrive on or before the 25th instant and be so held, are hereby landed for a period of 90 days on execution of their personal bonds or personal-bonds relatives, with additional understanding that bonds with qualified sureties may later be required.

This order will not apply to those seeking admission and who are therefore in detention. Expedite to fullest possible extent release for all aliens who may be affected by this decision.

W. W. HUSBAND, Commissioner General.

The foregoing generous order applied to the 1,200 who were then at the stations in New York and Boston and, in addition, all quota cases among the Hungarians, Poles, and Italians in the harbor and coming up the bay at New York and all who

might be on the sea on December 24 and 25 who arrived on or before the latter date.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman's figures are very interesting with reference to insanity, and I will state that before the Veterans' Bureau Committee recently testimony has been brought to us that in civil life the insane are about 3 to the 1,000, and among the veterans of the World War it runs about 6 to the 1,000.

Mr. BOX. I have personally visited the ports several times and minutely observed the work of inspection. The persistent efforts of labor importers, foreign groups, and politicians and the result of their work have likewise been noted.

First. The 3 per cent quota law has been and is so poorly enforced that its purpose has been in considerable measure defeated, though it has accomplished much.

Second. Scores of thousands of inadmissible aliens are coming in from Canada, Mexico, and adjacent islands, and at the ports. Some of this is unavoidable. The greater part of it is due to insufficient appropriations and consequent lack of men to enforce the law.

Third. The greater number of the admissions at the ports after the aliens have been certified as diseased or defective have been wrongful, in plain violation of the law, and in defeat of its salutary purposes. I personally stood by an inspector on a ship in New York Harbor and saw him pass a senile woman. As he did so he remarked, "She has been certified as senile, but I shall pay no attention to that. Senator — is interested in her." Political and business powers from the centers largely populated by the foreign born persistently interfere with the faithful administration of the law by pleading for and demanding the admission of mandatorily excluded aliens. The executive department feels compelled to heed these demands as far as possible. The result is a discreditable and distressing failure to enforce the law in hundreds, probably many thousands, of cases.

Fourth. Many large foreign-born groups already here are at enmity with the law, as the friends of the liquor traffic are at enmity with the prohibition laws. They resort to every means to prevent its operating to exclude aliens. To this source may be traced another large part of the law's failure.

Fifth. Those in charge at Washington are guilty of flagrant and continued violation of the law. I thought that Louis F. Post, the former Assistant Secretary of Labor, was not properly enforcing this law. I therefore advised the Rules Committee, composed chiefly of Republicans, then considering an impeachment resolution against him, that in my judgment he was not in sympathy with the law and was therefore not the man to be charged with its enforcement. I am fully convinced that the present Department of Labor is failing to a ruinous extent, and that its failure is due to weakness and political influence. The monstrous idea that they are not bound to enforce the law as it is written, but may break it at will to avoid hardships, is inconsistent with any efficient enforcement. All laws faithfully enforced sometimes crush men who come in conflict with them seeking to defeat their purposes. That officials may set aside mandatory statutes at their discretion is preposterous, and the official who does it is unworthy of his place.

For at least six years there has been much of this in the enforcement of the immigration laws. Unless the country can find men of sufficient conscience and firmness to apply the law, the purpose behind all former legislation and this bill will fail. That purpose is the protection of the Nation against a recognized peril. Unless we have strength to execute the law, foreign groups, whose alien affinities rule them, and labor importers, whose greed subordinates their patriotism, will have their way, and America will be filled with the poison and fire which have flooded the Old World with the miseries of perdition. [Applause.]

EXTENSION.

Being a copy of the letter of the Hon. W. W. Husband, Commissioner General of Immigration, explaining why so many aliens certified as diseased and defective by the examining physicians are nevertheless admitted, and comments thereon:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION,  
Washington, February 9, 1924.

Hon. JOHN C. BOX, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BOX: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 6 inclosing certain tables showing the disposition of cases in which medical certificates had been issued in connection with aliens

applying for admission in the fiscal years 1918-1923, inclusive. I have had these checked over by our statistical division, and they are found to be in accordance with the bureau records.

In explanation of why large numbers of aliens are admitted notwithstanding certificates showing physical or other defects have been issued by the examining medical officer I can perhaps do no better than to quote the following from a recent letter of the department in answer to a similar inquiry as to the record for the fiscal year 1923. The department stated in part:

"You are, of course, aware that the mere fact that an alien is certified for a physical defect which in the opinion of the medical examiner affects the ability of the alien to earn a living does not in itself render an alien inadmissible, but that the immigration officers at the port must consider such medical certificate in connection with all of the surrounding circumstances and decide the case accordingly. For instance, of the number against whom medical certificates were rendered, 5,623 were certified for senility, it being the invariable custom for the medical examiners to attach to such medical certification the statement that the disability may affect the ability of the alien to earn a living.

"The fact remains, however, that approximately 95 per cent of these aliens are the parents of aliens already here, who are both able and willing to properly care for them, and who, themselves, are not expected to engage in remunerative employment. Without in any manner intending to reflect upon the work of the public-health doctors assigned to immigration inspection, as I believe they are performing a most meritorious service and almost without exception are conscientious and painstaking in their duties, it appears that there are some medical examiners who make it a practice to certify almost all aliens over the age of 55 as being afflicted with senility; but when all the surrounding circumstances are taken into consideration, there would seem to be no justification either for the officers at the port or for the department when such cases come before it on appeal to exclude such aliens merely because of the medical certification.

"There are numerous other causes, such as deformity, hernia, pregnancy, less than normal function, loss of member, etc., for which medical certificates are rendered, but when considered in connection with the other facts in the case, which, of course, the medical examiners can not take into consideration, it is quite apparent that such 'deformities,' 'loss of member,' etc., would in no wise affect the ability of the alien to earn a living. For instance, if a jeweler, bookkeeper, or any other person engaged in occupations of a sedentary nature, were to be certified for deformity of the hip, loss of the nether extremities, etc., it could hardly be considered that such defect would impair their earning capacity. In fact, one of the officers in the principal districts has stated that over 90 per cent of the medical certificates rendered might be considered in the nature of marks of identification.

"As you are no doubt aware, the seventh proviso to section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917, provides that aliens returning after a temporary absence to an unrelinquished United States domicile of seven consecutive years may be admitted in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor and under such conditions as he may prescribe. It is not at all unusual to have it develop in cases comprehended within this class that the alien has resided practically all of his life in the United States; that the ailment for which he is certified was contracted in this country; and that he has a wife and minor children residing here. The department has taken it for granted that the particular provision of law mentioned was designed to take care of just such cases, which seems the only logical conclusion if one is to be guided at all by the dictates of common decency and humanity. You understand, of course, that the medical officers can not take these matters into consideration when rendering their medical certificates, and if aliens so certified are admitted under this particular provision, the medical certificates would remain a matter of record. This circumstance might apply to any one or all of the aliens shown to have been certified for ailments which render them mandatorily excludable, and I have no doubt that they do apply to a large majority of the cases shown in the inclosed table.

"I might state, in this connection, that only a few days ago the department was confronted with a case wherein a family was returning to the United States after a temporary visit to one of the European countries. This family, when it first came to the United States, was accompanied by an infant child against which no medical certification was then rendered. When the family returned, however, this child, which is now, according to my recollection, in the neighborhood of 18 years, was certified as being an imbecile. The case was presented to the solicitor for an opinion as to whether this child could be considered as comprehended within the seventh proviso to section 3, already mentioned, and the solicitor's opinion was in the affirmative. Consequently, the

department directed admission. I am sure that it could not be logically argued that the entire family which knew no home other than the United States should have been refused permission to reenter simply because of this afflicted child, or that the child in its helplessness should have been separated from the parents.

"Another circumstance which might explain the admission of such aliens is the fact that it has been the practice for a long time past to admit aliens for the purpose of obtaining medical treatment in this country where it is shown that similar treatment is not obtainable in the country from whence the alien comes. This applies particularly to a large number of aliens who are admitted from Canada for the purpose of obtaining treatment in the Mayo Institute, Rochester, Minn., and also to considerable numbers who are permitted to undergo treatment for tuberculosis at Saranac Lake, N. Y., and elsewhere. In fact, there are certain organizations, such as the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, the International Typographical Union, and others, which have filed a blanket bond with this department under which their members residing in Canada are permitted to enter the institutions maintained by them, there being no possibility of such aliens becoming public charges nor there being any danger of spread of contagion resulting from their admission.

"By reference to section 22 of the immigration act, it will be noted provision is made that whenever an alien shall have been naturalized or shall have taken up his permanent residence in this country and thereafter shall send for his wife or minor children to join him, and said wife or any of said minor children shall be found to be affected with any contagious disorder, such wife or minor children may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be accorded hospital treatment until cured and then be admitted. This provision also accounts for a large number of those shown to have been admitted, particularly those affected with trachoma or venereal diseases."

In this connection the department did not take into account the joint resolution of October 19, 1918, under which section 3 of the immigration act of 1917, known as the excluding section, was very materially modified for the benefit of aliens who served in the United States forces or those of the allied nations during the World War. The terms of this resolution applied to aliens returning within two years after the termination of the war, and the fact that this was in force up to March, 1923, undoubtedly accounts for the admission of a considerable number of defective aliens who otherwise might, and in many cases undoubtedly would, have been denied admission to the country.

I am returning the tables, as requested, and trust that I have given you the information you desire. Additional information as to any specific point will be gladly furnished if desired.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. HUSBAND,  
Commissioner General.

COMMENT BY MR. BOX.

The record of the thousands of appeals to Washington from excluding decisions made by the hard-pressed port inspectors and of large and increasing percentages of admissions by overruling the port inspectors, as revealed by the commissioner general's own annual reports, shows that the doctors, port inspectors, and boards of inquiry who see and examine the diseased and defective immigrants do not agree with the Washington authorities, who see the attorneys and politicians about them.

They also show that the New York National Republican Club was right in saying that there is need of "a more efficient and rigid enforcement of the immigration law, particularly as regards the exclusion of excludable aliens," and corroborates Dr. Spencer L. Dawes, of the New York Hospital Commission and president of the Interstate Conference on Immigration, when he said "that he had seen immigrants passed as mentally and physically fit to enter the United States at the rate of eight a minute"; that "there were admitted under bond to the United States at Ellis Island 4,724 defective aliens who were excluded under the immigration law" during the last fiscal year, and that "during the same year 2,712 defective aliens were allowed to enter without bond; Ellis Island said they must not come in—they were defective. Of 12,976 other aliens found to belong to the excluded classes by medical officers at Ellis Island, 12,305 were permitted to enter by direct order from Washington; nearly 20,000, in all, of the mandatorily excluded classes were permitted to enter the United States during the year." I quote these statements of Dr. Spencer L. Dawes without personal knowledge as to the exact figures, but because he is in position to know and his statements are strongly corroborative of the facts stated by me in the foregoing remarks.

[Mr. FRENCH was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD on the pending bill.]



Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, in common with all the Members of the House, I presume, there came to my desk about 10 days ago, in anticipation of the discussion of the bonus bill, a letter from a gentleman who purports to be the head of the Antibus League of the United States. In that communication he imparted to me some startling information.

This startling information was to the effect that if the bonus was passed by Congress the measure of the obligation chargeable to the fourth Michigan congressional district, based on population, would be the significant sum of \$10,149,000.

In view of the fact that this district is undoubtedly an average one and this burden seemed rather tremendous, relatively speaking, my mind was naturally challenged by the statement, and I thought I would undertake an analysis of the situation to see what the exact facts were, and with the further thought that these facts might be of some interest to the members of the committee, I have asked these few minutes to present to you what the facts are as I find them from a survey of the actual conditions in this district. For the fiscal year which ended in 1923, the congressional district which I represent paid into the National Treasury a total of \$1,743,200, in all sorts of internal revenue, assuming that ours is an average district for the revenue district in which the congressional district is located. Segregating this \$1,743,200 to personal income taxes, corporation taxes, and miscellaneous taxes, the figures run as follows: \$610,125 to personal income taxes, \$610,125, or practically the same amount, to corporation taxes, and \$522,950 to miscellaneous taxes.

In this congressional district there are 8,135 Federal income tax returns filed according to the latest report. Taking the proportion of income tax which these personal income-tax payers return to the Government, I find that the average per return for this congressional district is \$75. Please keep the \$75 in mind.

The Budget this year for the United States is \$3,019,000,000, and taking the figures as estimated by the Ways and Means Committee as to the annual cost of the soldiers' bonus as it is to be reported to us as being \$105,000,000 per year, this would make an increase, assuming it is to be an increase, of 3½ per cent in the Budget and a corresponding increase in the amount of taxes paid in the various revenue-collection districts. Three and a half per cent of the total amount that we paid in our congressional district for the year 1923 would be \$61,012 for just one year, or a total for the 20-year period of \$1,220,240, instead of the alarming sum of \$10,149,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Possibly the exponent of the Antibus League thought you were going to raise this money by the tariff, and if you did, inasmuch as under the present system every dollar that went into the Treasury would cost your people \$10, in order to raise \$1,000,000 it would cost your district \$10,000,000.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am at a loss to understand how the figures given by the gentleman could have been finally produced.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. It will take me but a moment more to complete my statement, and then I will gladly yield to my colleague.

The 3½ per cent increase on \$75 would amount to \$2.62 additional on each income-tax return filed. This surely would not be a heavy burden to the individual income-tax payer, in view of the reduction of 50 per cent just provided on such incomes in the revenue measure recently passed by the House.

These are as close as I can get the figures from one congressional district, and I thought possibly they would be of considerable interest to others who might have been troubled somewhat by the rather astonishing figures from the president of the Antibus League. Let me turn the situation the other way around. If it were true that this congressional district would pay \$10,149,000 as its share of the bonus, then on that basis the whole country would pay \$16,915,000,000, instead of \$2,119,000,000. I have brought this to your attention in order to indicate to you the length to which some gentlemen will go in order to create a wrong impression in the minds of those of us who are honestly trying to face this proposition.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I was attracted by the question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]

as to where this money is coming from with which to pay the bonus. Evidently no one expects it to come from Mississippi, at least no one who reads and knows what the returns in the shape of taxes are which the different States make. Last year Mississippi paid into the Federal Treasury from internal revenue taxes, income taxes, and so forth, \$3,000,000 out of about \$3,000,000,000 that were turned in by all of the States. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] is justified in talking about what is paid in by Michigan and portions of it. Michigan paid \$187,000,000 into the Treasury last year, just 50 times as much as did the State of Mississippi.

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

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. I notice the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] has been figuring considerably upon the bonus and it occurred to me that perhaps he is prepared to answer the celebrated question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] as to whether the tax will pay this bonus. That question has not been asked for a week or two.

Mr. KETCHAM. In reply to the gentleman may I say that I have been very greatly impressed by the statement which appears in the newspapers, credited to the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN], that it is expected that the savings which will very soon be made in vocational training and certain other features of our war welfare expenditures will care for the amount to be annually appropriated and set aside as a sinking fund to meet the maturing insurance policies. This should be comforting to all who have feared an actual increase in Federal taxes if the bonus bill passes.

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

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. In reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, which has brought out this bill to run over the Congress and the ex-service men, I desire to say that one reason taxes from Mississippi do not go more into the Treasury of the United States directly is because so much money goes into the pockets of the manufacturers who collect it through the tariff, and according to the gentleman's figures we are entitled to at least a full share of the adjusted compensation, because we furnished a greater proportion of soldiers for the amount of property we had to protect, and I do not believe his figures get him anywhere when it comes to comparing them, to show that this is the reason why the masses of the American people should be taxed \$10 through a tariff where only \$1 is poured into the Treasury.

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

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. TINCER. I suppose the argument of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in respect to the tariff, injected into this bonus speech, comes because those States that believe in free trade believe also in free soldiers, and have not paid their soldiers in cash any bonus, and are now, therefore, dissatisfied with the insurance which the committee had reported.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] for his courtesy in yielding me time, and to the gentlemen of the committee for granting the privilege of extending my remarks. I have made the request for extension because of the fact that it is not possible in the time allotted me to discuss adequately the matter I have in mind.

I want to speak with reference to one feature of the pending bill which seems no longer controversial. A few years ago the mere mention of it led to agitated debate and there was much difference of opinion concerning it. The difference of opinion grew out of a lack of familiarity with the subject, but by this time its practical importance as a proper matter for legislative consideration and action has been forced upon our attention in the hard school of experience.

It is my purpose to discuss briefly the history and importance of the helium project in this country. When I first became a Member of this body in the Sixty-sixth Congress, it naturally fell upon my shoulders to seek to get an adequate appropriation for the continuance of the operation of the helium plant, because I live in the city of Fort Worth, Tex., where it is located. Owing to the fact that the three original experimental plants, at which the feasibility of the project was determined, were called argon plants, helium by its true name was as much

Greek to the public as the language from which the word is derived. These experimental establishments were known as argon plants during the war in order that, for purposes of military safety and caution, the secrets of helium might not become generally known. The public were excluded from these plants and the secret experimentation was carefully guarded. Under these circumstances, when I first appeared in my efforts to get an appropriation for a helium plant, some of the Members looked at me as if they wondered whether I was talking about a patent medicine or a new breakfast food. The subject had been discussed very little in the magazines, and perhaps less in the press, and there was no general familiarity with it. During the great world conflict helium had been traveling incognito, and it was only after the cessation of war that it came to public attention undisguised.

The progress which has been made in such a brief period in the production of helium and in the ascertainment of the purposes to which helium is adapted is almost incredible. There are probably many new Members in this Congress who have not had an opportunity to hear the subject discussed, and it is this fact largely which has led me to make these remarks to-day. In the first place, therefore, let me talk about it in an elementary way, for my one desire is to try to give helpful information. In deference to myself I should state, however, that I do not claim to be a helium expert. Such education as I have received has been along the line of the arts rather than the sciences, but as a layman I have given the matter considerable study. And perhaps the observations of a layman on the subject will be more readily understood, anyway, because they will be free from technical terms intelligible only to those with some scientific training.

What is helium? It seems to be generally conceded now that helium is an element, like oxygen and hydrogen. It is a gas which is inert and which is not noxious. It is noninflammable and noncombustible. By reason of its buoyancy it has 92 per cent of the lifting power of hydrogen, which is the lightest of known gases.

How did it get its name? Why is it called helium? Back in 1868 some scientists were observing an eclipse of the sun. They found in the solar chromosphere an element unknown at that time on the earth. It made a little yellow line in the spectrum, a line somewhat akin to that made by sodium, but it was sufficiently differentiated to convince these observers that it was not sodium. It was a chemical curiosity, and such it remained for many years. There was no known counterpart in the world for this strange element of the heavens. Now, the Greek word for sun is Helios; and, in view of the fact that this mysterious gas made its first manifestation to science in the sun, it was appropriately termed helium in honor of the great orb of day. The scientists felt that, though there might be nothing new under the sun, they had certainly found something new in the sun.

Later light on the subject, scientific rather than natural, brought the revelation that this heavenly stranger had deigned to reside also on this mundane sphere, and fortunately for us the United States of America seem to furnish the principal scene of the earthly visitation. It was first discovered on the earth, it appears, in some effervescing springs abroad; then, in inconsequential measure, in the air. The chemists began a curious and diligent search for it and succeeded in separating a few cubic feet from uranium ores. Up until the time we went into the war in 1917 these few cubic feet of this chemical curiosity represented the world output of extracted helium. These had been obtained in laboratories at the prohibitive cost of from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per cubic foot. Helium was then but an expensive plaything for the scientists. Several years before that time Professor Cady, of the University of Kansas, had determined from experimentation in that State that it might sometimes be expected to appear in natural gas. He made this discovery in certain natural gas in Kansas, but the volume of the known supply of this particular gas at that time seemed hardly sufficient to justify any extensive operation in extraction. Besides the percentage of helium in that gas was quite low.

The results of this experimentation, however, led to a very satisfactory discovery. Just before our entrance into the World War helium was found in some gas wells which were drilled at Petrolia, Tex., about 104 miles north of the city of Fort Worth. It developed that there was approximately 1 per cent of helium in this gas, and it has been learned that that percentage affords a very profitable basis for practical operation in extraction. This is a relatively high content of helium. Just how the helium gets in the natural gas is still a matter of scientific conjecture. I have been informed that helium is one of the elements into which radium finally breaks up.

There may be some activity of radium down in the earth which accounts for the presence of helium in this natural gas. That is a matter about which I must confess that I know nothing. At any rate, it is present in some natural gases and absent from others, and the men of technical skill and training are still trying to solve the mystery.

The advantages of the use of helium in lighter-than-air craft appealed at once, of course, to the Government authorities. If a sufficient volume of it were available its service in war might be of incalculable value. That highly inflammable gas, hydrogen, had cost much in the loss of life and property. A noninflammable gas to take its place would save both, and also multiply efficiency. Naturally the Government was deeply interested in the Petrolia discovery. If helium could be had to replace hydrogen in lighter-than-air craft a great problem would be solved. The Government determined, therefore, to see if some feasible method could be found of extracting the helium from the natural gas. Fortunately, the volume of gas at Petrolia appeared to be adequate for quantity production. The one thing necessary was the separation of the helium. How could it be done?

Bear in mind that prior to 1917 the minimum cost of separating a single cubic foot of helium had been \$1,500. A realization of this fact will help us to appreciate the subsequent accomplishments.

Three experimental plants were started under Government operation. As I have said, they were called argon plants. Two of them were located at Fort Worth and one at Petrolia. Two were placed at Fort Worth because of the fact that at the little town of Petrolia sufficient power and water were not available for the purpose. A different process was tried in each plant. It seemed from the experimentation that the most practical one at the time was that of the Linde Co. From the successful operation of these experimental plants the United States had 210,000 cubic feet of helium on the docks at New Orleans ready for shipment to France at the date of the signing of the armistice. That was several hundred times as much helium as had ever been extracted previously in the whole world. And what did it cost? Mirabile dictu, 40 cents a cubic foot. From \$1,500 to 40 cents. Surely that was a drop that rivaled Niagara. In times of peace 40 cents would likely be prohibitive, but as an element of offense and defense in war helium seemed practically invaluable. We shall see that this cost has been reduced almost incredibly in the short time of the Government's operation since the war.

In view of the fact that reasonably cheap extraction seemed both possible and probable, the Government determined to build a permanent plant for the production of helium. That plant has been maintained at Fort Worth, Tex., since about the time of the conclusion of the war. It was constructed when war prices were prevailing and cost about \$2,000,000. A pipe line was also built by the Government from Fort Worth to Petrolia, 104 miles, at a cost of more than \$1,500,000. The helium-producing wells in this gas field were owned by a private company, and a contract was entered into by the Government with that company for the privilege of extracting the helium from some of the gas. The contract also contained clauses designed to conserve this helium supply in part, at least, by restricting the output of the gas to be used for commercial purposes.

As I have stated, the Linde process has been used in the operation of this production plant. It may be interesting to know, in a general way, how the helium is extracted from the gas. Through refrigeration by compression and expansion all of the constituent elements of the gas except helium are liquefied. The nitrogen, for instance, is liquefied. They create a temperature of about 300° below zero. At this low temperature all the elements except the helium become liquid. The helium is drawn off and stored in metal cylinders which hold about 190 cubic feet each under pressure. The liquefied gases are then returned to the gaseous state, put back in the mains, and used commercially. Of course, the gas is better for commercial use after the helium has been taken from it, inasmuch as helium is a nonburning element.

The helium project is supported on a 50-50 basis by the Army and Navy, one-half of the necessary appropriation being carried in the supply bill for each of these services. The operation of the plant itself is conducted by the Navy, and the output is appropriately divided. Storage facilities are available at the plant for several million cubic feet. The entire project is under the supervision of the Helium Board, composed of one member from each of the following departments: War, Navy, and Interior.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly.



Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. What is the capacity of the helium field in Texas?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman that, fortunately, they have been finding some new wells down there containing helium-bearing gas—some about Petrolia and some in other sections of the State. If you mean to inquire how much gas we have from which to extract helium, I will say that it is largely a matter of conjecture; but if properly conserved there is certainly enough for many years of operation. This inquiry leads me to say some things further which may be of interest and which, to my mind, are of great importance. This country has practically all of the known sources of supply of helium in the entire world. In its almost monopolistic possession of helium this is a favored Nation.

No other country on earth, according to the information now available, has this rare element in sufficient volume to make its continued extraction feasible either commercially or as a factor in national defense. There is a little in Canada, and some in Italy and Czechoslovakia, but it is relatively insignificant. It seems that we have been peculiarly blessed by the Almighty with this wonderful asset of offense and defense. That we are making the most of this natural and national advantage is not so certain. The annual wastage of helium in the United States is estimated at 500,000,000 cubic feet. In other words, our yearly contribution of it to thin air is almost one hundred times as much as the total of all that has ever been separated from its gaseous host and made available for practical use. The mere statement of this fact forces upon our attention the importance of its conservation. Shall we continue this lavish and prodigal waste of an element valuable both in peace and in war, and which, for practical purposes, is our exclusive possession? There is a bill now pending before the Committee on Military Affairs whose purpose is to provide for proper conservation. Practically all of the helium-bearing gas in this country is privately owned. As this gas is being used commercially without being processed the helium is being lost. Practically no geological structure containing a natural gas bearing helium to an appreciable extent has been discovered on our public lands.

This statement naturally prompts an inquiry as to where helium is found in the United States. In addition to Texas, it has been discovered in Oklahoma, Kansas, Ohio, southern Illinois, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, and New York. In other words, a strip of land beginning in north Texas and running in a northeasterly direction into New York includes the most available territory. The greater volume of it seems to be in the southern part of this area. It has been found also in a few isolated spots in the West, but the preponderance of the gas, so far as known, is located in the sections indicated.

I wish now to say a few words concerning the capacity of the plant. I have said that up to 1917 only a few cubic feet had ever been separated, but in January of this year the United States Government extracted at this plant a million cubic feet of helium. That is almost half enough to fill the *Shenandoah*, our large dirigible. And a very significant feature of this extraction is that the helium was obtained for 6½ cents a cubic foot. When you are thinking of progress, stop and consider that accomplishment. I attended a hearing this morning before the Committee on Patents and heard a gentleman discuss progress in an interesting and learned way. He said that the original ideas of Mr. Alexander Graham Bell's invention of the telephone, of Mr. Marconi's wireless communication, and of the Wright brothers' flying machine might have amounted to but little in a practical way but for the subsequent discoveries and developments which have facilitated their general use. The mere finding of helium in the sun, and later on the earth, might have amounted to but little in a practical way had we not by persistent experimentation subsequently demonstrated the fact that we can extract in one month 1,000,000 cubic feet of it at a reduction in cost from \$1,500 a cubic foot to 6½ cents. Think of the progress that has come in this new project in the brief course of seven years. And I may say, further, that the successful testing of a new process practically assures the extraction of helium at a cost of about 3 cents a cubic foot.

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

Mr. LANHAM. Gladly.

Mr. LITTLE. Is it not a fact that Professor Cady, a constituent of mine in Kansas, has made some important discoveries in connection with helium?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. He made in Kansas the discovery of helium in natural gas, which seems to be the only practical source for getting it in sufficient volume.

Mr. LITTLE. Then my constituent had a large part in the progress that has been made?

Mr. LANHAM. He did, and I am glad to see given to him his proper meed of praise.

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

Mr. LANHAM. Under the leave extended so graciously by you gentlemen, I shall extend my remarks in the Record. [Applause.]

I desire in this extension of remarks to discuss further the practical application of the discovery and extraction of helium to the pursuits of peace and war. And it is interesting to observe, in passing, that in the entire period of experimentation, operation, and development of this project we have expended only about one-fourth of the cost of a single battleship, despite the fact that much of our expenditure was made during the prevalence of war prices. Helium also has an advantage over the warship in that it is durable. That which was extracted in the experimental plants tests just as pure to-day as when it was first obtained. Let us consider briefly some of its advantages over hydrogen, which it is so rapidly supplanting in our lighter-than-air operations.

Hydrogen is limited in the period of its utility. After it has become contaminated with air, a highly explosive mixture is formed, which is worthless as an agent in aviation because of the attendant danger. Helium, on the contrary, never ceases to be an available asset. When contaminated, it may be repurified at a nominal cost and used over and over again. I understand that the necessary machinery for this operation may be transported on two flat cars. Subjected, therefore, to the critical analysis of cold calculation in dollars and cents, the inert helium is not displaced as an agent in aviation by the active hydrogen which roars and flashes its claims to consideration in explosions in dirigibles and the consequent loss of men and material. In the *Roma* disaster we lost more than 30 trained men. The *Roma*, the *ZR-2*, and *C-2* have all gone the hydrogen route to the scrap heap. The flying of dirigibles with helium has not been attended with the loss of either ships or men. For my part—and I speak as a layman lacking in technical knowledge and skill—I doubt the wisdom of even permitting brave American boys to imperil their lives and their usefulness to the Nation by going up in balloons that are needlessly filled with hydrogen. With helium, safety is possible; safety is economical. Why not have it?

It seems to be generally agreed that if the *Shenandoah* had been filled with hydrogen when it broke from its mooring mast the men and the ship would have perished in an awful catastrophe.

Hydrogen evinces a fiery and explosive disposition. I am told that one who is smoking is not permitted to approach nearer than 100 yards to a hydrogen-filled dirigible. About one that is inflated with helium one may smoke with impunity. Helium is passive, well behaved, and manifests no tendency at all to break up the party. It approximates much more nearly than hydrogen the scriptural definition of charity—it "vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, does not behave itself unseemly, is not easily provoked." Its use naturally relieves the tension of the crew. It is an old saying that "it is better to be safe than sorry." Perhaps we have not learned that lesson absolutely in our lighter-than-air flying, but we have certainly advanced beyond the primer stage. It is very much easier to sell the helium idea now that hydrogen has hurled so many trained men into eternity and so many dirigibles into the discard of the junk pile. Safety in aerial sailing makes for a clear head and a stout heart. It stimulates concentration upon the purpose in mind.

The experts tell us that the leakage of helium through fabrics is only about 10 per cent of that of hydrogen. And, besides, the invulnerability of helium-filled airships to gunfire, to the once troublesome incendiary bullet, is a distinct point in favor of the use of this new element. It goes Achilles one better. Also, the greater possibilities in mechanical construction of helium-filled ships afford the opportunity for a direct drive and the consequent enhancement of speed and effectiveness. Hearings before committees have brought out the fact that both the Army and Navy Air Services contemplate the use of large, rigid dirigibles for transporting troops and naval personnel, and also mother ships for airplanes and their equipment that will be serviceable from coast to coast and far out from our continental shores. In fact, the cruising radius of airships is a vital point in their importance. They can remain in the air for long periods of time and cover great distances, and thus they become the most logical craft for search and reconnaissance scouting. Their ability to hover seems to be surpassed only by that of the national debt, and their consequent availability in bombing operations is apparent.

We are being taught constantly in the school of experience that the achievements of the past are but an earnest of the things which the future holds in store. This is no time for a near-sighted policy. We need eyes that in the scope of their vision will rival the strides of the old, fabulous 7-league boots. I hope that we may have no necessity for further wars. Fortunately, the uses of helium are adapted also to times of peace. A large commercial company is now contemplating the establishment of transportation routes with helium-filled dirigibles. An agent has testified before a committee of this House concerning this matter, and he has stated that the trip from New York to Chicago could be made easily and safely in one night. But if war should come, it seems that rigid airships filled with helium are destined to become one of the most important factors in national defense and offense, both by land and sea. Just a little flight of the imagination will picture the possible flights of these mighty leviathans of the air. Colonel Lucas, the English officer who made the trans-Atlantic trips in the *R-34*, has given, according to my information, some most interesting statements concerning the possibilities of helium-filled dirigibles in times of war. We are told that Germany was even preparing to bomb New York from a hydrogen-filled dirigible. No other nation possesses helium, and for the purposes of peace and war our aerial future should be made correspondingly secure.

The first real flight with helium in the history of the world was made on Monday, December 5, 1921, by the Navy blimp *C-7*. The weather conditions were quite unfavorable, but the attempt was entirely successful. In a snowstorm this small dirigible, inflated with about 190,000 cubic feet of helium, journeyed from Norfolk to Washington and then returned, after circling the Capital City. There had been two brief preliminary test flights at Hampton Roads. It was my pleasure to witness a part of this flight and also to speak concerning it in the House on the day of its occurrence. That initial trip demonstrated the superiority of helium over hydrogen in other respects than its safety. It was found that the use of helium facilitated the operation of a dirigible in many important ways.

Since that time the use of helium has been greatly extended in lighter-than-air flying, both in the Army and Navy branches of the service. I had the privilege the latter part of November of taking an hour's ride over Fort Worth in the Army dirigible *TC-3*. It was the first time I was ever physically up in the air. The use of helium made the jaunt an entirely safe one and I enjoyed the experience thoroughly. We sailed over the helium plant and thus for the first time brought into proximity the respective agencies of cause and effect in this wonderful project. In exemplification of the possibilities of such flight the engines were stopped temporarily and we hovered in mid-air. One of the crew left the car and went upon the engine platform to demonstrate the ease with which necessary adjustments and repairs could be made in flight. And this was all happening in less than seven years from the time when helium was an exorbitantly expensive chemical curiosity.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts has given on the floor of the House a most interesting talk on the proposed polar explorations of the *Shenandoah*. In the light of past performance and present accomplishment, who can say with authority that the achievement is impossible? The dreams of yesterday are the realities of to-day. Of course, I have no personal familiarity with Arctic conditions. Certainly there are some circumstances which augur well. The continuous daylight would prevent the varying expansion and contraction of the gas, which occur in this country with the frequent successive periods of day and night. Under conditions otherwise normal, this fact would facilitate the flight. The distance from Nome to Spitzbergen directly over the pole is but little more than half the cruising radius of the *Shenandoah*. The trip could likely be made in about four days. We have been advised that the purpose of this proposed journey is not the red-discovery of the pole, but rather the exploration of a great area of unknown territory. One thing is certain. This is the only country under the sun which is able to use in such an effort that wonderful element discovered in the sun which renders a dirigible entirely safe from destruction by explosion. Whether it may be done will likely be a fact of history before the lapse of another seven years.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I trust my colleagues will pardon me for

speaking out of order, but a matter has been called to my attention that is so shocking to my sense of patriotism and does such violence to the tenets of public decency that I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the whole country. I have just received from a patriotic constituent, Dr. H. E. Christenbery, of Knoxville, Tenn., a clipping from a recent issue of the Knoxville Journal and Tribune which calls attention to a very sad situation, which, in my opinion, challenges the earnest and patriotic attention and the immediate action of the Congress. The newspaper clipping, bearing a Washington date line, recites the following:

[From the Journal and Tribune, Knoxville, Tenn., Wednesday, March 12.]

NO MONEY TO DISTRIBUTE THEM; UNITED STATES MAY DUMP CAPTURED TROPHIES INTO OCEAN.

(By John T. Lewing, Jr., Central Press correspondent.)

WASHINGTON.—When the late war ended the Government decided that the American people would want souvenirs of the conflict in the form of captured German guns and equipment, and it arranged the shipment of a huge quantity of the materials to this country. Guns were to be given to cities. Complete collections of German helmets, guns, sabers, etc., were to be given to museums and schools.

But this plan has never been carried out. The shipload of stuff is in the Government arsenal at Fort Newark, N. J., rusting and rotting. It may be dumped into the ocean shortly.

No money has been appropriated by Congress for the purpose of distributing the materials. A bill has been pending many months. Sponsors of the bill say it isn't likely to be passed, because Congressmen frown on the idea of spending money for such a purpose now.

Several private firms are reported to be willing to buy the smaller trophies, of which there are thousands, for sale to persons desirous of obtaining souvenirs; but the idea of commercializing the mementoes is frowned on, too.

While this story was doubtless written in good faith and was based upon the reasonable apprehensions of the Washington correspondent, to me the whole proposition is preposterous and utterly inconceivable. Is it possible that we have lost all sense of gratitude and national pride? After spending from twenty-five to fifty billion dollars in the prosecution of the war, in the name of common justice can we not spend a few paltry thousands to commemorate and perpetuate the brilliant deeds of heroism performed by our brave boys in carrying Old Glory to victory on the Marne, at St. Mihiel, in the bloody Argonne, and elsewhere? Of course we can; and the act will be unanimously approved and universally applauded from Maine to California.

Besides, gentlemen of the House, the distribution of these trophies will entail no expense on the Government, should the Government be willing to put itself in a niggardly light, because the States, counties, municipalities, and civic organizations, as the case may be, will be only too glad to bear the expense incident to their transportation and installation.

Out of a spirit of loyalty, Doctor Christenbery resents the proposed or supposed attitude of our Government as described in the clipping which I have just read to you; and this position of his, in my opinion, is shared by every patriotic American citizen.

At the conclusion of the war it was generally understood that these German cannon and other trophies captured by our brave soldier boys would be distributed throughout the country; and, acting upon that impression, practically every Member introduced a number of bills providing for an allotment of these relics of the war to his particular district. The proposition appealed to me as it did to the membership of the House generally as a thoroughly meritorious and praiseworthy action. To exhibit the trophies of the war at public places throughout the Nation would not only be a proper acknowledgment and recognition of the signal prowess exhibited by our intrepid soldiery but it would be a patriotic inspiration to the people who would behold them and contemplate their significance.

In my judgment, it would be a downright shame, a dastardly crime, a gross insult to our soldiers, both living and dead—yea, it would be practical perfidy itself to destroy these testimonials of the unparalleled valor of our service men as is suggested in this newspaper article, and in the name of our gallant soldiers, both living and dead, and in the name of every patriotic American citizen, I desire to register my solemn protest against this unholy program, and insist that provisions be immediately made for the preservation of these war trophies and their suitable distribution throughout the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell us what the Committee on Military Affairs is going



to do about this? They have had the subject before them for several years, and meanwhile, I understand, the trophies are rotting.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. According to this story they will be cast into the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Has the gentleman taken this matter up with the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I have not, but I hope to do so. I think it is a meritorious measure.

Mr. JAMES. I will say to the gentleman that it has been reported out of committee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, now that Secretary Denby has reached home and has been received with a brass band and various other demonstrations of approval, it becomes us to inquire what else is to be done with reference to distinguished executives who cooperated and collaborated with Mr. Denby in what has been pronounced such a violent misappropriation of the assets of the Navy and of the United States.

Secretary Denby is not shown to have done anything except to have made a mistake of judgment. He is not shown to have had any interest tied to him that might have influenced his judgment. He is not even supposed to have been the recipient of any loan or to have had any connection whatever with the oil people. And yet he has been rejected under such circumstances that his fellow citizens met him with a brass band when he got home.

All the time we find the Assistant Secretary, who was collaborating very actively in the whole business, left as the guiding star to the new Secretary who is to come from the Pacific coast in a day or two. I want to direct attention to the fact that if Mr. Denby ought to have gotten out, Mr. Roosevelt ought to get out, too.

Why do I say so? We have had numerous attorneys who were suggested to conduct certain litigation rejected, and promptly rejected, because it was shown that at some time or another they had been retained by, or had been connected with, some of these oil companies. We have one now held in suspense where the committee of the Senate refuses to recommend him because he is connected with a bank that is known as a Standard Oil bank; they refuse to confirm him because, forsooth, having represented one of the Standard Oil banks he is not in a position to represent the Federal Government in bringing suits against an oil company which is said to be robbing the Government.

Let us look into it and apply that to an official of the Navy Department to-day. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy was a director of the Sinclair Oil Co. up to the time he entered the war. He was a stockholder in it. When he returned from the war he did not go back with them, but, according to the testimony produced before the committee, he became an employee of Montgomery & Co., the bankers of the Sinclair Oil Co., having in his particular charge the business conducted by the bank with the Sinclair Oil Co.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Has the Assistant Secretary of the Navy perpetrated any other crime than this?

Mr. STEVENSON. If the gentleman will be patient, I will not charge the Assistant Secretary of the Navy with any crime, and I do not intend to; but I want to call attention to the fact that he is in an equivocal position, if these different attorneys were in such a position that they could not properly represent the Government.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Did I understand the gentleman also—

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not yield any further now. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy, when he returned, as I say, took up his duties with Montgomery & Co., according to the testimony of his brother, Mr. Archie Roosevelt. According to his own testimony, his wife became the owner of 1,000 shares of the Sinclair Oil Co., and retained them until 1922, after the leases that are complained of had all been executed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. On what authority does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. STEVENSON. I get it from the statement of Mr. Roosevelt himself in his testimony before the committee.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to hear the gentleman make that statement and prove it.

Mr. STEVENSON. Well, I will refer you to the testimony that he gave himself.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let me get the gentleman correctly. Does the gentleman state that Mrs. Roosevelt owned that stock at the time the leases were made?

Mr. STEVENSON. I said that Mr. Roosevelt in his own testimony, which I can read to you, said that they owned it and sold it in 1922, and that then—

Mr. LONGWORTH. No, no. The gentleman made this positive statement: The gentleman said that Mrs. Roosevelt owned that stock at the time the leases were made, and I submit that the gentleman—

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not care what the gentleman submits.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That the gentleman has made a false statement, and let the gentleman prove his statement.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman will not maintain that outside of this House.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let the gentleman prove his statement.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why does not the gentleman read the testimony?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will read it at the right time.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman has not yielded.

Mr. STEVENSON. There is no use of getting "het up" about this thing. [Applause.] I will call the gentleman's attention to what Mr. Roosevelt said in one minute:

Senator WALSH. And your stock was sold some time during 1917 or 1918?

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. My stock was sold, I should say, in the winter of 1918.

Senator WALSH. And then your wife became a stockholder in 1920?

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. In 1920, and sold that stock in 1921, I think. I can tell you approximately. It was, I think, in 1922; sold it in 1922.

Senator WALSH. Are there any other members of your family interested in the Sinclair Co.?

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. My brother is an employee of the Sinclair Co.

Senator WALSH. Does he hold any official position there?

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. Yes; he is an employee. I do not know whether you would call it an official position. I will ask Mr. Sinclair, however.

And so on.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. "And so on" is pretty vague.

Mr. STEVENSON. I can read you what he says additionally.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman has made the positive statement that Mrs. Roosevelt owned this stock at the time these leases were made. Does the gentleman repeat that statement?

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not say that he has said so, but I say—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then the gentleman said it himself?

Mr. STEVENSON. I say she owned this stock, according to his statement, in 1922, and the order which he procured the President to sign was on the 31st day of May, 1921, when she owned it, and this was the basis of the whole transaction. The contract was made on the 7th of April, 1922, and it is up to him to show whether she sold before or after the 7th of April.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman has made the positive statement that Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt owned this stock at the time the leases were made. Is the gentleman prepared to prove that?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I have stated what the proof is, and if the gentleman now says she did not own it on the 7th of April, 1922, I shall not be prepared to controvert it, but she did own it when the negotiations were going on and when the order of the President transferring this was signed, for the very purpose of consummating the act, in 1921, according to their own statement; they can not get away from it and say there could have been no such transaction.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am prepared to make a statement, and if the gentleman cares to deny it, let him do so.

Mr. STEVENSON. Just wait a minute; this is in my time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Not at all.

Mr. STEVENSON. If the gentleman makes a statement which I know is not true, I will deny it and I do not hesitate to say so.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.  
Mr. LONGWORTH. I am prepared to make the positive statement that Mrs. Roosevelt did not own a share of stock at the time these leases were made.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman make a statement as to what time in 1922 she parted with it?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will make a statement to the effect that she was not in possession of any of this stock within three months before the leases were made.

Mr. STEVENSON. After or before?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Before the leases were made.

Mr. STEVENSON. Then the gentleman is prepared to admit that she owned it when the original order was procured by Mr. Roosevelt to be signed by the President, is he not?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That proposition is negated by what I have stated.

Mr. STEVENSON. No; it was stated positively she owned it in 1922.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Well, the gentleman stated his own inference from the testimony.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman stated his own inference from the testimony, which Mr. Roosevelt could have made positive, but he did not do that. Mr. Roosevelt knew what they were driving at. If he had sold that stock before the leases were made, why did he not say so then? If he had so stated, I would not have disputed it. If he sold it in 1922, if you run back for three months from April, then it must have been sold the 7th of January. We had hardly gotten into the year 1922 then.

Now, I am not going to have any further controversy about that. That is settled. It is settled that Mr. Roosevelt, through his wife, had an interest in the oil company when the negotiations began and when they were running and when he himself carried the order to the President, May 31, 1921, and had the order signed and brought it back to the Navy Department.

Mr. FRENCH. Would the gentleman yield just a moment, and if necessary, I will yield him whatever time I may consume?

Mr. STEVENSON. All right, sir.

Mr. FRENCH. It should modify the situation to have it understood that Colonel Roosevelt was one of the officers in the Navy Department who was not in accord with this leasing and building program. The Navy Department was not harmonious on that question—neither the administrative officers who were civilians nor the regular officers of the Navy. It happens that in this great administrative matter Colonel Roosevelt was opposed to the leasing and storage construction program.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; well, we will see about that. At page 420 of the record:

Senator WALSH. Please let me know whether you approved or disapproved of the policy of making expenditures of between \$15,000,000 and \$20,000,000 for these tanks by private contract and without competitive bidding.

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. I approved the general policy of endeavoring to arrange the situation so that the oil, which was evidently intended by Congress to constitute the naval reserves, should be kept as a naval reserve in the only way possible, which was that.

What was that but approval, and he said it several times. He was pinned down on that several times, as I will show the gentleman, when he said, "I approved the general policy which was adopted." See also page 1300, where he reiterates it.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman must remember that the policy of conserving oil for the Navy is one thing and the policy of what arrangements should be made for building storage and all that sort of thing is a different thing. That could have been worked out through calling upon the Congress, or it could have been worked out without having these leasing companies build the storage reservoirs. There are various ways, either one of which might have been adopted.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is the gentleman going to yield me time for the time he is taking now?

Mr. FRENCH. I shall be glad to. Undoubtedly Colonel Roosevelt believed in the general program that we probably, as a Congress, all approve, of conserving oil for the Navy.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman will find—and I will put it in my remarks—that Mr. Roosevelt not only approved it at this point but he approved it at two or three different times when pinned down and said, "I approved of this general policy." Page 1300.

That is the proposition which comes before the new administration of the Navy Department.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. STEVENSON. All right.

Mr. FRENCH. Did not Secretary Daniels approve of saving the oil?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; Secretary Daniels approved of saving the oil, but he did not approve of leasing it out and taking a large part of it for the purpose of constructing tanks.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not yield any further. We will get through with one thing at a time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina declines to yield.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield if I yield him time for the time I consume, and that is what I propose to do?

Mr. STEVENSON. All right.

Mr. FRENCH. Does not the gentleman know that under Secretary Daniel's administration there was that actual thing done—the leasing of the right to procure oil in order to conserve its value to the Navy or to the Treasury?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir. But those were protective wells. Mr. Daniel's position is fully stated in the Record of February 10, 1920, page 2709.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield right there so that I may ask the gentleman from Idaho a question?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I judge from the remarks of the gentleman from Idaho that the gentleman favors this naval policy.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; the gentleman has no right to make any such deduction from my remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman was citing with approval the fact that Secretary Daniels had leased some wells, and I supposed he was using that as a basis for supporting his own belief that that was a proper thing to do.

Mr. FRENCH. I have no hesitation in asserting that it was the right of any Secretary of the Navy, whether Secretary Daniels or his successor, to carry out vigilantly a policy of endeavoring to save the Navy oil for the Navy, to save it for the country, and unless something had been done to protect the Government's interests the oil would have been pumped out by the Standard Oil Co. and other subsidiary companies through wells upon lands adjacent to the oil reserves. The question of method of carrying forward such a program is an entirely different proposition, and if the gentleman will consult the hearings held two months ago, and held some time before the statement was made by Secretary Fall touching his entire relationship to the matter, the gentleman will find that I specifically disapproved of the policy that was followed, and that continues to be my own attitude.

Mr. STEVENSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to have any more interpolations about this before I get through.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, may I yield the gentleman as much time as the gentleman thinks I ought to yield for the time I have consumed?

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman ought to give me at least five minutes.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Ten minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Ten minutes, they say, and I suspect that is right. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair understand about the matter of time. Does the gentleman yield 5 minutes or 10 minutes?

Mr. FRENCH. Whatever time we have consumed I wish to yield the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, there is no need for anybody to get too warm about this matter. It is all in the record. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] said a moment ago that I did not read on, and so forth. Well, I will read on and just give all that is there at that place:

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. I will ask Mr. Sinclair, however.

Mr. SINCLAIR. He is a vice president of one of the subsidiary companies.

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. Vice president of one of the subsidiary companies.

Senator WALSH. Is he a director in any company?

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. Again I will have to ask Mr. Sinclair.

Mr. SINCLAIR. He is not a director in the original company; he is in the subsidiary company.

Senator WALSH. Do you know how long he has sustained these relations to the Sinclair Co.?

Assistant Secretary ROOSEVELT. Yes; since the spring of 1919.



Now, we will see where Mr. Archie Roosevelt came in on this proposition. He says:

Senator DILL. Mr. Roosevelt, you may have stated, but I did not get it clearly, as to just how you came to go into the employ of Sinclair Co.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You can help me on this, Mr. Stanford. I think Montgomery & Co. were bankers for the Sinclair Co., weren't they, at one time?

Mr. STANFORD. I think so.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And my brother was with Montgomery & Co., and had represented Montgomery & Co. with the Sinclair Co. This is a long time ago, and I don't know about it as well as, perhaps, you would. And he said to me—

The CHAIRMAN. Who said to you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. My brother, Ted. He said, "There is a chap I know in New York, and he might give you a job." He said, "I served on his board of directors. And he might give you a job." And that was how it came about.

Senator DILL. Well, did your brother go to Montgomery & Co. in your interests?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. To Montgomery? Oh, no. He was with them.

Senator DILL. He was with Montgomery & Co.?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes.

Senator DILL. And did your brother go to the Sinclair Co. for you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Oh, yes; he helped me there.

Senator DILL. He helped you get it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. He helped me get the job; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions? If not, we will excuse Mr. Roosevelt.

So Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, the present Assistant Secretary and Acting Secretary of the Navy, being with the bankers of Sinclair & Co. goes and gets the job for Archie, his brother, with Sinclair & Co. What compensation did he get and when did he quit? Mr. Theodore Roosevelt said two or three days ago that Mr. Archie Roosevelt got \$10,000 a year to start with, which was subsequently increased to \$15,000 a year.

That is twice the salary of a Congressman. If you read the testimony of the gentleman—and I never saw Mr. Archie Roosevelt—I think you will conclude with me that it was a remarkable salary to be paid to a man of the capacity which he showed in the testimony. I do not know him and I never saw him, but I know from reading his testimony that he did not show sufficient capacity to do much more with that crowd than to turn a grindstone or grease a gimlet. That is about the way it impressed me, and yet he was being paid \$15,000 a year, and was so paid until this investigation got too hot, when he jumped overboard. Then, gentlemen, talk about there being no interest up there.

There was a picture the other day of Daugherty standing on the burning deck, with the oil fumes all flowing up around him. It was called "The boy stood on the burning deck." That reminded me of the scene when they found that Ned McLean admitted practically that he had been lying, and Senator CARAWAY made a speech which scared Archie so much that he hallooed for Teddy. Senator CARAWAY certainly got a feather in his cap, because he scared a Roosevelt.

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

Mr. STEVENSON. No; I can not yield just now.

Mr. LITTLE. I just wanted to know why the gentleman said "practically"; that is all.

Mr. STEVENSON. Oh, I shall not qualify it; I shall say that he admitted that he lied, but he had not admitted it at that time. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy rushed over to New York and they listened in on a telephone conversation with another fellow, and then came back here and jumped overboard. Fifteen thousand dollars a year was good enough until it began to burn. It impressed me so much that I wrote a little parody on that well-known poem. It seems that doing such a thing has become fashionable these days, although mine was completed some weeks before Senator HEFLIN and Senator LODGE began it. It is as follows:

ARCHIE AND THEODORE OR THE BOY JUMPED OFF THE BURNING DECK.

Archie stood on the oily deck

Whence Theodore had sped;

He proudly drew his weekly check—

It was his daily bread.

But soon the deck became quite warm—

The boss to Europe fled—

Feeling a sense of keen alarm,

He called for Brother Ted.

With life preserver in his arms,

Abandoning his bread,

He made a flying leap from harm,

But landed on his head.

That is what happened to Archie. I leave it to this House whether or not the fact of the ownership of the stock while negotiations were going on, and that under the influence of the Assistant Secretary, this boy was being carried on the pay roll at \$15,000 a year, does not call for a change over yonder?

There are one or two other things that I want to talk about. The gentleman talks about Mr. Daniels advocating this, that, and the other. Mr. Daniels is not Secretary of the Navy at the present time, and if he had been you would not have anything like this going on. Doheny and all of his crowd admit that they could not break in with a crowbar when he was there, and they denounced him for it. What was done? They went to work in defiance of the right of Congress to appropriate the money and the assets of the United States and made the contractors spend \$20,000,000 in building oil terminals at Pearl Harbor and other places and paid for it out of the oil that belonged to the Government, taking the assets and making contracts and building establishments without any right from Congress or anything else, but it was all approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, because he said so in his testimony which I just read to you and in many other places.

We are going to have a new Secretary of the Navy from the Pacific coast. They are exceedingly interested in building a naval base at Alameda, Calif. If he conceives that he has the same power that this other Secretary and Assistant Secretary conceived they had, what is to hinder him from alienating every gallon of oil in the naval reserves and building up a great naval base there without the consent of Congress or anybody else? One is as bad as the other, and one is not any better than the other, and you can not distinguish between them. I say for that reason the Assistant Secretary of the Navy is now in a position where he ought to get out. Not only that, but you had the testimony a day or two ago of the marines being used and sent out there to throw off those people who were contesting with Mr. Sinclair the right to that property. Some say that that was Government property. Oh, no; it had been transferred to Sinclair, and the question was between him and the "squatters," as they were called. It was a question between two claimants to land, and we find the Navy Department, under the express order of this Assistant Secretary of the Navy, taking that great historic organization, the marines, and sending them out there instead of letting those people try their rights at law. We find him bringing all the power of the military force of the United States to bear in behalf of Sinclair and his crowd, to whom they had granted these leases, and on whose behalf they had no right to use the military arm of the United States Government.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Assuming the fact, which the gentleman will probably deny, that this lease was a legally made lease, would it not be the duty of the Government to put the lessee in peaceable possession of the leased property?

Mr. STEVENSON. The Government would have properly remanded him to the United States court, and when the United States court had determined his right, then the marshal and his force and all of the military forces of the Government would be behind the decree; but that is what they did not do. They did not propose to submit the matter to a court. They said: "We have taken up Sinclair and we are going to see him through with the military arm of this Government, and we are not going to give anybody else a chance," and it became a military strong-arm ejectment that went on out there, probably all of them squatters, but they had their rights as American citizens.

I made the statement when I started out that the wife of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy owned stock when this contract or lease was made. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] challenged it. I have read to you the evidence. If that is not true, it is merely a wrong inference from the evidence. I do not intend to misrepresent those people, and the gentleman from Ohio knows that I do not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I admit that. I think the gentleman made an erroneous statement, made it without authority.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Was that made clear in the evidence?

Mr. STEVENSON. No; the Assistant Secretary had the opportunity to make that clear, and that was what they were driving at, and he failed to do it, and I had a right to infer that. Had he stated that the stock was sold in February, 1922, as he had the opportunity to do, no question would have been made of it by me.

But, gentlemen, do not forget this is a matter of 12 months' transactions. Gentlemen, do not forget that the foundation stone of this was the order of President Harding which Mr.

Roosevelt himself carried to the President on the 31st day of May, 1921, and secured him to sign. At that time the stock was owned by Roosevelt's wife, according to his own testimony, and continued up until some time in 1922, and this contract was signed April 7, 1922, and therefore assuming that while the gentleman—I am not charging the gentleman has done anything wrong, but assuming after all these other men referred to are disqualified by being lawyers, because they accepted pay from an oil company—the gentleman who occupies the position of Assistant Secretary of the Navy is disqualified from sitting in that position after the circumstances which I have detailed when his personal interests in the Sinclair Co. were in such shape as I have detailed, and I think he can very properly follow the lead of Archie and jump overboard, and I believe he will.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it has been a matter of some considerable satisfaction to most of the Members of the House that the House of Representatives has not indulged in as plain unwarranted gossip and vicious scandalization without warrant as some other branch of our Government has been indulging in. What was the object of the speech just made? It could have but one object, and that was for the Saturday night and Sunday morning papers to carry to the country the statement that Theodore Roosevelt was interested in Sinclair oil, and that while it was admitted it was in the name of his wife, by reason of the leases made he has profited, and for that reason he should get out of the office of a Cabinet officer. The excuse offered by the learned gentleman, who always displays some partisanship in making a speech on this floor, is that a plain denial of that statement of his was not contained in any hearing. Now, let us stop and be moderate. Is it possible in this great country of ours the right way to do is to charge some one with being a criminal unless he has some legal proof of his innocence? Think how unfortunate it would have been for a great and honored family of this country if they had no one on the floor to speak for them and deny that contemptible insinuation and assertion. [Applause.] I suppose the thing that prompted the charging of it was the fact that men intimately connected with the family are prominent on our side of the House. Thank God for the support to that honored family that the country may know the base falseness of the accusation at the same time it is issued. Mrs. Roosevelt had stock in the Sinclair company and Mrs. Roosevelt sold it three months before the lease. Could a person say that she sold it at a profit by reason of her husband having to O. K. a lease that might make the stock more valuable? Mr. LONGWORTH is here, and I want to ask him, Do you know whether Mrs. Roosevelt sold her stock at a profit or at a loss?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, of course I have nothing whatever to do with the business connections of any of the members of my family except myself. However, I do know this: Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt has her own property entirely independent of control by her husband, and I do know this, she sold whatever she may have owned of the Sinclair oil stock at a substantial loss at least three months before any of these naval leases were made.

Mr. TINCHER. I assume that no one will deny the truth of that statement. But how nice it would have been for the scandal mongers if the morning papers had carried the statements here presented and should have insinuated that while Theodore Roosevelt was in the Cabinet position he enriched his wife by making an oil lease. Shame on that kind of statesmanship! I believe in an honest House, where it reaches honest conclusions with some reason and common sense. I do not believe you will gain anything as a party by stooping down and trying to attack a man like Theodore Roosevelt in such an underhand, contemptible manner, and without any excuse for it whatever.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. I will.

Mr. BARBOUR. Does not the gentleman from Kansas also think it would have been ordinarily decent to have given the new Secretary of the Navy a chance to start in on his duties before attacking and criticizing him? I want to say the new Secretary of the Navy is as clean and fine a type of American citizen as you will find anywhere in the United States, and I know it. [Applause.]

Mr. TINCHER. I believe it, and I will say this, that the time has come in this country when I do not believe men will bear the reputation of being clean, fair, and honest statesmen who are willing to stoop to scandal of this character or kind.

We are getting rid of some of the grafters; we are prosecuting some of the criminals, more than you ever did; and I do not believe you raise yourself in the estimation of the people of this country by such dastardly, cowardly attacks on the good name of men and women on this floor without any warrant whatever for them, except you could not find out where they denied it in some hearings you read. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. TINCHER. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from Texas wants to speak on this subject?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes. That was the understanding. That is the only one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, a great many Members on this floor, especially my good friends on the Republican side, sometimes good-naturedly tell me that I am a partisan. That charge is true. If I did not believe in my party and its principles I should leave its ranks. I am a partisan, but I have not permitted my partisanship heretofore to cause me to say anything on this floor about any of the transactions that have attracted so much attention in the public press with reference to Teapot Dome and Secretary Fall and Attorney General Daugherty. I shall just take this occasion to make a few observations with reference to the conduct of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] a little while ago in rising in his seat and so bitterly attacking the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] for standing up in the House and quoting, from the printed hearings, the sworn testimony of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Roosevelt. Now, if a noise were wisdom, and heat were courage, the gentleman from Kansas would probably occupy the leadership that is now occupied by the gentleman from Ohio. [Applause.]

But such, happily, is not the case in this instance. I want to say a word to gentlemen on the other side, and especially to the gentleman from Kansas, because he is quite a debater. He is quite a partisan on this floor. I admire a man who is willing to stand up and fight, but I admire still more a fighter who, when the battle goes against him, is willing to take the gaff once in a while.

I remember when the gentleman from Kansas made his advent here on the floor of this House, fresh from the wild plains of Kansas, bellowing like a roaring bull about the way the war had been conducted under a Democratic administration. I heard him and other Republicans pouring out here on this floor volleys of denunciation of the waste, the criminal extravagance, the corruption, and the graft that filled the War and Navy Departments under the Democrats. And yet, with all of your investigations and all of your smelling committees, with all of the machinery that the Republican Party could set in motion immediately after it came into power in this House in 1919, never was there uncovered in all the vast transactions of the war a single transaction that was corrupt. They never uncovered one transaction that imputed dishonor or disloyalty to a single responsible Government official under the Democracy.

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

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In a moment. They did uncover one official of the Government, and they indicted him, and that happened to be an Assistant Secretary of War, a Republican, from Cleveland, Benedict Crowell by name, whose indictment was dismissed by the court a few days ago because the Attorney General and his assistant could not write an indictment that the court would hold to be sufficient to charge a crime.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Kansas suggested a few moments ago that the Republicans had prosecuted more criminals than the Democrats did. That was necessary, because more criminals had developed under the Republicans than got in under our administration. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Now, I have not charged or attacked anybody in all this controversy. But as I have said, I like to see a fighter. Let me say to the gentleman from Kansas, your party, after making all kinds of investigations and raising such a hullabaloo about the Democratic administration, when it comes to your time to be investigated, when it comes to throwing the light on your secret transactions, when committees of investigation find some tracks leading up to your door, when they find these tracks leading up almost to the White House itself, if the gentleman from Kansas is a real fighter, if he



is game, if he is not a quitter, he will stand up and take his medicine and not whine and cry like a whipped baby. [Applause.]

Now, what about the Assistant Secretary of the Navy? Since this question has been raised I want to make some observations about that. I honor the name of Roosevelt. The first time I saw Colonel Roosevelt, sr., was in San Antonio, Tex., when he was recruiting his Rough Riders. I saw him booted and spurred, out in the camp, organizing the regiment that made him famous. As a schoolboy, I tried to enlist in his regiment, and I met and talked with him, and I was inspired by the splendid qualities of that great man.

But the name Roosevelt did not make him what he was. It was the great qualities of heart and mind and the great qualities of courage that made him, and not the name Roosevelt. There is no magic in a name. I grieve for his son. It grieves me and it makes my heart sad that the same son that bears his name and, as I understand it, entertains the same ambition that he entertained did not, when he was confronted by this situation in the Navy Department, exhibit the heart and the courage of a real Roosevelt and say to Sinclair and Fall and Doheny and the rest of them, "I will have nothing to do with those transactions. You shall not steal the Navy's oil. We are going to keep it for the Navy; and if this is your game, rather than be Assistant Secretary of the Navy I will resign," as he advised his brother Archie to resign, "and go out into private life."

My God, gentlemen, I derive no satisfaction from the fact that these things, these corrupt and scandalous things, have occurred. Since they occurred I am of course glad they have been uncovered. But I derive no satisfaction, because I happen to be a Democrat, from the fact that there have been revealed these corrupt chapters in the administration of the public affairs of my country. Would that they had never occurred, because I know that the harm that will be done out yonder among the people, the harm that will be done in the destruction among the people of confidence in the Government, will be more harmful to the country at large than could be counteracted by any partisan advantage that my party or I will derive from them. I am for my country first and my party afterwards.

When I contemplate that my party went through a great war with marvelous opportunities for fraud and for graft and emerged free from the taint of corruption in high places, I do derive some little satisfaction out of the fact that while I regret these things, Teapot Dome and the naval oil-lease scandals, and the Department of Justice scandal, have occurred, and while I regret that this dish of corruption shall be held up to the nostrils of the people of the country—I derive some satisfaction from the fact that when they invaded the chambers where the dark doings of conspirators and criminals were taking place, when they bared the secret schemes and corrupt bargains that were hatched there, no responsible figure in the party to which I belong was either found there or was revealed as being guilty of corrupt conduct in office or of treachery to a public trust. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I personally am somewhat tired of the "everybody knows" type of evidence to which we have been treated and to which the country has been treated for a good many weeks in connection with Teapot Dome and other matters. I should like, if it were possible, to deal with information and to deal with facts rather than to deal with hearsay in the second, third, and even fourth degree. My purpose in asking for this time this afternoon is to depart from the usual practice on this general topic. I propose to give the House some information on the subject which has been brought into this debate by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield in order that I may make one slight correction?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. My friend from California, I infer, believes I criticized the new Secretary of the Navy. I think you will find in my remarks nothing critical of him but a plea that he should have a clean slate.

Another statement which I want to correct is an inferential statement which the gentleman has just made that I have been stating that "they say" and "everybody knows." I did not quote a statement from that record except from Theodore Roosevelt and Archie Roosevelt—not a single one.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Most of the gentleman's speech, which I heard, was based on inference rather than on sworn testimony.

Here are the facts, as I understand them, concerning Theodore Roosevelt's connection with this Teapot Dome matter. I assert them on my own responsibility. So far as I know they have not been set forth in consecutive form before this moment.

Col. Theodore Roosevelt's connection with the oil leases was, briefly, as follows: Shortly after President Harding's induction into office Secretary Denby sent him, Roosevelt, a copy of a proposed Executive order transferring the naval oil reserves to the Department of the Interior without recourse. At the same time a copy was sent to the Bureau of Engineering. After getting his copy of the order Colonel Roosevelt asked Admiral Griffin, who was then chief of that bureau, and who had naval oil matters under his particular care, to talk it over with him. Colonel Roosevelt knew very little of the matter, for it was exceedingly intricate and complex, and he had recently taken office. Admiral Griffin felt very strongly that this transfer to the Interior Department would be a mistake. After thinking the matter over Colonel Roosevelt decided he was probably right. His grounds for coming to that conclusion were that the Interior Department has as its general mission the development of the resources of the United States, whereas the oil lands belonging to the Navy should not be developed except in a case of real necessity; and that, therefore, there would be a conflict of ideas and policies between the two departments. Colonel Roosevelt went to Secretary Denby and urged that the lands be not transferred to the Interior Department. Secretary Denby informed Colonel Roosevelt that his protest was made too late, because the transfer had already been agreed to by the President, Secretary Fall, and Secretary Denby. After this Colonel Roosevelt went back and discussed the entire situation with Admiral Griffin and certain other officers. It occurred to Colonel Roosevelt that if he could get an amendment to the original order for transfer, making it necessary for the Interior Department to gain the consent of the Navy Department before any leasing or drilling was undertaken, the Navy could guard the oil lands against improper exploitation. In other words, the Navy would not lose its complete control over the details of ensuing transactions.

A number of amendments with this end in view were submitted to Colonel Roosevelt. He took them to Secretary Denby and discussed them with him. After considerable discussion Secretary Denby agreed to a modified form of one of them. Secretary Denby told Colonel Roosevelt to take it to Secretary Fall, and that if Colonel Roosevelt could get Secretary Fall to agree to this amendment it would be all right with Secretary Denby. Colonel Roosevelt took the amendment to Secretary Fall, who agreed to it. Colonel Roosevelt then took it to the White House for signature.

I want you to mark carefully the language of this Roosevelt amendment:

But no general policy as to drilling or reserving lands located in a naval reserve shall be changed or adopted except upon consultation and in cooperation with the Secretary or Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Now, gentlemen, see what that Roosevelt amendment did. That amendment reserved to the Navy complete supervision over the oil reserves. It was on account of this Roosevelt amendment that all of the leases under discussion by the Senate committee at this time were countersigned by Secretary Denby. They could not have been validly executed without the affirmative sanction of the Navy Department.

At this exact point—and I ask you to note the sequence of events—Colonel Roosevelt's active participation in the entire matter ceased. It so happened that he was not consulted on any of the oil leases. Colonel Roosevelt did not know they were under contemplation until after they were signed. With reference to the Teapot Dome lease in particular, Colonel Roosevelt did not even know there was a plan on foot to lease Teapot Dome. Colonel Roosevelt did not know that Sinclair was interested in any of the leases and heard of them only after they had been made known to the general public.

The question of the Roosevelt family's ownership of stock in certain Sinclair companies has been brought out this afternoon. I think most of us will feel it is rather unfortunate to drag, with the apparent purpose of exciting suspicion, the name of a woman into this general controversy; but that has been done. Therefore I should like to give you the facts upon this point. Again, I say, I assert them on my own responsibility.

In so far as Colonel Roosevelt's connection with the Sinclair Co. goes, it is as follows: He was among the group of bankers who were interested in its original formation; he was a director of the company until the United States entered the war in 1917, when he resigned. Colonel Roosevelt's last stock in the company was sold during the war, not later than 1918. Colonel Roosevelt's wife bought 1,000 shares of Sinclair stock, however, in 1920, but sold them at a loss some time before the lease with the Navy Department was signed.

Colonel Roosevelt has engaged in no business of any kind since the war and since his entrance into politics, and he has, therefore, made no money of any kind in business.

Much of what I have here set forth is given in the Senate hearings. It has not, however, been developed in the chronological order in which I have attempted to present it this afternoon.

Gentlemen, I have a very keen admiration for the name of Theodore Roosevelt. [Applause.] I have a very keen admiration for the personality of the present Theodore Roosevelt. I have for that reason made it my business and my duty, as I regarded it, to acquaint myself, so far as possible, with the extent, if any, to which he was properly to be criticized throughout this whole transaction. I have followed the story in the newspapers; I have followed the testimony in the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one more minute.

Mr. FRENCH. I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And I have discussed this matter with those who were apt to be best informed on the general topic. I can assure you, gentlemen—and I say this on my honor as a Member of the House—that I have not been able to find one instance in which the manliness, the dignity, the honor, or the efficiency of Theodore Roosevelt has in the least degree been affected by the Teapot Dome revelations. [Applause.] I think he has been an admirable public servant; I think it would be a tragedy if his public career were even for a moment to be retarded by these disclosures and by the inferences which unfair critics have been prone to put upon what he has done and upon what he has not done.

Gentlemen, the name of Theodore Roosevelt is untarnished; we can have perfect confidence in the performance of this man as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I hope the country realizes how fortunate we are to have a public servant of his ability, character, and unblemished reputation and honor. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, liberty is the sublimest word in the language of men. Nothing can be grander in this world than to fight the battles for its attainment. Nothing can be more glorious than to fight in defense of one's country, especially when that country is the land of one's nativity. Born in a struggle, developed in an atmosphere of independence, our forefathers wrung from the hands of British oppression the unhindered right to be free. During all the period of our national existence we have been an independent people, but our independence had to be won on the field of battle, and having been won it must be maintained even at the point of the bayonet.

Since the beginning of our national life the name America has been a synonym for liberty and freedom. The peoples of all the world have spoken of Americans as defenders of those great principles of human happiness. That very fact, however, should cause us to use all the more zealous care to see that we deny to no one else the same privileges that we claim for ourselves.

At the time of the conclusion of peace at the close of the Spanish-American War, we accepted the Philippines under certain specified conditions. Hardly a voice was lifted during the discussions in favor of the permanent retention of the islands.

#### CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH PHILIPPINES WERE ACCEPTED.

The sole controversy that arose during the proposed relationship was whether the Philippines should be granted immediate independence or whether a sort of protectorate should be established until such time as the Filipinos should show themselves capable of self-government.

The latter plan was adopted. William McKinley was President of the United States at the time. In discussing the problem in the year 1899, he used the following language:

The Philippines are ours not to exploit but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government.

He further said:

We must make these people whom Providence has brought within our jurisdiction feel that it is their liberty and not our power, their welfare and not our gain we are seeking to enhance.

This has always been the declared policy of the Government of the United States, and I have been able to find no expression of any official having authority to declare our position which conflicts with this statement.

In 1907 Governor Taft said:

Our jurisdiction and control will finally end in the islands when they are capable of self-government.

In 1915 Theodore Roosevelt said:

If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. These being the circumstances, the islands should at an early moment be given their independence without any conditions whatever by us, and without our retaining any foothold in them.

#### THE JONES ACT.

In 1916 the Congress passed what is known as the Jones Act. The preamble to that act read in part as follows:

It was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of the war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement. \* \* \* It has always been the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein.

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

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Did not the Jones Act, as it originally passed this House, provide they should have their independence upon the 4th of July, 1922?

Mr. JONES. I do not think any definite date was set in the law as actually passed.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Not as actually passed, but as passed by this House.

Mr. JONES. I think probably the gentleman is correct, as the act passed the House.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. The opposition to the granting of independence to the Philippines has come somewhat from a fear that they might become the prey of some other nation, or may be controlled by some other nation, which might be detrimental to the welfare of the United States; and I would like to hear what the gentleman has to say on that phase of the question.

Mr. JONES. I think if the gentleman will get down to the heart of things he will find that is not the real fear, and that is not the essence of the objections which have been made as to Philippine independence.

The real objection is the interest of some business men who have interests in the Philippines. As to their becoming a prey to some other nation, if any nation undertook to take them over, a number of other nations would oppose such a course, while under present conditions the United States would have the entire responsibility should any nation undertake to gain a foothold there. Besides, if that were the only objection to independence, the United States could, if they saw fit at the time they granted independence, say to the world that for a definite or an indefinite length of time we would see to it that no outside nation interfered in the Philippines. In other words, we could make such conditions as might seem wise relative thereto. At any rate, there can be no question of the obligation which the United States has assumed—that we undertook the obligation to release the Philippine Islands as soon as they showed themselves to be capable of self-government. There can be no doubt of our obligation to make their interests and not ours the test. The question is not what is best for ourselves; it is not even what is best for the Philippines; the big question is whether or not they are in position to look after their own government. It is very easy for us to minimize the importance of this question. It is always easy for any individual or any nation which is exercising power of any kind to feel that such individual or such nation can exercise that power better than anyone else. No doubt England thought exactly the same way when the American Colonies sought their independence.

America has grown to be a great Nation; the richest, the most powerful organized country on earth, but at the time she fought for and obtained her independence she had less popula-



tion, less national wealth, and was probably of as little apparent relative national importance as the Philippines are to-day.

But whether or not these comparisons be true, the only questions now left to be determined are whether the Filipinos desire independence, and whether they have shown that they are capable of conducting their own government.

#### PHILIPPINES DESIRE INDEPENDENCE.

There can be no doubt of their desire for independence. They have sent two missions to the United States with the single purpose of urging upon the Congress the granting of absolute independence. I was a member of the Insular Affairs Committee of the House at the time this first commission came, and had the pleasure of listening to their presentation. That was the first time in the history of the world that a dependent people had come before the governing country asking independence without reciting a complaint whatever but asking simply for the recognition of a great principle on the basis of fundamental right and breathing nothing but appreciation and good will toward the governing people. It was a magnificent tribute to the unselfish purposes of their country. Only recently another has come for the same purpose. Even the Woods-Forbes report shows that the Filipinos desire independence. I quote from that report, as follows:

We find the people are happy, peaceful, and, in the main, prosperous. We find everywhere among the Christian Filipinos—90 per cent of the population—the desire for independence.

Thus their desire for independence is beyond question. However, I may add in this connection the following quotation from the same report:

The Americans in the Islands, numbering 6,931 out of 10,956,732 total population, or far less than one-tenth of 1 per cent, are for a continued American control.

Thus it seems that the Americans who are there are anxious to have them continue under American control. I wonder if there is not a likelihood that the present policy toward the islands may have been determined more upon the basis of the interests of Americans than the interests of the Filipinos themselves?

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. LITTLE. Very largely I agree with the gentleman, but may I call his attention to the difference between a Christian Filipino, the Moros, and the Mindanao people and suggest probably there is considerable difference in their capacity for self-government.

Mr. JONES. But the Wood-Forbes report says that 90 per cent are Christian people.

Mr. LITTLE. That is true, but as the gentleman knows the Moros and the Mindanaos are really practically savages, and I do not believe you should place the Moros and the Mindanaos in the same category.

Mr. JONES. I base my judgment on the seven years' government under the Jones Act.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. KENT. During the administration under the Jones Act, which was very largely under a Democratic administration, of course.

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENT. Does not the gentleman realize at that time the banking system they organized was completely disorganized because of the speculative efforts of the men in control of the system—

Mr. JONES. I have heard all kinds of charges on that score, but they got along fairly well during the seven years, and I do not believe that they had much more trouble along that line than we had in this country during the crash that followed all over the world after the war.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. A moment ago the gentleman stated an official report as to the percentage of American residents in the Philippines desiring independence for the Philippines, and if I recall it was very small, almost negligible. Practically all of the Americans there desire the continuance of the American Government?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I would like to ask if the gentleman has any authoritative figures touching the percentage of American residents in Cuba who were in favor of Cuban independence and the percentage in favor of retaining the island under the Spanish Crown?

Mr. JONES. I have not the figures at hand, but I have an idea you will find the same condition existed there as now exists in the Philippines, at least that is my opinion.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I do not have authoritative figures, but I can give some newspaper figures to show that at least 75 per cent of the Americans in Cuba just preceding the final revolt there were in favor of retaining Cuba under the yoke of Spain, and the illustration seems to be apt with reference to the attitude of Americans now resident in the Philippines.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. I think that is true.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, the same thing is true to-day with the controversy over the Isle of Pines, which some contend belongs to the Cuban Republic. Those Americans who have gone in and invested money and exploited those people protest against taking it out from under the American flag.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I am sorry, I really have to get on.

Mr. KENT. If the gentleman will just permit, is it not a fact that capital always wants to invest itself under a stable government?

Mr. JONES. Most assuredly, but capital has not the right to dictate to a government or a people the form of government they shall have simply for the protection of outside invested capital.

Mr. KENT. The gentleman, then, is conscientiously of the opinion that there is a stable government now in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES. What I said and what I undertook to say is that the Filipinos have shown they are entitled at least to the experiment of self-government. They have had seven years during which they have made their own laws, controlled their own affairs, with simply the veto power in the hands of Governor General Harrison, which was seldom exercised.

Mr. KENT. Would the gentleman want to send it out independent as a republic among the nations?

Mr. JONES. According to our promise, that is our obligation. We could, of course, reserve the right under certain conditions to, at the end of a certain time, resume the control; but I am perfectly willing to "cut loose" entirely with the possible exception of coaling privileges. Now I must decline to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. JONES. In his message to Congress on December 2, 1920, President Wilson plainly recognized that the only remaining condition which had stood between the Filipinos and independence had been complied with, and in his message to Congress he uses the following language:

Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf, and have thus fulfilled the condition set by the Congress as precedent to a consideration of granting independence to the islands.

#### THE PHILIPPINES ARE READY.

I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled, it is now our duty to keep our promise to the people of those islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet.

This message was written just after America had taken part in a great war, the greatest of all history. One of the great principles which was involved in that struggle was the right of peoples everywhere to control their own destinies without regard to the governing authority of any country and without regard to the selfish interests of any group or set of men whatever. During the war the Filipinos showed their loyalty to the Government of the United States by tendering the services of 25,000 men. They contributed a submarine and a destroyer to the fleet of the United States, and 6,000 of their men served as volunteers in the United States Navy. They gave a half million dollars to the Red Cross fund and subscribed about \$20,000,000 to the issues of Liberty bonds.

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

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Does the gentleman think that the people in the Philippine Islands would have maintained a stable government had it not been for the American authority established in the islands?

Mr. JONES. That is a purely academic question. That was 25 years ago when we first took them over. Whether or not they would at that time is an entirely different question to the one with which we are now faced. The only question we are face to face with now, if they desire independence, is whether

or not they can handle their own affairs, not as they were then, but as they are now.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Does the gentleman think they could maintain order to-day—

Mr. JONES. I most certainly think that the Philippines are in much better condition to handle their own affairs than a great many of these other little countries that we recognized at the conclusion of the great World War, and I believe that the experience under the Jones Act, under which for the last seven years they have practically handled their own affairs, until General Wood went over there, shows that they can handle them. We had no trouble until General Wood went over there.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. That does not answer the question.

Mr. JONES. I am sorry. I have made it just as clear as language can make it.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. I asked the gentleman if he believed they could maintain order in the Philippines to-day were it not for the presence of the American authorities.

Mr. JONES. I most certainly do. That is purely an opinion, and I base it on their experiences for the seven years prior to the time we sent General Wood over there and upon the judgment of men who are in a position to know. I want to say in that connection that in the last 25 years there has not been an insurrection of any consequence nor a revolt against the United States Government. There has been as little of disorder as could have been expected by the most sanguine of the advocates of independence. Since the enactment of the Jones law they have had practical control of all of the affairs of their country until the sending to the islands of General Wood.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Has the gentleman's attention been called to a consideration of the conduct of Governor General Wood and a misunderstanding with the Philippine people and its bearing upon the general question of independence?

Mr. JONES. Yes; and I want to say—

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Is the gentleman's speech an attack on General Wood?

Mr. JONES. Not at all. I am answering the gentleman's question as to whether or not they are able to handle their own affairs. I say they did do it until we sent a military man there. I do not believe—and I am not saying this as an attack on General Wood—that a military man ought to be at the head of the Philippines or any other civil government. [Applause.] That is exactly the way I feel about it.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is the gentleman acquainted with General Wood's administration of civil affairs of Cuba?

Mr. JONES. I understand there were a great many complaints of his administration there. There have been several efforts made to get me away from the Philippines, but I want to speak to the Philippines as far as I may.

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

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the gentleman gets too far from the proposition of the Filipinos' fitness for self-government, I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the statement Admiral Dewey made about 1898 or 1900, and subsequently before a committee of either the House or Senate, to the effect that in his opinion the Filipinos were more capable of self-government than the Cubans were.

#### THE WOOD RÉGIME.

Mr. JONES. I believe the sending of General Wood to the Philippines was a great mistake, not so much because it was General Wood but because he was a military man. The training of a military man in its very essence and nature renders him unfitted to head a civil government. It is just as unwise to select a man whose lifelong training has been in a military way to head a civil government as it would be to select a man who had all his life been in civilian employment and never had any military training to command an army on the field of battle. The very nature of the training, the very character of the work that a military man is called upon to do demands unlimited authority and unquestioning obedience. No man can escape the nature of his training. It was but natural, therefore, that General Wood should endeavor to institute a form of government that was altogether out of harmony with the spirit of autonomy, and that would tend to destroy rather than to develop the art of self-government in the people of the Philippines.

Not only was General Wood unfitted by virtue of his military training to be the head of a government in the Philippines or of any other civil government, but in addition thereto he seems to have had the wrong viewpoint generally. He seems to have had the viewpoint of the big business interests who apparently want to exploit the islands instead of to see them remain the property of the people themselves. This has been the complaint of the Filipinos practically ever since General Wood became Governor General of the islands. At the time complaint was first made many thought it was due to an impulsiveness or to a little irritation occasioned by the change of governors. However, the complaint was so persistent and additional ones were so numerous that it appeared there must be some grounds for such continued dissatisfaction.

A number of things have occurred that seem to bear out these complaints. Only recently it has developed that the governor's son, Lieut. Osborne Wood, had made an immense fortune in speculating on the exchanges in New York City. If this had been but a single speculative investment it could easily have been designated as a stroke of fortune, but it extended over a period of more than a year, involving a great many investments in numerous stocks and other interests. When those who have spent their lifetime bending over and watching every pulse of the stock ticker find it difficult to beat the game in New York, it is very remarkable that a boy in his twenties should through a long course of speculation involving both sides of the game—short selling as well as purchasing—be able to come out so handsomely and so consistently. Of course, General Wood denies any knowledge of these investments. We must take him at his word—at least, until proof is given to the contrary—but, at the same time, it requires some effort to give full credence to that position when it is remembered that Lieutenant Wood is the son of Governor Wood, was his first aid, and was with him during the whole period, especially in view of the rumors that have been going around for months as to the good fortune of young Wood.

#### OUR HONOR AT STAKE.

That, however, is merely an incident. The big question before the Congress and the American people is the plighted faith of the Government. America occupies a proud place in the world's affairs. From simple beginnings we have grown to a position of heritage and power. It is easy for a nation to forget its early struggles when hardships have been endured. After the lapse of a few years the hardships are forgotten and only heroic memories remain. People become absorbed in other things and are prone to forget what has gone on before.

More than a quarter of a century has elapsed since Old Glory was first raised in the Philippines. For nearly 150 years that flag has been the symbol of liberty and not of conquest, an emblem of human rights, without a taint of selfishness or exploitation. "Blazing all over its ample folds" has been an unbroken record as stainless as the stars that sparkle in its field of blue. Shining through every thread of its wondrous fabric has been the memory of the Revolutionary blood that was spilled to make it possible. In all the period of its glorious history not one ignoble deed of national consequence has been done to dishonor it; not one cloud of suspicion has arisen to pollute it since the days of Betsy Ross, whose Quaker hands first fashioned it into a robe of triumph. Can we, we with such a heritage, afford by any act, either of omission or commission, to raise any question as to our utmost good faith? Shall we forget the blood that was spilled in our defense, or the tears that were shed for our glory? Not so long as the fires burn upon the altar of freedom and we remain true to the traditions of the Republic.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will give the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. JONES. America's word has never been dishonored. Her honor has never been questioned. The world's faith in her has never been shaken. Shall we desert the principles builded into our national structure at so terrific a cost?

Perhaps the Filipinos would make some mistakes. Perhaps for a time their government would not be so good as the one we have given them. A child would never learn to walk alone if some grown person, who could walk better than it could, insisted always in rendering assistance.

Mr. KENT. Is it not a fact that by reason of the experiences in the past year or so the failure on the part of the Filipinos to adapt themselves either to military or civil authority is one of the strongest grounds for doubting that they are able to govern themselves?



Mr. JONES. I do not admit the gentleman's premises. Those who are in the best position to know think otherwise, and I prefer to accept their authority rather than that of others with reference to their ability to govern themselves. Years ago Governor General Taft said the Philippines would soon be ready for self-government. The great Roosevelt said substantially as much. Governor General Harrison said they were ready for the great adventure. President Wilson three years ago urged immediate independence. The last seven years have fully demonstrated their ability to govern themselves. The parting of the ways has come. The hour for action has arrived.

I do not know what the future may hold in store. I do not know what discoveries, what inventions, what wonderful things the genius of man may contrive. I know not what labor-saving devices, what triumphs in the arts and sciences, what wonders in delving into the earth or in mastering the elements of the air may be the attainments of the peoples of the world in the years to come. Probably what has already been discovered, what has already been invented, what has already been achieved is but faintly typical of the marvelous things in store for the future. But I do know that whatever may be discovered; whatever inventions, whatever triumphs, whatever glories await the peoples of the world, there can not come to any race of men, to any country, to any land or people anything to take the place of liberty.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, in this morning's paper is a dispatch from Chicago evidently intended to influence the wheat market and legislation on wheat. It states that the President has increased the tariff on wheat 12 per cent and that that has resulted in a cut of 8 cents a bushel in the price of wheat on the Chicago Board of Trade. It also gives a distorted statement of the wheat on hand now. The Agricultural Department has just informed us that the farmers have 22,000,000 bushels less wheat on hand than they had a year ago; that the country mills and elevators have less wheat on hand than a year ago, but that the speculators have on hand 18,000,000 bushels more of wheat in what they call the "commercial visible supply."

The dispatch says that the "largest house in the grain trade" says, "Our visible supply is 10,000,000 bushels larger than last year." That one firm or outfit has on hand over half of the speculative wheat, and they are at the bottom of all this effort to break the value of the farmers' wheat and to bulldoze Congress into buying the speculators' wheat at a fancy price through legislation now before Congress, and this dispatch was sent to further those interests.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Is the gentleman referring to some bill that is now being considered?

Mr. LITTLE. Well, I am going to leave that for the gentleman's very able and logical mind to decide for itself. [Laughter.] The gentleman probably knows more about it than I do.

Gentlemen, an immense amount of the agitation for wheat legislation springs from the wheat speculators, who do not know just what to do with their wheat—18,000,000 bushels more than last year. Their market price is cut down, the farmers suffer, and then they call attention to a misfortune in Europe—the alleged terrible shortage of food there—and that the Government must buy their wheat. Well, we put a stop to that last summer when they threatened to again force down the value of wheat if the Government did not buy their accumulations and ship them to Europe.

Here is one firm that has 10,000,000 bushels of wheat more than a year ago. If they get 50 cents more a bushel on that and sell it to the Government, they will make \$5,000,000 on it.

I want to put these facts before the House while the morning dispatch is fresh in the minds of the Members, and to show the Members that there is a mysterious influence which is continually keeping such stuff in the papers. You wait another week, and you will see another dispatch.

If this Chicago Board of Trade can cut the price of wheat 8 cents a bushel in a day, as it claims in this dispatch, simply because the President raised the tariff on wheat, it is a venomous incendiary and should be suppressed by criminal penalties; but it boasts in this wire that it did that.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. I want to get the gentleman's judgment on this: Is it the gentleman's judgment that the bills which are

now being considered to relieve the wheat farmers will relieve not the wheat farmers but the wheat speculators?

Mr. LITTLE. My judgment is that the wheat speculators are very earnestly agitating some such legislation because they expect to make money out of it, but in addition to that I think the farmers very much need some legislation of this sort. Without any doubt whatever there are men who agitate for legislation that will force the Government to buy their speculative wheat, taking advantage of the dire necessities of the farmer whose wheat they bought for almost nothing.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is it not a fact that every one of the speculators who has appeared with reference to this bill is very violently opposed to it for the simple reason that it takes away from him the future market which has been the source of his speculation?

Mr. LITTLE. No; if the gentleman is asking me.

Mr. KETCHAM. I have attended the hearings and I find that is the evidence.

Mr. LITTLE. So have I, and I have heard them speak. There is one great buyer that is said to have on hand 15,000,000 bushels of wheat. If they could get \$1.50 for this wheat, which cost them 90 cents or less, they would profit by several millions of dollars. I must not yield too much. Who is the speculator referred to by the gentleman?

Mr. KETCHAM. I am speaking of the president of the board of trade, if the gentleman please.

Mr. LITTLE. All speculators are opposed to any law except those just now stuck with too much wheat.

Mr. LAZARO. How much of the wheat of the last crop is now held by the farmers and how much by the speculators?

Mr. LITTLE. One hundred and thirty-three million bushels are held by the farmers, 22,000,000 less than a year ago, 90,000,000 bushels are held in farmers' elevators, which is less than one year ago, and the wheat speculators hold 72,000,000 bushels, 18,000,000 bushels more than they had a year ago. They are making much agitation, in my judgment. They buy the farmer's wheat for 80 cents a bushel, and under the pretense of getting better prices for the farmers advocate some plan that will give them 50 or 60 cents a bushel profit on the wheat they accumulate. Nevertheless, gentlemen, it is your duty to provide sufficient legislation to enable the wheat farmer to continue in his business without losing money. Your manifest duty is to accord him the possibility of such a successful business. He simply must have more money for his wheat or quit raising any wheat for export, and since the war he has exported wheat that brought him approximately \$1,500,000,000. Is that worth preserving?

Now, the gentleman has touched a point right there which I have discussed before. He asked me how much was held. I am right here going to tell you what the experience of the year before this was, and you will have the figures before you. They are constantly misrepresented; I will just say, plainly lied about all the time by the bunco steerers of the boards of trade in London, Liverpool, Chicago, and elsewhere. They constantly assert we have grown too much wheat, but there never was a year when we had a surplus of wheat, and there never will be.

The gentlemen fail to differentiate between an alleged surplus and our exportable wheat. We produce about 800,000,000 bushels per annum. We utilize about three-fourths of that or more at home. The rest we must sell in the world's market, and the wheat speculators and the boards of trade scare the farmer to death by telling him that is a surplus. There is never any surplus. Our foreign market is just as certain as any other market, and the wheat we sell abroad is sold just as much as any other wheat the farmer raises. It becomes our duty, gentlemen, to devise a means by which the American producer can dispose of his goods in the foreign market at a reasonable price, but first you must get it clear in your minds and in the minds of the farmers that we have no surplus.

And I shall now present to you the figures for a whole year to demonstrate that when the year is done we have no wheat remaining except the ordinary carry over, which we must maintain every year because the millers must necessarily have it to produce good flour when the soft crop first comes in and to meet the home consumption from month to month.

I have consulted the Wall Street Journal, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, who has given more attention to this particular feature of it than perhaps any of us. For example, take the year beginning July 1, 1922; that year we grew a crop of 856,000,000

bushels. We had a carry over from the year before of 78,000,000 bushels. We imported that year 20,000,000 bushels, or a total of 984,000,000 bushels. We could eat it or sell it, as we pleased. We carried over into the next year 101,000,000 bushels. We exported 222,000,000 bushels, and we ate, fed to stock, or used for seed all the rest, 631,000,000 bushels. When the year ended we did not have a bushel of surplus wheat. The carry over of 100,000,000 bushels was quite ordinary. Of that amount the farmers only held 35,000,000 bushels in their bins. There was no surplus except what the farmer had in his bin, because the farmer is the only man who can have a surplus. If he sells all his wheat, there is no surplus; it does not make any difference who buys it, or whether it is bought in London or Cleveland or Liverpool.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The gentleman's distinction is this, as I understand it: The bill he has particularly in mind puts in the term that there is an exportable surplus, while the history of the growth of wheat the world over, year after year, demonstrates clearly that there never is any such thing, viewed by and large in the world, as a world surplus.

Mr. LITTLE. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. If the gentleman will permit me, I will go into that in detail a little, because I think I can make it clear. There is in the world this year—the Wall Street Journal claims, and it is the limit, I think, but the Secretary says, in effect, the same thing—there is a total crop of 3,400,000,000 bushels of wheat. For the six years before we went into the war the annual average crop was 500,000,000 bushels of wheat a year more than this year. You will see, gentlemen, that it is pure nonsense to talk about any world surplus at all.

Before the war and up to 1915 the world produced 500,000,000 more bushels of wheat a year than we have got this year. There is no surplus.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood the gentleman to say in his opening remarks that the speculators state that there are 18,000,000 bushels more of wheat than really exist.

Mr. LITTLE. This house says they have 10,000,000 bushels—

Mr. RANKIN. More than really exists?

Mr. LITTLE. No; not more than exists.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman confesses then that all the wheat they claim is in existence is really in existence?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; sure. Perhaps the gamblers exaggerate in claiming 72,000,000. The department should make those figures itself.

Mr. RANKIN. The reason I ask that question is the Department of Commerce has recently given out a statement accounting for 600,000 bales of cotton that does not exist at all, and I just wanted to know if they had imposed on the wheat farmer the same as on the cotton farmer.

Mr. LITTLE. They are better sharks than the wheat men, I guess, and that is going pretty strong. No; there is some wheat in the country, but that is nothing to be scared about. They have that every year and get rid of it every year. There is no world surplus of wheat and there never is. Now, let us go further. These speculators at Chicago say they have no market. They were weeping around here last summer begging the Government to buy wheat and ship it to "starving people in Europe." I found out that the scoundrels had a lot of wheat that they could not get as high a price for as they wanted and they wanted to pass it on to the Government, and I telegraphed to the department and sent them, I am afraid, a rather impertinent telegram; but anyway we stopped it.

Now, in reference to this wheat market: In the years since the war we have shipped to Europe and exported, all told, 1,500,000,000 bushels of wheat. They talk about no market. There never was in all time any market that compared with the foreign market this country has enjoyed. I do not want you to think there is a surplus of wheat. There is nothing here but less than the usual exportable wheat which we have every year, and we sell it every year. It is not a surplus at all. If we sold every bushel we raised in London it would not be surplus, it would be export wheat. What we have got to deal with is the exportable wheat. That is our menace, and I will speak to you about that in a moment, if you will permit me.

We have plenty of markets and we have no surplus. We have to contend with the exportable wheat. The board of trade at Chicago and the one at Liverpool and Broomhall in London begin each season by scaring the farmers to death by telling them there is too much wheat all over the world and various other tales.

#### MEET FARMER AT HARVEST.

I find that if we can meet the farmer coming in from the wheat field with his crop before these sharks get to him and give him a decent price for his wheat, he will be in the clear. [Applause.] This is the first thing we have to do.

I am now going to speak to this side of the House for a moment. In this country for 100 years we have been paying a tariff tax in order to keep you folks in New York and New England busy. You could not compete with the shoe manufacturers in England, and we gave you a tariff and we built up the greatest manufacturing industries in the world; and I am a Republican and proud of it. But now you must reciprocate. Times have now changed. It was a very simple thing then. We could not make a pair of shoes that could compete with a European pair of shoes and so you stuck a tariff on the shoes and we had to pay a little more for them, and as a result we make our own shoes and have cheap shoes at home and sell shoes in our home market. Now, this world market confronts the farmer when he sells wheat, as it did the shoemaker. They have become so prosperous they are growing more wheat than we can eat, and they have to ship it to Liverpool. The conflict gives them a lower price than they ought to have at home. Are you now going to put wheat on a par with shoes and steel? We have made you rich.

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

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman knows that there is no duty on shoes or leather now.

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, I am not speaking of the moment; I began a hundred years ago. The principle, of course, is what is involved. Now, these farmers are stuck. There is just one thing for you to do and you might as well quit fooling with it. You either have to enable them to meet the market in Liverpool or they have got to quit raising so much wheat. The shoemaker did not quit making shoes. When you put a tariff on, somebody has got to pay it.

Mr. SNYDER. I am not a shoemaker, but the gentleman knows what the tariff did. It made us make so many shoes that we now supply not only this country but other countries, and we hope to do the same thing with wheat. We have put 45 cents a bushel on wheat and hope that that will enable us to supply ourselves and other countries.

Mr. LITTLE. When the shoe trade could not compete with the European shoemakers 100 years ago, we put a tariff on shoes and all these other foreign competitive goods. The rest of us paid a better price and made the shoemakers and other eastern factories well to do. The tariff is useful to the farmer, but it could not be such a bulwark to him as it was to the factories and laboring man. We can use it here, because it protected our shoemaker in our home market. We can not so much benefit the farmer thereby, but what he wants is protection in the foreign market, in Liverpool, for instance. We can not by any tariff give the farmer protection in Liverpool, but we must give him something just as useful and we can do it under H. R. 8330, my export bill. The predecessor of it was reported favorably by the committee last year.

The first difficulty the farmer meets is that when he comes in from his harvest field with his first wheat he finds himself confronted by threats of a surplus crop and insistence that his wheat has no value. The first thing you have got to do for him is to fix it so that he will get a fair, reasonable price when he harvests, and nobody will do that but you gentlemen, you of this House, if anybody ever does. It is useless and idle to pretend any longer. The bill H. R. 8330 provides that when the farmer brings his wheat in the Government shall stand ready to pay him \$1.10 a bushel at once for his wheat at his home town, not in Chicago or Minneapolis. It provides that he shall get \$1.10 at home for his crop, which we hope will be enough to prevent him from a loss. If you are going to maintain a tariff you will simply be compelled to make provision for the farmer and his protection in the Liverpool market.

When he knows that the Government is prepared to pay him \$1.10 at his home market, the wheat buyers of this country will necessarily be compelled to meet the Government competition and pay \$1.10, too. When that happens it will not be necessary for the Government to buy any wheat at all. The bill, if administered intelligently, will simply make it clear that the Government will pay \$1.10, if nobody else does, and then the wheat buyers will pay \$1.10 for all the wheat we need for home consumption. We produce about 800,000,000 bushels a year, and we consume and utilize about 650,000,000 bushels of it at home, and the home market of the United States would be \$1.10 a bushel, and the farmer would be sure of that.



amount for his wheat until the home consumption was amply supplied. That disposes of three-fourths of our crop.

Let us suppose the wheat buyer, the farmer, and the Government agent meet at a town in the morning. The wheat buyers will purchase through the day until they have bought as much as their market demands. Possibly at 4 in the afternoon, or on Saturday morning of the week, they may say, "We have all the wheat for which there is now any demand for home consumption." The Government will then step in and purchase the surplus of wheat on hand at that town that day or that week or that month, and eventually that year, and pay \$1.10 for it. Thus at the end of the year the Department of Agriculture will have purchased all the wheat we raised that must be exported.

The conditions will necessarily adjust automatically to meet that plan. Thus when the Secretary of Agriculture gets our 150,000,000 or 200,000,000 bushels of wheat each year to Liverpool he will have no American competitors to prevent him from controlling the Liverpool market.

Last year my bill simply provided that we pay \$1 a bushel. They laughed at me and said the farmers would insist on at least \$1.50. Wheat sold for 70 cents, 80 cents, 90 cents, and 95 cents. Nobody out West got \$1 a bushel until very recently, when they have gotten \$1.02 in some places. This country raised 780,000,000 bushels last year. If my bill had gone into effect just as it was written last year, they would have averaged 20 cents a bushel on wheat more than the farmers have received, and the wheat farmers of this country would have been worth \$150,000,000 more than they are now or will be by the end of this crop year. I think those who have kept track of this proposition will concede that, and the Government would not have been compelled to buy more than about 100,000,000 bushels of wheat all told, because that is nearly all we have actually exported by this time. Now, again they tell me the wheat farmers insist on \$1.50 a bushel. Why, does anybody seriously think that they are going to get it? No; nobody does. Why not be reasonable, gentlemen, and sane and sensible and try to actually accomplish something? Last year I would have made you \$150,000,000 if you had let my bill alone and made it a law.

This year H. R. 8330 provides that the Government shall be authorized to pay \$1.10 instead of \$1. I think the eastern people are opening up a little. They begin to understand that if they do not pay the farmers at least a cost price for their wheat the farmers will discontinue sowing wheat and it will soon soar out of sight and the American people will quit eating wheat bread. This bill also provides that when the price goes above \$1.10 the Department of Agriculture can stay with the rising price until they pay \$1.25 to encourage its rise and to make a supply in the Government vaults for any unexpected emergencies and foreign trade. If my bill had become a law last year, I think a good share of the wheat would have sold at \$1.10 without any further encouragement.

We now, if this bill becomes a law, approach what will happen in Liverpool when America appears in the foreign markets with one-fourth, one-third, or perhaps one-half of the exported wheat. In the last six years since the war we shipped abroad 1,500,000,000 bushels of wheat. The European world would have starved to death, gentlemen, if they had not received our wheat. If the Department of Agriculture should say to Liverpool, "We have determined to ship you no wheat for three months," wheat would go up 50 cents a bushel in Liverpool before the 90 days elapsed, and the Government could sell its wheat at its own price. Joe Leiter was the only benefactor the farmers have ever really had. He actually got them more money for their wheat, and there is not a thing in the world that will do them any good except to get them more money for their wheat at their home town. The Secretary of Agriculture, with that enormous crop in his hands, could go to Liverpool and do far more than Joe Leiter did when he controlled the markets at Chicago and raised wheat so high in price. They tell us that the farmers are losing money on the exported wheat. Let us suppose that the Secretary of Agriculture should suddenly conclude to lose money on 20,000,000 bushels of wheat. Why, he could undersell Canada or Argentina in two weeks and drive them out of the European market, and then fix his own price. He could say to the great Canadian exporters, "Unite with me and we will raise the price of wheat by our little pool 20 cents a bushel in Liverpool," and that could be done any time by the Secretary, who would become the potentate of the export trade. You take any shrewd wheat man like my colleague, Mr. HAUGEN, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and make him Secretary in full control of our wheat crop abroad. He could bring home for the American farmer a profit on every bushel of wheat they sent abroad. There are several other bills, but every one of them

admits from the start that we must necessarily lose money under their plans on every shipment we make. Why, then, make any such a law? Why undertake any such commerce? We can do as well as that right now. Let us take a gambler's chance anyway and fight for the markets of the world.

House bill 8330 takes care of all of our home consumption and means that the price of wheat would be \$1.10. That disposes of the local situation as long as the home market holds out. You are a wheat buyer, we will say; you will stick to it until pretty soon you will find that the home consumption is supplied. It might happen the first day at 4 o'clock, and you may begin buying for home consumption right away. The wheat buyer says that he is not going to pay \$1.10 and export to Europe and sell for 99 cents. Then the Government has got to come in, and you may as well face it now. You can tell the farmer to quit raising wheat or do what I am suggesting. They tried it on coffee in Brazil and all of them got rich.

Mr. KVALE. How is the gentleman going to get that bill through this House when the boards of trade and chambers of commerce do not want it?

Mr. LITTLE. I am after them right now. Are you with me?

Mr. KVALE. I am.

Mr. LITTLE. You stay with me and I will lick them. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of a policy of price fixing on any commodities raised by the farmers?

Mr. LITTLE. I am not fixing any prices. I am not in favor of fixing the price on anything. I wish to make the Department of Agriculture a competitor in the wheat market that the wheat gamblers will respect, so that the farmer may get cost price at least for his wheat.

Mr. BLANTON. I just want to remind him that during the war, when our cotton was selling for 40 cents—

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, why do you remind me of that? Do you think that I can not remember back that far?

Mr. BLANTON. That is what the gentleman's proposition would lead to.

Mr. LITTLE. Excuse me. I can not yield any further. The gentleman is a good lawyer and will see that this is not a price-fixing bill as soon as he reads it. The Government would not have to buy any wheat to maintain home consumption wheat at \$1.10. I explained to you that the price would fix itself. The Government acts as a competitor. We do not fix the price any more than you would if you went into the market.

I carefully avoided price fixing. The Government is not going to buy any wheat on this proposition as long as the home markets hold out. I am not in favor of price fixing; I am not in favor of trying anything but wheat on this. I tried that because we can go and stick it in the elevators and keep it there for a cent a bushel. We would build no storehouses. Because of the many elevators, the Government need never build any storehouses. Cotton could be handled in exactly the same way, and the two major farm products made safe crops by the same plan, and with no investment except for the purchase of the wheat and the cotton themselves.

I did not suggest hogs, because it would be, in my judgment, absolutely impossible to buy and feed and keep and slaughter hogs without involving the Government in tremendous expenses and complications. The same is true of handling cattle and many products of the farm. If we can not enact a law that will put wheat farmers in the clear, we certainly can not make a law that will help any other crop or product. If we can manage to make a good law out of this, we can gradually develop possibly other crops and other products as the Government learned its business; but if we undertake to take care of many of them at once, the Government would be swamped. If the Government has a few millions on hand the wheat buyer will respect its promise to buy and stand clear and meet it. To buy the total export of 200,000,000 bushels in a year would be entirely within the range of the Government, but if this Government undertakes at the same time to purchase corn, cotton, wool, hogs, sheep, cattle, flour, and other farm products, no bluff would work. The buyers would absolutely decline to respect any such talk of possible funds. Billions of dollars are needed every year to buy and sell the stock and stock products alone. If this Government would undertake to establish a universal market for all these things, they would require a cash capital of at least \$20,000,000,000 in order to make themselves respected in the competing local markets. One of the reasons this wheat proposition might succeed is the Government could afford to buy and hold wheat and sell the wheat when it got ready and thereby dominate the market, but if this wheat and these hogs,

and so on, must be turned as rapidly as trade turns them now, immediate cash by billions would necessarily have to be kept on hand all the time.

As I said before, home consumption will buy wheat at, at least, \$1.10. It will then become the duty of the Government to pay \$1.10 to the farmer for the export wheat and to take care of it abroad. For nearly 20 years the Government of Brazil has been buying and storing inland its coffee product, shipping it to Santos and Rio, the seaports, and selling it abroad and dominating the market price of coffee in the world. That is the job I suggest for the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to wheat, and if he accomplishes that he certainly will have his hands full without talking about hogs and corn and sheep and cattle. It will be up to him to get us a good price in Liverpool.

This export bill takes care of that. There is not any surplus; that is simply to scare children and deceive farmers in June—the Government will have to buy and carry abroad the exportable wheat. We will do like they do with coffee in Brazil, where they made money for 20 years. When that time comes the Government has got to buy the exportable wheat and none of it allowed to come on the market till the sign is right, and then the Government goes to Europe with a third to one-half of all the exportable wheat. Suppose the Secretary of Agriculture is a shrewd, good business man and finds himself in Liverpool with one-third or one-half, perhaps, of the wheat of the world. Who will fix the price at Liverpool? Why, the Secretary will if he has good common sense. Suppose he says to Europe he will not let anybody buy wheat if it does not bring enough; that he will not export any in three months. Suppose you keep off the market a third to a half of the wheat for a period of three months. Why, everybody here who thinks a minute would know that wheat would shoot up like an arrow. Two hundred million bushels would be about the limit and cost about \$1.10.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Who would fix the price in Liverpool? I ask for two additional minutes.

Mr. FRENCH. I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. The Secretary. He fixes the price in Liverpool, and says what is a reasonable price. It seems to me it is common sense—

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The gentleman called attention to Brazil and the great success it has had in its valorization scheme with reference to coffee. Is it not true that at three different times Brazil has been in great distress through that process? Is not the process to which the gentleman refers exactly the same—

Mr. LITTLE. It is not exactly the same.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. In principle the same?

Mr. LITTLE. No; it is not. From 1907 until now Brazil has been trying the valorization of coffee, with some difficulties and with wonderful success all told. In 1901 and 1902 the price of coffee in Brazil fell from 75 to 50 francs per bag. In 1906 the world had on hand 11,000,000 sacks of coffee, nearly a year's product, and in 1906 and 1907 big crops added 20,000,000 bags. The coffee industry was thus confronted with absolute ruin. In 1907 they actually began the valorization plan. They sailed the ship with difficulty over the rocks until in 1910 they reached victory and big prices and control of the world market.

Mr. KINDRED. Was not the Brazilian law unwholesome in respect to its restriction of the production of coffee?

Mr. LITTLE. The Government maintains eight great warehouses in the interior, in which it stores 4,500,000 bags of coffee. They allow each day only, Sundays excepted, the shipment of 35,000 bags to Santos and 12,000 bags to Rio Janeiro, the seaports, and this is all the coffee exported, and thus they restrict the trade and secure good prices. The crop of 1923 was nearly ruined by torrential rains and the conditions have been very unfortunate for that crop. They have had ample market for all the real good coffee they could export, but great difficulty in handling the rain-soaked coffee. Commencing in three States, they now have the Government with a department for coffee behind the valorization plan with the announcement that it shall continue. For 17 years they have weathered it through, generally with great success, assisted by the export taxes, by Government loans sometimes, and sometimes by issues of bank notes, but with the result that Brazil leads the world's markets. They have tried many experiments and had many new ideas which failed to materialize.

Gentlemen, there are many theories they talk to you about they never put into force. [Applause.]

#### ARGUMENT BEFORE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE.

In accord with leave given me to revise and extend my remarks and insert my argument to the Committee on Agriculture March 5, I present following this the argument made then to that committee in favor of H. R. 8330, formerly 78, by its author, including the bill:

#### LITTLE EXPORT BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Little, we will be glad to hear you now on H. R. 78.

The bill is as follows:

"[H. R. 8330, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.]

"A bill (H. R. 8330) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, store, and sell wheat, and to secure and maintain to the producer a reasonable price for wheat and to the consumer a reasonable price for bread, and to stabilize wheat values.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to buy wheat of such grades and quality as he designates, at such times and places as he directs, at not to exceed \$1.25 a bushel and at not to exceed the market price at said times and places, except when wheat is being sold there, and then at less than \$1.10 a bushel, when he may pay \$1.10 a bushel for said wheat if he deems best; and an appropriation of \$60,000,000 is hereby authorized for the purchase, transportation, storage, and insurance of said wheat.

"Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has accumulated in elevator storage 1,000,000 bushels of wheat or more, Treasury certificates shall be issued to the Secretary of Agriculture at such interest and for such times as the Secretary of the Treasury shall name, but with authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to pay them prior to their expiration if he shall see fit. They shall be issued in such amount as the Secretary of the Treasury shall hold to be properly secured by the wheat then in storage. But whenever the wheat on which these certificates are issued is sold, that money shall be applied to the discharge of that particular indebtedness and to pay off those certain certificates, and this process may continue whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has a million or more bushels of wheat in storage on which no certificates have issued.

"The wheat he buys shall be stored in elevators under warehouse receipts. When any 2,000 bushels or more of wheat shall have been held by the Secretary for more than 30 days, thereafter it shall be stored in bonded elevators.

"The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time sell wheat at not less than the market price in Minneapolis; Buffalo; Kansas City, Kans.; Chicago; and New York City, as he shall deem to best interests of the Nation.

"Whenever wheat of the aforesaid grades and quality can not be bought in Chicago and New York City for less than \$1.85 per bushel, the Secretary of Agriculture shall proceed to sell as much of the wheat he holds in storage as he deems wise, at such prices as shall be considered proper by him, and so continue as in his judgment such sales shall be to the best interests of the Nation.

"The \$60,000,000 first appropriated, the money derived from the sale of the certificates authorized, and the money derived from the sale of wheat by the Secretary as hereinbefore authorized, or for this fund from any other source, shall constitute a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this act. If the sale of any wheat made security for any given certificates shall not be sufficient to take up those certificates, the balance may be discharged from the said revolving fund.

"The President of the United States shall appoint, for a term of four years and subject to removal by him, an officer in the Department of Agriculture, to be known as the superintendent of grain and bread, at a salary of \$10,000 a year, who shall maintain in Washington an office as his headquarters, employing, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, such assistants in said headquarters and such agents for the purchase and sale of wheat as shall be appropriated for. The bonds of all bonded elevators in which wheat shall be stored shall be subject to approval by the superintendent of grain and bread.

"Subject to the provisions hereof, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make, subject to the approval of the President of the United States, and shall enforce suitable regulations for the exercise of the powers and the performance of the duties hereby authorized."

Mr. LITTLE. Apropos of Mr. TINCER's instructions, Hon. SYDNEY ANDERSON, who was president of the National Wheat Conference and has given a great deal of study to the matter, has instructed me to say to this committee that if any one of these bills is to be reported he prefers the Little bill. He was chairman of the Joint Agricultural Commission and has given as much attention to the subject as anybody, and I guess represents as many people.

Mr. CLARKE. We deny that he has given any more attention to it than has this committee.

Mr. LITTLE. I did not say he had. I said as much.

Mr. CLAGUE. He does not represent the wheat farmers.



Mr. LITTLE. I don't know the details of all national organizations. They had a meeting up here and Mr. Jewett, president of the American Wheat Growers' Association, spoke the other night, and at the National Conference, over which Congressman ANDERSON presided, at Chicago last June; so they have been active. I just speak of that incidentally.

As far as I can learn, this bill of mine was the first bill ever reported favorably from a committee to this Congress, authorizing the Government to buy wheat and pay certain amounts for it. As far as I know, this bill is the first instance in which a bill has been introduced to enable the Federal Government to conduct the exports beneficially for the farmers. There is, in this connection, another thing that I want to call your attention to. The only instance in the world where a government has been successful in handling crops that I know of is that of Brazil. I have given considerable study to that. It is very difficult to secure from the Department of Agriculture or any source any definite information about it. What I learned I got from the Department of Commerce.

Gentlemen, I think that Brazil's method should have been the first thing that we should have studied. There should have been a committee sent there to get the facts. As near as I can figure it, the gist of it is this: The Government of Brazil puts an export tax on coffee. In that way nobody else can afford to export coffee. The Government can then buy all the coffee. That gives them control of the export of coffee from Brazil, and eventually of the world market. It has been very successful.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce told me that it was a total failure. He had no information. It has been a great success, as his department's figures show, and I want to say to you gentlemen that I am not familiar with the facts for a year or two, but in 1921 they made a great deal of money out of coffee, more than they ever did in Brazil, and I can assure you that that is the best possible basis to work from.

Mr. CLARKE. Let me ask a question there. You are familiar with the fact that they came very near going broke in 1920, and had to be refinanced through a loan of millions of dollars?

Mr. LITTLE. No; not in 1920, but some 10 years before that they did. They accumulated so much coffee that they did not know what to do with it, but things broke right for them and went over, and they have been making money ever since.

Mr. SINCLAIR. How long has this coffee embargo been in existence?

Mr. LITTLE. The Government has been at this since about 1905. I want to call attention to that for the simple reason that my bill is, I think, the first bill that undertakes to follow that proposition. If my bill prevailed, the Government would buy 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. That would mean that the Government would control the shipment of wheat to Liverpool, and in my judgment it would then control the world market. That is really the principal thing in my bill, except one more, with which the older Members are familiar. If my bill had become a law in the Sixty-seventh Congress, the Government would have been authorized to pay a dollar a bushel at the man's home town for his wheat. They would have been able to go right there and give that to him. My theory was, and JOHN TILSON and MARTIN MADDEN both joined me in it, among others; TILSON spoke to the committee and MADDEN authorized me to say that last year. I haven't talked with him lately; but my theory is that if you are a farmer at Abilene, Kans., and the Government informs you that it is going to buy your wheat at a dollar, you won't sell it for any less, and that is all there is to it. Then a buyer comes there buying wheat for a big mill, and he finds the Government and the farmer standing there, and he will pay a dollar, because the miller must have the wheat. That is all there is to that. My theory is, agreed to by Colonel TILSON and other men, that it would not be necessary for the Government to buy any wheat at all, that the result would be that the farmer would not sell for less than a dollar because he knew he could get a dollar, and the wheat buyers would have to meet the Government competition and pay a dollar.

If that had happened last year, if my bill had passed, or the bill which the committee reported out had passed, you would have gotten a dollar and a half, and that would have made 50 cents a bushel on 700,000,000 bushels of wheat and the farmers would have made \$350,000,000 above what they did.

The trouble was that when you got it up to \$1.50 Mr. Tilson and these other men wouldn't stay by me and I did not have a chance to pass it. I do not believe anybody else will ever pass any bill to make it \$1.50 in the House. You can't get by long with a pretext of \$1.50 and drawbacks and rebates. If they had taken my bill and made it a dollar, I could have put it through, and the farmers would have made at least 20 cents more a bushel on the average last year. I had considerable conservative support, and if the farmers had stayed with me they would have gotten 20 cents a bushel more on the wheat; and \$1.10 to \$1.25 in cash is better than \$1.50 in soap bubbles in the sun. The lawyers who make fortunes collecting overpayments of taxes will soon have a lifetime job here collecting the claims wheat producers will have against a corporation for the farmers' share of the

wheat sold in Europe if you are not careful in your legislation. Come, gentlemen, be sensible, and pay the farmer for his wheat at his home town.

There was not any wheat west of the Mississippi that sold for a dollar. Some of you people said that that wasn't enough to encourage the farmer. It would have gone up to \$1.10, too. If that bill had gone through they would have gotten 20 cents a bushel more and they would have made \$150,000,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. You speak of the Government paying the farmer \$1.25 or whatever it is.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. At Abilene, Kans., you use that point as a citation.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Would you pay that at Fargo, N. Dak.?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; anywhere.

Mr. SINCLAIR. And Helena, Mont.?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; anywhere.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is the reverse of the usual order.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; I know it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. You don't take into consideration the freight?

Mr. LITTLE. You are making a market for the farmer in Chicago. That is one of the things that is breaking him up. The market, under my plan, would be at the home of the farmer, at the farmer's town, and one farmer would get as much as another. There are some arguments against that, of course. I see your point.

Mr. SINCLAIR. You are not taking into consideration the cost of freight?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; I have.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The cost of shipping to the consuming centers?

Mr. LITTLE. If a man wants to buy a bushel of wheat, he will have to pay at least \$1.10 under this bill, no matter where he gets it. He can look after the freight himself. Now, we make a market in Chicago or Minneapolis, but the farmer has got to have a market at home, because that is where he sells his wheat. When you pay a certain amount at Chicago or terminal market, the farmer don't get it. The reason we never helped the farmer is because we never legislate for him. We only legislate for the man in Chicago, Minneapolis, or Kansas City.

Mr. SINCLAIR. No; the amount of freight is off.

Mr. LITTLE. The only bill that I know anything of that has been offered that gives the farmer anything is my bill. The rest of you are talking about Chicago or Minneapolis. If I give him a home market instead of a Chicago market, I will make more money for the farmer than has ever been made for him by any one man except Joe Lefter one season.

Now, the wheat would have been sold for 20 cents a bushel more if my bill had gone through, and 50 cents more if the bill you made out of my bill had gone through. I want to bring before you the fact that my bill follows the Brazilian plan, and in my judgment would throw the control of the American wheat markets abroad into the hands of the Government and give them control of the world market.

Mr. Atkeson, who supported this bill last year, will be here this morning to speak again for it.

Prior to every harvest the grain exchanges of London, Liverpool, Chicago, and elsewhere raise the cry of an enormous crop and bring their energies to bear on forcing the farmer to sell his wheat at a sacrifice. The bill I am discussing provides that the United States shall be ready to pay from \$1.10 to \$1.25 a bushel as soon as the harvest begins. That immediately disposes of any dangerous attack by the predatory wheat speculators on the impecunious wheat farmer. The bill I introduced at the last Congress, and which this committee, with some amendments, reported favorably for passage, provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to pay at least \$1 a bushel at the farmer's home town for the farmer's wheat and to the farmer. If that bill had gone into effect just as I introduced it there would have been no marketable wheat sold west of the Mississippi or anywhere else in this country for less than \$1 a bushel and it would have gone, probably, to fully \$1.10. I think that every man who is familiar with that bill and the facts will so concede. No wheat west of the Mississippi ever sold the last year even for the minimum of what my bill provided.

The committee was afraid that \$1 a bushel would not be enough to please the farmer and amended it by making it \$1.50, which at once, of course, made it impossible of passage. If that bill had become a law the 780,000,000 bushels of wheat we raised would have averaged 20 cents a bushel more than it has been sold for. If my bill had been made a law the wheat farmers of this country would have enjoyed an income of \$150,000,000 more for their wheat this year than they are now receiving and all the great West and Northwest would have been in prosperous condition. If my bill becomes a law the Government will be prepared by a \$30,000,000 appropriation and other available resources to buy wheat from the farmer at his home town all over the country at \$1.10 a bushel, and to keep up with competition, at \$1.25. If the Government announces that it will pay \$1.10 for wheat no farmer will sell his wheat for a penny less.

When the farmer demands that for his wheat every miller and every grain buyer will necessarily meet the Federal competition and pay that price for wheat. As long as there is an American market for wheat that will continue. The buyers buy all the wheat every year, and they would any year whether the Government bought any or not, and they would pay that price because they must meet the Government competition. On the front page of these bills that I am handing around you will find the statement that every bushel always sells, all over the world, and that was always so and always will be so. There is not any question about there being an ample market always.

If in the course of the year it developed that the United States would not utilize all this wheat, as is probable, and the buyers decline to purchase any more because they did not need it for home consumption, the Government would take up the purchase of the export wheat and handle it abroad, as I shall explain to you.

If you and I were buying wheat at a certain point—we will stick to Abilene, Kans.—the Government of the United States says that it will pay \$1.10, here is what would happen. We have got to have so much wheat for the millers, and we would buy each day whatever wheat we wanted. The Government buyer would not buy any as long as we were buying. At 4 o'clock you and I might quit; we have got all the wheat we want at \$1.10, and if there was any more wheat then the Government buyer would be expected to buy it. He would buy each day, at \$1.10 a bushel, if any, the surplus that they had at that particular place. The result of that would be that at the end of the year the Secretary of Agriculture would have gradually accumulated all the exportable wheat from all over the United States. They would have to export it month by month as they got it.

That is the thing the Government might and could do. This thought has occurred to me, that a great deal would depend upon the shrewdness of the Secretary. If we had as good a trader and as good an agricultural man as Mr. Haugen, with all his successful experience in farming and in business, our surplus wheat, as you gentlemen call it, would be taken care of abroad at a good price. I admit that the success of my proposition depends upon the keenness of the Secretary. All we need is a man who is as smart as John D. Rockefeller, or some one like him, to handle it. I don't know whether we could get him or not. There would never be any time or place that the Government would be compelled to purchase this wheat except when it became settled that we did not need it at all for home use. The exportable wheat would, as will be explained by me, all be handled by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Thirty years ago at Luxor, Egypt, Abdul Karim, a very successful farmer, told me about the wheat conditions in Egypt. Taxes all fall due in June, and every wheat farmer was compelled to sell his wheat at about 50 cents a bushel instead of \$1, as it generally is sold at Cairo. Abdul Karim managed to get by without selling at a sacrifice, and when Christmas came he was able to sell his wheat at \$1 a bushel instead of 50 cents, and maintained that system and became wealthy. This bill of mine will take every American farmer past the harvest crisis and put him on his feet face to face with the world. They learned those wheat tricks in Egypt in Joseph's time, for the wheat trade is the oldest international commerce, and these fellows at Liverpool and Chicago have inherited all the tricks that have encumbered it and grown up with it from the beginning of time. That is the backbone of this whole business. Every time we begin a harvesting season they tell us that the wheat isn't worth anything, that there is too much of it. If you put my bill through at the time the harvest begins, we will be right there with the money to put it down, and he will get \$1.10 there, and there isn't going to be much four-flushing.

Mr. VOIGT. Do you care if I ask you a question there?

Mr. LITTLE. No, sir.

Mr. VOIGT. The theory of your bill is that the Government shall buy this wheat at not less than \$1.10. Suppose the Government buys 100,000,000 bushels or more at that price; there would be some loss in the export, wouldn't there?

Mr. LITTLE. I do not think so. I am prepared to answer that a little later, if you will permit me to do so. I think I can make it clear. Last spring they were heralding abroad the announcement of a tremendous wheat crop, when we raised some 81,000,000 bushels less last summer than we did the summer before. The world wheat buyers have more tricks than the gypsy horse jockeys, and have inherited them from a time before the gypsies left their primeval homes in the Orient.

If in the course of the year it developed that the United States would not utilize all this wheat, as is probable, and the buyers declined to purchase it because they didn't need it for home consumption, the Government would export the wheat and handle it abroad, and I will explain why what you people call the surplus is not a surplus.

Mr. PURNELL. I have never been able to get fixed in my mind your theory upon which you make the statement that there is no such thing as a surplus of wheat.

Mr. LITTLE. I have convinced the Secretary of Agriculture and the Wall Street Journal and Mr. SYDNEY ANDERSON and a great many other people.

Mr. PURNELL. Then I suppose I might just as well give up.

Mr. LITTLE. I will come to that question.

Mr. KETCHAM. I think perhaps you had better spend a little time on that. You use the word "surplus" in connection with the world production of wheat instead of in connection with our own production?

Mr. LITTLE. There is in the world no surplus of wheat.

Mr. KETCHAM. You say there is no such thing as a surplus. Is there any surplus in the United States?

Mr. LITTLE. None at all. There is exportable wheat, but the wheat we sell in London is just as much sold as if we sold it in Cleveland.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am not arguing it. I simply make the statement.

Mr. LITTLE. I admit that there is an exportable amount of wheat, but the wheat that we sell abroad is not a surplus. We sell it every year. We have sold a billion and a half bushels since the war.

On July 1, 1922, we had on hand 78,000,000 bushels of wheat carried over from the crop grown in the summer of 1921. In the summer of 1922 we raised 856,000,000 bushels of wheat. This makes 934,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand after the threshing in 1922. Beginning July 1, 1922, and ending June 30, 1923, we imported 20,000,000 bushels. In other words, we had opportunity to dispose of 954,000,000 bushels of wheat during the year beginning July 1, 1922, and ending June 30, 1923. At the end of that year, on July 1, 1923, we had on hand 101,000,000 bushels carried over into the next year.

Mr. ASWELL. I thought you said awhile ago that all the wheat there is is always sold.

Mr. LITTLE. They always dispose of it.

Mr. ASWELL. Where was that 101,000,000 bushels?

Mr. LITTLE. It was carried over.

Mr. ASWELL. Had that been sold?

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, yes. The farmer had 35,000,000 bushels on July 1, 1923.

Mr. ASWELL. He hadn't sold it?

Mr. LITTLE. He hadn't let it go, because he didn't want to. He just wanted to speculate a little.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Do you know what the average carry over is for a series of years?

Mr. LITTLE. It has been up as high as 163,000,000 bushels and down to 58,000,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It ranges between 58,000,000 and 160,000,000?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; 163,000,000. It gets a little bigger every year—gradually, I rather think. As I say, we had on hand 101,000,000 bushels carried over into the next year. During the year beginning July 1, 1922, and ending June 30, 1923, we disposed of 853,000,000 bushels of wheat. Of this we exported 222,000,000 bushels—

Mr. SINCLAIR. We did not dispose of all of it. We had 101,000,000 left. You only disposed of 700,000,000?

Mr. LITTLE. No; we had 934,000,000 and we kept 101,000,000, because the speculators and farmers wanted to keep it. We disposed of 853,000,000. Of this we exported 222,000,000 bushels, which leaves us 631,000,000 bushels of wheat utilized at home for food, stock feed, and seed.

Mr. PURNELL. The farmer carried 35,000,000 of that himself. Who carried the other?

Mr. LITTLE. The big millers, the terminal elevators, and elevators. The big mills have got to hold over a certain amount of wheat to make good flour. The June wheat is too fresh and soft. Every big elevator has a stock every year, which is a carry over. The world needs it for famines, droughts, and other emergencies. We don't have to take care of that because that carry over goes on all the time; it keeps right on, and it will go on forever. Have I made myself clear on that, Mr. Purnell?

Mr. PURNELL. I think I understand your position.

Mr. ASWELL. All of the bills pending before this committee speak of a surplus.

Mr. JOHNSON. You are not in harmony with the others, then?

Mr. LITTLE. I do not like to speak about that surplus business. I am trying to be polite. You will see that the United States during that year disposed of all the wheat raised, carried over, and imported, and had no wheat left on July 1, 1923, except a very ordinary carry over, only 35,000,000 bushels of which was in the barns and bins. The farmer could have sold that without any trouble at all, but preferred to carry it over.

Let me say here that I prepared, at the request of the Review of Reviews, in December, an article covering all these figures. A gentleman told me the other day that my figures in that article had been challenged. He said there was an associate editor of that paper here who said that he had gotten a thousand kicks on my figures. I wrote to the editor in chief, and let me tell you what he said. He said, "I have yours of February 26. There is no such office as that of associate editor on the Review of Reviews. No member of our editorial staff has recently been in Washington." (I am reading from his letter in my hand.)

Now, gentlemen, I would be glad if you would listen to this letter, because I place a good deal of importance on it. "I have been there once or twice myself, but I have said nothing about wheat statistics.



Any such letters that have come here criticizing the figures in your December article are neither numerous nor important." Then he goes on and speaks very nicely further. I just want to say to you gentlemen that the figures I present are from the Department of Agriculture, or as good a source. Nobody has ever challenged any figures that I have presented.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Little, we ship out of this country every year about 150,000,000 or 200,000,000 bushels more than we use, don't we?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. JONES. What do you call that surplus or excess supply of exportable wheat, or whatever it is—

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. VOIGT asked me that same question; and I think I have the answer here, if you will wait a moment.

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLE. In other words, in the year from July 1, 1922, to June 30, 1923, the people of the United States entirely disposed of their wheat crop. The people of the United States and of the world every year dispose of all the wheat they raise. They always have done so and always will. The suggestion that there is a surplus in the world at any time is pure imagination, without any foundation whatever. The hue and cry is raised by the grain exchanges of Liverpool, London, Chicago, and other places for the purpose of bluffing the farmer into selling his wheat at a small price. As long as legislators allow themselves to thus be fooled by such fakes we can never get practical, beneficial results.

Mr. PURNELL. Do you agree with the position taken by many—in fact, I think it is the general belief—that this exportable surplus of 200,000,000 controls very materially, in fact, determines the price we get for the other 750,000,000 or 800,000,000?

Mr. LITTLE. To some extent that is true, and I am just going to approach that matter. During the year from July 1, 1922, to June 30, 1923, we exported 222,000,000 bushels of wheat. It makes no difference to a farmer whether they sell his wheat in Liverpool or Cleveland. In either event he has none left. But we have heretofore confused the export wheat with the alleged surplus.

Mr. PURNELL. It makes no difference where he sells it, but it does make a great difference to him if the part of the wheat that is sold abroad fixes the price here.

Mr. LITTLE. I am coming to that. It is true that we must take into consideration the wheat that we export when we consider our sales and prices, but before we do so let us remember that the export is just as sure a sale as any other. It goes on all the time and always will. In order to reach a satisfactory conclusion we must figure on the amount of wheat we export and the price it brings, because without doubt the export price of our wheat does to some extent determine the home price of our wheat.

Mr. ASWELL. If you fix the price at \$1.10, would you get that much for that which you exported?

Mr. LITTLE. I think I will answer that in a moment. The world's annual average crop of wheat during the years 1910-1915 was 3,855,000,000 bushels. The Wall Street Journal only claims that the world's total crop for the season of 1923 was 3,343,000,000. The crop we are now consuming is 500,000,000 bushels less than the average crop during the six normal years before the war. In order to induce an American farmer to sell his wheat for less than it cost him, the grain exchanges of London, Liverpool, and Chicago have told us over and over that the present supply has produced a tremendous surplus of wheat. Instead of there being a big surplus crop, as they have been telling us, we are 500,000,000 bushels of wheat behind the average world crop in the years before the war. We had one year of 4,250,000,000 bushels, and another year we had 4,100,000,000, and if it wasn't for the war this world would be now producing annually 4,000,000,000 bushels of wheat or more. We are 500,000,000 or more behind.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that the market for wheat the world over is 400,000,000 bushels greater than the amount produced?

Mr. LITTLE. No. What I said was this: The average wheat crop before the war was 500,000,000 bushels of wheat more than the crop of this year.

Mr. ASWELL. We sold it all then?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; we got rid of it.

Mr. PURNELL. Of course, you must take into consideration the fact that the world is not able or in a position to buy now what it was able to buy then.

Mr. LITTLE. That is a very great mistake. During the year beginning July 1, 1918, immediately after the war, we exported 287,000,000 bushels; from July 1, 1919, 220,000,000 bushels; from July 1, 1920, 366,000,000 bushels; from July 1, 1921, 279,000,000 bushels; and beginning July 1, 1922, 222,000,000 bushels.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Do you know anything about the price of that wheat?

Mr. LITTLE. It isn't a question of price, but they will buy the wheat and eat it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. They paid at least a dollar more a bushel in 1918 than they are paying for what we export now.

Mr. LITTLE. Beginning July 1, 1923, up to February 15, we exported 112,000,000 bushels of wheat without including the flour for the last two weeks. At this rate, by the conclusion of this present wheat year we will have shipped abroad 195,000,000 bushels of wheat if the present rate continues. I say that that is the greatest and most remarkable wheat market the world ever saw. Never at any time did this country ever sell so much wheat, but yet Mr. PURNELL asks me if I think they still use the wheat.

Mr. PURNELL. I know they will eat it if they can get it. My question is, Are they able to pay for it?

Mr. LITTLE. I guess we don't ship it abroad for nothing. There never was a bigger lie than the statements in the papers that the European people can not pay for wheat. I have shown right here that they have paid for it, since the war, to the extent of a billion and a half bushels, and they never did that before. It was many millions less in the preceding years. The European market for wheat during the six years since the war terminated is by far the greatest market for wheat the world ever saw. In order to keep our wheat prices down and to lead the Government to purchase the speculators' wheat at fancy prices and shipped without expense to him, we are told that the Europeans are starving, that they can not buy wheat, and that our European market is wrecked.

I don't want to characterize things, yet with regard to these wheat speculators there never was a more nefarious attempt to force the Government to purchase the wheat from these wheat speculators that they had on hand and did not know what to do with and to send it to the starving Europeans. They bought a billion and a half, and they paid for it, too.

On November 22 last, Secretary Wallace wrote me, "of course, every bushel of wheat can be sold at some price." On November 26, 1923, SYDNEY ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Commission of Agriculture Inquiry, wrote me, "Our own surplus, in my judgment, is very small; and, indeed, I do not think we have any surplus of good milling wheat." On November 29, 1923, Mr. ANDERSON said, "The American farmer can sell every bushel of wheat he produces this year or any other year."

On December 14, 1923, the Wall Street Journal wrote me, "The Wall Street Journal has never said that the farmer will not be able to sell all his wheat. He always has been and always will be able to dispose of his wheat." Of course these gentlemen continue to say that he will not be able to sell it at a sufficiently high price. Well, that depends on who is the better trader, the buyer or the seller.

There is another universally admitted incorrect assertion that we can not meet foreign competition. In order to substantiate the incorrectness of that assumption, and the lack of any serious danger, I want to call your attention to some figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture and the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome. These figures give the value of wheat at different foreign ports on certain dates, and the cost of transportation as compared with that here in America.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that table may be inserted in the record.

*Cost price at Liverpool of wheat from New York, Buenos Aires, and India.*

Seaport	Price	Ocean freight	Cost at Liverpool
August, 1922:			
Karachi, India.....	\$1.27	\$0.108	\$1.378
Buenos Aires.....	1.23	.132	1.362
New York.....	1.295	.054	1.349
1913 average:			
Karachi, India.....	.91	.12	.03
Buenos Aires.....	.100	1.08	1.108
New York.....	.974	.06	1.034
July, 1923:			
Karachi, India.....	1.08	.168	.248
Buenos Aires.....	1.10	.132	1.232
New York.....	1.22	.042	1.262
August, 1923:			
Karachi, India.....	.90	.15	1.11
Buenos Aires.....	1.01	.12	1.13
New York.....	1.114	.042	1.157

Mr. PURNELL. According to that table, wheat sold in this country in 1923 at \$1.11. That was the New York price.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; \$1.114.

Mr. CLAGUE. In 1923, in August, you say the price at New York was \$1.11?

Mr. LITTLE. \$1.114.

Mr. CLAGUE. Suppose your bill was in effect, and it was \$1.25 at Minneapolis. The freight to get it from Minneapolis to New York is 15 cents a bushel, a charge of 4½ cents to get it across, and under your bill they would have had to have \$1.44. Now, how could they have sold that wheat in Liverpool at \$1.44 when they could buy all they wanted at \$1.11 or \$1.13?

Mr. LITTLE. They could not; but it wasn't that way. I am just taking the world the way it is made year in and year out. Under every bill but mine you all concede you will lose money on every shipment. Suppose the Haagen bill or Sinclair bill were in effect, and you shipped \$1.50 wheat from Minneapolis to Liverpool for 19½ cents, your wheat in Liverpool would cost \$1.69½. Suppose you had to meet their Argentinian competition of wheat that is laid down for \$1.11. They would undersell you 58½ cents a bushel, and in a year you would lose nearly \$120,000,000. So what difference would it make, as compared to my bill, when you might occasionally get a small loss which the Government would bear, while every shipment under the other bill gives a loss which the farmer himself must pay.

Mr. CLAGUE. How could they have done it the year before?

Mr. LITTLE. I think I can meet that point, and it is a very pertinent question.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is the whole problem.

Mr. LITTLE. It is the whole problem for the gentleman's bill, which takes a loss on every shipment, which loss must be paid by the farmer, while it is practically certain under H. R. 8330 that year in and year out the Secretary would make money for the department by his export trade. Just now I am undertaking to prove to you that we are in excellent shape to compete in Liverpool. I know what you mean, and you are right, but what I am now showing you is that year in and year out we have been competing on even terms and sometimes underselling them. On November 27, 1923, the Department of Agriculture issued a statement, which was reprinted in the Kansas City Times, with regard to freight rates to Liverpool. Examining that, we find that the freight rate from McPherson, Kans., to Galveston, Tex., was 27 cents a bushel, and the rate from Galveston to Liverpool was 8.6 cents, making a total from McPherson to Liverpool of 35.6 cents per bushel. However, the rate from Larimore, N. Dak., to New York was 22.6 cents, and from New York to Liverpool 4.8 cents, a total of 27.4 cents from Larimore, N. Dak., to Liverpool.

These figures are deduced from those given by the Secretary of Agriculture. He says:

"ARGENTINA WHEAT RATES—SHORT HAUL TO SEAPORTS SAVE TRANSPORTATION COSTS—OCEAN FREIGHTS TO LIVERPOOL ARE HIGHER AND RAIL RATE PER MILE IS MORE THAN IN THE UNITED STATES."

"Washington, November 26.—The ocean freight rate on wheat from Rosario, Argentina, to Liverpool, in the period from January 1 to September 30, this year, averaged 14.7 cents a bushel, while in the same period the average rate from New York to Liverpool was 4.8 cents a bushel, and from New Orleans, 8.6 cents a bushel."

His figures show that it costs 18 cents to reach the seacoast from the Argentina wheat fields, which, added to the ocean rate of 14.7 cents, makes 32.7 cents a bushel from the wheat fields of Argentina to Liverpool, while the total from Larimore, N. Dak., to Liverpool was 27.4 cents, 5.3 cents a bushel less than the Argentina rate. In other words, the wheat fields of Larimore, N. Dak., can ship wheat to Liverpool 5.3 cents a bushel cheaper than Rosario, Argentina, or could last year when the Secretary of Agriculture figured it.

In other words, we can deliver wheat to Liverpool and beat Buenos Aires and Argentina on equal terms, and the Indian wheat, whose export is comparatively very small, anyway, can generally outsell us a little at Liverpool, though it is a different kind of wheat. In other words, this story about cheap wheat from cheap lands and cheap people is just a greatly exaggerated bugaboo that has been worked to death. Our wheat can compete in Europe all the time with any wheat exported to Europe from anywhere. You will notice that we have undersold the Buenos Aires wheat 7½ cents a bushel, but we could have run them off the market—

Mr. CLAGUE. That is, for low-priced wheat?

Mr. LITTLE. That is for the best wheat.

Mr. CLAGUE. I do not mean poor wheat, but I mean low-priced wheat.

Mr. LITTLE. I think I will cover that point in a moment. You will see, gentlemen, that when the Department of Agriculture takes over the export business of this country it will have no difficulty in the world in competing in the Liverpool market, and it never at any time can be swamped by other supplies.

I call your attention to the fact that in Brazil the Government has been handling the coffee crop for nearly 20 years with wonderful success. The Government controls the export trade of the country, because they levy an export tax on all coffee that private individuals export. The Government, then, is able to buy coffee according to its own estimate of world conditions, and is able to go to the European market and decide the price at which coffee can be sold.

As you have seen, we export about 200,000,000 bushels of wheat annually.

The sale of that wheat in Liverpool or elsewhere will be controlled largely by the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington. He can meet any competition.

Mr. ASWELL. That is true only as long as the price of wheat stays down as low as it is. That means we have got to keep wheat down to compete with the world price.

Mr. LITTLE. If my bill passes the price of wheat in this country will be decided by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ASWELL. But how can he compete?

Mr. LITTLE. He can meet any competition. He can, if he wishes, undersell any foreign competitor.

Mr. ASWELL. That means the price is low here.

Mr. LITTLE. No; under my bill the farmer would get at least \$1.10 a bushel for all his wheat and the Government would lose nothing on home consumed wheat. The department might have to take a loss sometimes on wheat exported, but that would not touch the farmer. The other bills that have been offered admit a loss of \$75,000,000 annually, anyway, which will always be borne by the farmer. Under my bill there will be no loss possible except on exports, which will be borne by the department, of course.

The Secretary can, if he wishes to, undersell any foreign competitor. If he wishes to drive Argentina out of the Liverpool market he can do so any week he desires. He will handle the American export wheat crop. No American exporter will contend with him. He will name the price in Liverpool on American wheat. Suppose for six months we did not ship any wheat to Liverpool at all? The world would be starving to death. The rest of the world can not meet it.

Mr. CLARKE. You say as far as the United States is concerned he would have no competition in the Liverpool market. But what about Canada?

Mr. LITTLE. I have figures on that. He can sell his wheat at any port where people eat flour. He can have his wheat manufactured into flour and exported as flour whenever he sees fit. If H. R. 8330 becomes a law, gentlemen, the wheat prices of the world would be made in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington. I want to leave that thought with you. It is an assertion, an estimate, but he sits here in Washington and controls every bushel we export and he can undersell them when he is willing to lose a little money. We are losing money all the time; we are not getting the money in the foreign market that we ought to get, and we are not getting what we would like to have, and that interferes with the home market, as you have all suggested. You see by this time, of course, that it would not interfere with the home market at all under my bill. The only question remaining would be whether the department could gain or lose in Europe. My contention is that under these other methods you are simply going to take the loss and let the farmer pay it until your corporation goes into bankruptcy, as it will. At the worst I could not do any worse than that. I concede that there may be times when the Government will be up against it, but I have shown that we could meet them on equal terms at Liverpool, except in a few bad years, and those bad years will come anyway. Suppose, Mr. CLARKE, that you were Secretary of Agriculture, and suppose you had 200,000,000 bushels to export, and you would see that Argentina was going in, and you would say, "Let them go in," and lay off for 60 days. If you did that, the rest of the world could not feed Europe, but they would have to wait for us. When you stayed out for 30 days you would see the wheat going up and you would quit selling when they didn't buy it at the increased price. I contend that Joe Leiter is the only man in the world that ever did anything for the American farmer. He gambled in wheat and raised the price of it. That is one reason why I started this. I don't believe Joe Leiter knew any more about the business than I do, and I tackled it.

Mr. CLARKE. But Joe Leiter went bankrupt, didn't he?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; but no American farmers went into bankruptcy while he was raising the price. I don't care anything about Joe Leiter.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If it went on long enough probably the Federal Government might go into bankruptcy.

Mr. LITTLE. There isn't a chance on earth of that; no. The Government can withdraw from the business any year they see fit. These other plans evidence that they expect to buy wheat and export it and lose money. They estimate that they will lose \$75,000,000 a year. They explicitly state that they do not expect to have anything to do with the price of wheat in Europe. Gentlemen, what is the use of playing around the edges of this proposition? Let us put the American Department of Agriculture in such shape that it can have more to say about Liverpool prices than anybody else, which it could under this bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Have you ever consulted the present Secretary of Agriculture about that bill?

Mr. LITTLE. I should say so.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What does he have to say about your bill?

Mr. LITTLE. He didn't find any fault in it, and I haven't heard from him since.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am sure he did not express himself to any extent here the other day, and I was wondering whether he had talked to you.

Mr. LITTLE. Last year he told me that he could see no flaw in it and no reason why it should not succeed, but declined to give a final opinion on short notice. I have had a great deal of correspondence with him, and, if he wishes it, I will print it.



Under this bill the department is not required to buy wheat. If it were, it could be urged that we would raise the price of wheat and greatly increase the production. This bill is so drawn that, whenever the people of the United States should undertake to plant speculative crops on the theory that the Government would protect them, the department could simply decline to buy or decline to pay the price anticipated.

Last year the Government informed the cooperative-marketing people that they could borrow money to carry on their business in an orderly way, but if they undertook to borrow money and hold their crops for speculative advances they would not get the money. This bill presents the same situation.

The Secretary is authorized to buy their wheat at such prices as he sees fit within certain limits. He is not ordered to do so, and it would ruin the whole proposition if he were so ordered. I undertake to say that no proposition that undertakes to fix a high price for wheat and meet it and guarantee it can by any possibility be a success. The value of this proposition lies in the fact that it simply makes the Secretary of Agriculture powerful enough to do what he sees fit. Beyond that I do not undertake to go.

I can not guarantee that the Secretary of Agriculture will handle this business always correctly. He is governed by the same limitations as other men meet; but if this bill becomes a law, a level-headed Secretary of Agriculture will always be in position where the American farmer can be assured of not losing money on his wheat. I do not believe anybody can go further than that with such, though if a very good business man were Secretary he could undoubtedly go far to assure our people of reasonable profits.

Now, I have a little table here of figures secured from the Department of Commerce on exports of wheat and wheat flour in millions of bushels, which I would like to place in the record:

*Exports of wheat and wheat flour, in millions of bushels.*

Country.	Calendar years.				
	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
Canada.....	114	144	180	255	293
Argentina.....	137	193	66	145	140
Australia.....	109	63	116	85	57
India.....	2	5	14	6	30
Total.....	362	405	376	491	520
United States.....	1 287	1 220	1 366	1 279	1 222
World total.....	649	625	742	770	742

<sup>1</sup> Fiscal year ending July 1.

If you undertake to pass a bill to pay a man a lot of money, he will plant more wheat; and you will be up against it worse than ever.

Mr. ASWELL. Won't he do it under your bill?

Mr. LITTLE. No. What I undertake to do is to give him a normal cost so he won't lose any money. Then he will have to take care of himself. I do not believe any bill that you undertake to pass will amount to a row of pins if it undertakes to give him a fancy price for his wheat. In the first place, the wheat eaters won't vote for it, and, in the second place, it won't work.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will this price give him the average cost of production?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; I think so.

Mr. SINCLAIR. You think it will?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; I do.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The testimony seems to be against that.

Mr. LITTLE. Well, the Secretary of Agriculture asked 4,000 men about that and got an average of 94 cents for production, not counting the land value. That was the figure, wasn't it?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes; but the land value and taxes are a very material part of the cost.

Mr. LITTLE. Somebody could tell us what that average was. I think about \$1.20.

Mr. JOHNSON. He now figures that it ought to be worth about \$1.58.

Mr. LITTLE. It ought to be, but it is not, and it isn't ever going up there except now and then. It would be too expensive for the world to use generally.

Now, I think the table I put in is an answer to the Canadian wheat question. I realize that this proposition will be enfolded and envied by many difficulties, but it can be handled with practical business men, and all I am asking you is that you give it careful consideration. I am as anxious as any man here to do something for the farmer. I am the seventeenth in direct descent from farmers who lived on their own farms. In 1406, 517 years ago, Simon Little bought a farm in Scotland, and I can tell you the farms that my people have owned and lived on ever since down to me. There is no man here that has more sentimental interest or more practical interest. I began my life sowing

wheat and the grasshoppers came along and ate it as it came up, and I said to my dad:

"This wheat business is just a gamble, and I am going to town and go to work."

That is the reason I am here.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Little, I have a great deal of confidence in your judgment about wheat. I think you have studied this legislation probably as much as any man in Congress. I think you have studied all the bills before us here, and if you do not mind I would like to have your opinion of the two bills, the McNary-Haugen bill and the Sinclair bill, now pending before this committee.

Mr. LITTLE. I do not think you are quite fair to me. Here is a committee, most of whom have made up their minds.

Mr. ASWELL. But he has already intimated how he stands, Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. LITTLE. I want to remind you that we have a Constitution; and if you pass a bill that won't stand up under it, it won't do any good. You had better hire a lawyer. I don't mean that unkindly at all, because the probability is if you put a bill out I would probably vote for it. I am in favor of doing something for the farmer, and if we get off on the wrong foot and go too far, I shall be very sorry. If you don't want to do something reasonable for the farmer, you can expect it isn't going to be long before he will do something unreasonable.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What is the difference in principle between your bill and the Sinclair bill?

Mr. LITTLE. Now, gentlemen, I think very highly of the authors of the Sinclair-Norris bill and of the Haugen bill, but if you want to start a socialistic government I do not believe you could find any better way in the world to do it easier than under the Sinclair bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR. There is no difference between your measure and the Sinclair bill. The Sinclair bill simply puts a commission in charge of the exportable surplus.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. And the Haugen bill sets up the same kind of a proposition.

Mr. LITTLE. My bill doesn't put the Government into the wheat business. If my bill is right in theory, the Government won't buy much, if any, wheat. Under your bill it has got to buy.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Under your bill who would stand the loss?

Mr. LITTLE. The Government would lose it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That is the same thing as in the Sinclair bill, and that is the reason why I asked you what the difference was in principle.

Mr. LITTLE. My theory, which I enunciated before you came in, Mr. KINCHELOE, is that when the Government announces that it is going to give a dollar a bushel for the wheat, that the farmer won't sell for any less, and the wheat buyers competing with the Government will have to pay that price. The result of that will be, I think, that the Government will not have to buy much at all, except the export wheat.

Mr. KINCHELOE. How would you take care of the export? Who would buy that?

Mr. LITTLE. Sell it abroad. I called attention to that. I said if they started under my plan the home buyers would buy wheat until they got all the country would use, and when they got all the country would use then the Government would have to buy it, buy what you people call the surplus. It would, in a sense, become a surplus. I do not use the term "surplus," because that is the term with which they have beaten us out of our money.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The exportable surplus proposition is the whole problem that we are trying to solve.

Mr. LITTLE. Under my plan if wheat was sold at \$1.10 it would go up, wouldn't it?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. And it would stay up until you got to that so-called surplus.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Until the domestic consumption was satisfied.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; if they had followed my theory last year they would have made \$150,000,000 more, Mr. SINCLAIR.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I believe so if the price had been 10 or 15 cents higher.

Mr. LITTLE. They would have. I was perhaps weak beyond that point. I neglected to figure out what would happen. But I think, Mr. KINCHELOE, when I raise the proposition that the Government shall handle all of the export that it answers your question, don't you think so? If my bill had been in effect at \$1 to \$1.10, the farmers would have received \$150,000,000 more. If this one becomes a law, it will add \$200,000,000 to their income next year, and the export provision will bring us also a profit from Europe instead of a loss.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I was trying to take it back to your proposition of fixing it at \$1.10 on the domestic wheat, and if that was higher than the world price there would be an import of wheat into the country.

Mr. LITTLE. No; because of the tariff—

Mr. KINCHELOE. That drawback tariff is a miller's tariff, anyway.

Mr. LITTLE. What is the tariff?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Thirty cents.

Mr. LITTLE. They wouldn't bring in the wheat. We have only imported 19,000,000 bushels since last harvest, 8,000,000 from Canada only.

Mr. ASWELL. I am very keenly interested in all you have said, but I can not quite grasp the difference between your bill and the Sinclair bill. The loss will be sustained by the Government in the Sinclair bill if we export the wheat, and it seems to me it will be necessarily sustained by the Government under your bill. I do not see the difference.

Mr. LITTLE. You are right, in a sense, but the loss would be sustained by the Sinclair corporation, would it not?

Mr. ASWELL. You ask for \$30,000,000 and he asks for \$100,000,000. It is just a difference in amount.

Mr. LITTLE. Under his bill he has got to begin to buy the wheat, and under my bill we wouldn't buy it at all except for export.

Mr. ASWELL. You think it is simply a question of changing the word "authorize"?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Why won't that theory, created by the Government's statement that it was prepared to buy, work just as well under my bill and fix the price just the same as it would under your bill?

Mr. LITTLE. My idea about that is that under your bill it wouldn't have any such result.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It isn't contemplated that the corporation would buy all the wheat. It might have to buy but very little of it.

Mr. LITTLE. Pardon me; I didn't come here to get into a controversy.

Mr. SINCLAIR. No. I am just asking for information, Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. LITTLE. There is a good deal of information I haven't got. I have never studied the Sinclair bill as I have my own. I think I could give quite an extended review of the other bills after I had time to read them and study them. I do not think I am a very good witness as to just what would happen with that bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I can not understand that it makes any difference how the Government takes care of the surplus, whether it is taken care of by the Secretary of Agriculture or through a grain commission or corporation.

Mr. LITTLE. The biggest steal we ever had in the world was our shipbuilding corporation in this country, and, with all due respect to the authors of these bills, I think that is just what would happen.

Mr. CLARKE. There are others who think that about the grain corporation.

Mr. LITTLE. I think that putting this in a big corporation would be a wonderful mistake. Your bill would require a whole lot of high-salaried men and my bill would require but a few clerks. You suggest that they are in principle the same. Let me point out to you that the Sinclair bill calls for a big corporation and for a lot of money to be paid by the Government. There is no telling what would happen.

We have not yet thoroughly discussed the Canadian proposition. They claim that Canada is liable to invade us with cheap wheat. The figures of the Department of Commerce show that in the seven months after July 1 last we imported, in round numbers, 8,000,000 bushels of wheat from Canada and exported 16,000,000 bushels into Canada. Their competition does not amount to a row of pins in this country this year.

The figures of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome for August, 1923, show that at that time New York was landing wheat in Liverpool at \$1.157. On that day No. 2 northern wheat in Liverpool was \$1.15. At the same time No. 1 northern, a better wheat, was selling at Port Arthur at \$1.10.

Mr. PURNELL. Of course that wheat which was landed in London at \$1.11 was produced at a very decided loss in this country.

Mr. LITTLE. This legislation is not responsible for that. We are trying to meet that.

Mr. PURNELL. I understand, but I am not able as yet to get over the one big proposition in my mind, namely, that if, under your bill or any other bill, we shall increase the price in this country so as to give the farmers a reasonable return for their investment and a profit, I can not understand how, with that added cost, you can lay it down in Liverpool and hope to in any way compete with the Argentine and some of the other countries.

Mr. LITTLE. All I am undertaking to do is to show you that we can, always have been, and always will be, under the present conditions, able to meet foreign competition in Liverpool. Mr. PURNELL, I concede, of course, that if I am able to increase the home market for wheat to \$1.10 or more we will have to get more than we are getting in Europe now in order to meet competition there or make a profit there. Many here will now admit that if my bill had become a law in the Sixty-seventh Congress the farmers would have received on the average 20 cents a bushel more for their wheat, a total of \$150,000,000.

What I claim now is that if my plan for export by the Secretary of Agriculture is adopted he will not only get us a fair price in Europe but will practically be able to dominate the wheat markets of the world and decide their prices as the Brazilians control the coffee markets. My suggestion is that we adopt the Brazilian method of controlling exports, and the Secretary will have to go into the wheat

markets of the world and control those markets as Brazil does the coffee markets.

Mr. ASWELL. You delivered wheat at \$1.15 in Liverpool in August, and if your bill were in force, giving the \$1.10 to the farmer, with your transportation, etc., the Government would have to pay that \$1.10 and lose at least 50 cents a bushel.

Mr. LITTLE. We couldn't sell the wheat in Liverpool at what we get now.

Mr. ASWELL. They would lose at least 50 cents a bushel, and would lose \$100,000,000 the first year.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, under present conditions; but they admit that they will lose \$75,000,000 now or under any circumstances or under any plan they suggest. My answer to that is that we allow the Government to buy the export wheat and to handle it. If the Secretary controls all the export, he will be able to take care of that, and himself name the price of wheat in Liverpool. Instead of a scattering bunch of discordant, conflicting exporters we will be represented by the Secretary of Agriculture with all our wheat shipped across in American Government vessels.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Little, you have given a very interesting statement here, but there are a number of other people who desire to be heard.

Mr. LITTLE. I am almost through, Mr. Chairman. I think I have been very patient. I have not bothered this committee for weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. No; but you have exceeded the time asked for. We want to give you all the time you want, of course.

Mr. LITTLE. I will be through in a few moments. On March 4 the Department of Agriculture informed me that the average price for No. 1 northern wheat at Port Arthur in August, 1923, was \$1.10. Added to this, 20 cents for freight from Port Arthur to Liverpool, Winnipeg laid down No. 1 northern wheat in Liverpool at \$1.30. At the same time New York was landing No. 2 winter wheat at Liverpool at a cost of \$1.157. Winnipeg was not making real healthy competition in Liverpool for New York City.

Mr. ASWELL. That is just the point I can not grasp. You succeeded in the Liverpool market because of the prices the growers in this country were getting for their surplus wheat—

Mr. LITTLE (interposing). The prices they always have been getting and always will get if you don't legislate for them.

Mr. ASWELL. I don't know about that.

Mr. LITTLE. I don't know, either; but we will have to do the best we can. The people who are scared to death of Canadian wheat in Liverpool are laboring under a hallucination. They see the northern lights and think it is Canadian wheat headed for Liverpool. That is the stuff dreams are made of.

The United States and Canada combined raised 14,000,000 bushels less last year than they did the year before. The "vast wheat territory" they talk about in Canada is mostly peopled by the Rocky Mountains and glaciers and bounded by the North Pole. There never will be for any long period serious or dangerous competition from that country. Last fall Governor Leedy wrote me, "We have all the wheat we claimed, 467,000,000 bushels," and he says, "Half of it is unthreshed and mostly in the shock; if the snow does not fall by November, we will be in fair shape."

If you observe the above figures, you will see that for those five years, approximately, those five countries exported 3,528,000,000 bushels, and that of this the United States exported 1,374,000,000. In other words, of the world's exports the United States exported about two-fifths last year. Years before a much larger proportion. You have already noted that in ocean freight rates the United States has a very great advantage. You have noticed that the United States gets to the seacoast at more reasonable rates than other countries, so far as we have the figures. You see, therefore, that we are in excellent condition to meet anybody and fight it out at Liverpool. Let us suppose, for example, that for the first two-fifths of the year the United States exported no wheat. The world would be short two-fifths of its eating supply for that time and wheat, of course, would greatly increase in price. The United States would then be in a position to go into a high market and sell its wheat and receive the high prices. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture could control the Liverpool market at any time he saw fit. The Secretary, in full control of all our exports, could readily make a combination with the bulk of the Canadian exporters, for example, and they could work together to fix the price at Liverpool, or they could combine with the Argentinian exporters. The pleasant dreams of a big wheat pool and a combination of wheat growers could round out into practical common sense under the leadership of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America.

This would especially be true because he would have absolute control of two-fifths of the world's wheat supply. Being a governmental proprietor and responsible only to his Government and not to some copartners, he could, if he saw fit, go in at any time and undersell the rest of the world and name the subsequent prices. He would, possibly, lose some money at that time, but it is now conceded by all rival propositions that they expect to lose many millions of dollars a year anyway and make



no pretense that they could ever make a nickel by export business. If we have to take a loss the Department of Agriculture could take it and it would not go to the farmer. He would be receiving his home prices. This is the only plan offered which makes it possible for the American farmer to get the maximum price for wheat, whatever it may be. Every other plan devolves upon him, just as the present situation does, the loss, if any, due to the low prices in Liverpool and Europe.

Our manufacturers in New England found themselves unable to compete with European factories. The rest of us established a tariff bounty for the manufacturers at our expense. They found themselves able to compete with European labor on American soil by reason of our tariff bounty. We now ask that you reciprocate the bounty of a hundred years and enable the wheat farmers of America to have the same golden bounty that you have showered on the factory owners and workers. If you do not do so they will be forced out of business just as New England shoemakers would a hundred years ago but for the tariff. We can sit here patiently at the end of the world taking the worst of the battle, or we can thus assert ourselves and control the markets of the world and be sure that no American wheat farmer ever again sells his wheat for less than it cost him.

Mr. ASWELL. But those other bills include many other agricultural products. This touches only on wheat.

Mr. LITTLE. You will remember last year I told you that in my judgment wheat could easily be handled because the system was such that we could put it in the elevator, and we could do the same thing with cotton. But I don't know what to do with the hog. Do you? What can they do with hogs?

Mr. ASWELL. I don't know.

Mr. LITTLE. I do not think anybody who wrote that bill ever seriously intended buying hogs and cattle. Of course, if all the hog, cattle, wool, and cotton people will vote for the bill, it will go through. We can handle this wheat in the elevators. We do not have to build sheds for wheat anywhere we have elevators. The same is true with cotton, barley, and rice. I earnestly hope you may be able to find some way to get a reasonable price for hogs and cattle, but I can not. My proposition is very simple and practical and very inexpensive. If you had adopted it last summer several on this committee have confessed that the farmer would have been \$150,000,000 better off.

I can tell you about wheat, and I believe that I am right.

I would like to arrange that Doctor Atkeson should be heard on this. He is and for years has been the national legislative representative of the National Grange. Can he come back to-morrow? He is perhaps the most conservative of all the national farm leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have to give that consideration.

Doctor ATKESON. Mr. Chairman, may I state that I think Mr. LITTLE has said about all that I could possibly say in support of the bill, and if I may be excused, I would like to save my time and the time of the committee. I think Mr. LITTLE has completely exhausted the subject.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to have put into the record what Doctor Atkeson said last year. Will that be satisfactory, Doctor Atkeson?

Doctor ATKESON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DOCTOR ATKESON'S TESTIMONY BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, JANUARY 9, 1923.

On page 15, Doctor Atkeson, legislative representative of the National Grange in Washington, said:

"I have read all these bills, so far as I know, that have been introduced in both Houses of Congress. I have read Mr. LITTLE's bill both ways, and I am thoroughly convinced if we are going to try this experiment that it is the most defensible and less objectionable than any other bill.

"But if you fix the price of wheat—say you fix the price of wheat at \$1.50; Mr. LITTLE's bill undertakes to stabilize it at \$1—I say it is the most defensible and least objectionable of any of the measures, to my mind.

"Mr. KINCHELOE. Doctor, if I understand your position, which is personal, you are against all this legislation; but if the committee and Congress are determined to enact some of it, we should choose the one with the least evil in it, to wit, the Little bill.

"Doctor ATKESON. Yes; as an experiment. \* \* \*

"Doctor ATKESON. \* \* \* That is one objection to Mr. LITTLE's bill, which tends to stabilize wheat at \$1 a bushel.

"The CHAIRMAN. Doctor, is not the object of this bill to stabilize the price of wheat at \$1 a bushel? I am referring to Colonel LITTLE's bill.

"Doctor ATKESON. As I have said two or three times, as an experiment I prefer that to any and all of the other measures. \* \* \*

"Doctor ATKESON. Undoubtedly it is not high enough to pay the present price of production.

"Mr. SINCLAIR. Then why should you be in favor of that?

"Doctor ATKESON. As an experiment, to see how it will work; to see what the effect will be. As I interpret the Little bill—I think it is a fair interpretation—to take care of the surplus and stabilize the price of wheat to at least \$1 a bushel. The Secretary, at his option, might continue to buy it up to \$1.10. That means a price of \$1.10. If the Secretary did what he would do under the circumstances—that is, if he buys all the wheat that is offered up to \$1.10—anybody else that wanted to get it would have to pay \$1.11 or \$1.12, or something more.

"Doctor ATKESON. No human being knows certainly what the effect would be or how well satisfied the consumers of farm products or the producers would be after an experiment of a year or two; the Little bill is the most defensible and less objectionable than any of the others."

At the conclusion of his evidence, page 133, Doctor Atkeson says:

"I have only attempted to call attention to one solution. If price fixing is the way out, why let's experiment with it. We can quit if it doesn't pay. I want to repeat that of all the bills I have read I am partial to Mr. LITTLE's bill."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as one born in old Kentucky, as a loyal American citizen, as a friend to the valiant sons of America who defended its honor during the World War, and as an ex-service man of that war, I rise to enter my voiced protest against the condition which confronts us in respect to the proposed legislation that goes to the country as a so-called adjusted compensation legislation.

Back in Kentucky I practice the profession of the law. And early in the game I learned that in the trial of a case either by court or jury it is better to rest your case upon the merits involved rather than be controlled by technical legal construction. In days gone by more rigid use of technicalities were invoked than in this modern age. But in the consideration of the bonus legislation which confronts us we find that the bill which the Ways and Means Committee of this House approved, upon which we vote next Tuesday, was not released and was not obtainable by the Members of this body until 12 o'clock noon to-day (Saturday). The bill sponsored by the committee aforesaid comes to us under suspension of the rules, without right of amendment and with debate limited to 40 minutes of time.

I had hoped to be able to be permitted to cast my vote for a bonus bill which carried an option whereby those who so desired might receive cash. In lieu of such cash option, the bill presented comes to us under a suspension of the rules, which prohibits amendments to the reported bill, and we view the spectacle of being forced to accept this bill or have no legislation upon the subject. With this alternative confronting us, I support the measure and, while I will support the measure, I do not impugn the motive of any ex-service man or any Member of Congress who in principle and good conscience opposes this pending legislation, or bonus legislation in general.

I have the honor to represent the ninth district of Kentucky, composed of 19 counties, aggregating 5,499 square miles in area, with a population exceeding 272,725. For approximately 167 miles its northern and eastern borders are washed by the waters of the Big Sandy and the mighty Ohio; its northern county reaches to within 30 miles of Cincinnati, Ohio. The world-renowned blue grass, which peeps its head through the famous soil of the western counties of the district, extends into the mountain regions of Kentucky an approximate distance of 100 miles. The southeastern county, as well as the southwestern county of the district, is only removed from Virginia, the Mother State, by two intervening counties. In many ways it is cosmopolitan in nature. Not in the sense of a commingling of foreign blood, for there is none of perceptible consequence flowing through the veins of my people; but it is a district of diversified nature in respect of the topography of the country, soil of the land, the means of livelihood of its people.

In the creation Kentuckians fondly believe that God favored their nativity. It has been scientifically demonstrated that in the soil of the blue grass there are food values derived therefrom producing energy, speed, and stamina in the horses bred and reared upon it—unsurpassed the world over. Undoubtedly God favored this spot in its creation; well could it be said that it was His playground. But, when He created the blue grass, and smoothed out the rolling, undulating levels upon its bosom, methinks He tired of the monotony of the plains, and in the execution of His divine plan He caused mighty explosions in the bowels of the earth and upheavals consequent therefrom, and thereby brought into existence the further evi-

dence of His mighty power, the mountains. It has always occurred to me that the mountain districts of the world received a special touch from the hands of the Omnipotent Creator, for, when He molded the hills and carved out the valleys, He made of the mountains a depository for His jewels and treasures in the form of minerals; and to further safeguard these valuables in the mountains of Kentucky He caused to be reared a people of strong, sturdy stock, with minds clear and visions unimpaired.

Now, with a district of such character, it would be strange indeed if its people did not respond to the call of country with the offering of its young manhood. More than 10,000 of her sons served their country in the World War and, although here and there in this large district an ex-service man gives voice to opposition to a bonus measure, I confidently assert that I speak for 98 per cent of the soldiery of my district in voicing these sentiments that the Nation give recognition for the service of these vallant sons.

The pending legislation is commonly known throughout the country as "a bonus bill." Some of its friends take issue with such designation, but I do not. The word "bonus" comes to us from the Latin, in which language its meaning is "good." It is a good bill. Taking the definition of the word, that it is something in addition to regular pay, it occurs to me that it is just that; it is the gift of the Nation; it is the token of the country; it is a symbol of appreciation of the wealthiest country in the world to its defenders.

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

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I think that the ex-service men will agree with my colleague in calling this a bonus bill, because they asked the Congress for meat and this committee has given them a bone. Naturally it is bon-us.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Very good.

In their efforts to organize such veterans of the World War opposing the bonus bill, the moneyed interests of this country sent a man by the name of Brinkerhoff into Kentucky to effect an organization that is known as the Ex-Service Men's Antibonus League. From his own lips I heard Mr. Brinkerhoff state that he was a broker of stocks and bonds in the city of New York; that his opposition to the bonus was of such nature that he was contributing his time to the effort to organize Kentucky's soldiery against this measure.

To this date, according to my information, he has been able to form one club of men looking toward the defeat of the bonus legislation. In this chapter there are men whom I have known from early boyhood; there are men of splendid character; men who are honest in their opinions upon this subject, and I do not impugn the motive of anyone who, in virtue of his conscientious scruples, opposes this bill, but I do wish to go upon record against the moneyed interests represented by this man Brinkerhoff and others of like nature in attempting to organize the soldiery of my district against this recognition of their services.

Dealing with the total amount to be expended under this act, the amount is inconsiderable as compared to the total amount of this country's vast wealth, which authoritative statistics estimate to be \$350,000,000,000. The expenditure under this bill aggregates \$2,000,000,000. Upon that basis it is fifty-seven one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the total wealth of America. From these figures it is easy to ascertain that it is of no particular moment in respect of its being a tremendous financial burden.

Viewing it from a practical viewpoint, it occurs to me that it is a question that should be settled. I heard no lamentations from the representatives of the moneyed marts of this country in accepting the retroactive provision in the revenue tax measure, which recently passed this House, by which the income-tax payers for 1923 of America received a "bonus" of approximately \$250,000,000. It was not called a bonus in the bill, but it was as truly a bonus as that which will be granted unto the soldier heroes of America. This bonus to said income-tax payers of America came about in this wise: A surplus of \$600,000,000 was found to exist in the Treasury, and it was realized that the administration had placed an improper and a too weighty burden upon the people of America in 1923 by way of income taxes, and it was deemed fit and proper to provide for a 25 per cent reduction in the income taxes for 1923. I protest not against such measure. I voted for the amendment and for the bill, to the end that the tax burden of our people would be alleviated. But, nevertheless, it was a bonus, a good thing, an allowance over that to which they would have been entitled under the then-existing law. The number of persons directly affected by this tax reduction is approximately the same number that will be directly affected by the passage of this measure.

To the contrary, and as a matter of fact, the business interests of America should favor it; it is a question that should be settled, to the end that the business affairs of the country will not be injured by the circumstances surrounding the situation. Among the more than 4,000,000 soldiers of the World War this question is a tender spot, not only affecting the soldiers but reaching out into many millions more among the families of soldiers. It has gotten to be a sore upon the body politic of America. Permitting it to remain in this condition, I assert that it would fester, to the detriment of the very interests that are now opposing the measure. I submit that as a business proposition it is better to get this question settled, and settled right, than to let the soldiers, their families and friends in this generation, and the children of the soldiers in the next generation, hold in their hearts canker against the business interests of our country.

Most everyone has a cure for the diseases that prey upon the body politic of our country. I do not essay to prescribe for the ills that seem to hold our country in its grip, but were I to attempt such a thing I would lay at the door of the turmoil, strife, lack of faith, instability, trembling conditions of our affairs the old homily: "Money is the root of all evil."

It causes men to forget obligations with which they have been imposed; it causes men to forget the duties of official trust; it causes men to lose their position in society and their honor and esteem among men; it is causing our great business men and institutions to forget the saviors of freedom in government—the ex-service men of the World War.

In the hurly-burly of our modern life our old globe is spinning so rapidly that man has eaten up the distance intervening between the rise of the sun in the bustling east and its setting in the golden west. Soon it will be an accomplished fact that in the morning time man will view the appearance of Old Sol stretching its radiant head above the waters of the Atlantic and, at the eventide, watch its golden glow disappear into the mighty vastness of the Pacific.

No wonder, in an age of such speed men forget their obligations to their fellow men; no wonder that the country, to a large degree, has forgotten the splendid service of its manhood in standing between the purpose of a war-mad Kaiser and its successful termination. But our country, to a large degree, has forgotten.

LEST WE FORGET.

I would ask you to go back with me to the early days of 1917 when the Kaiser of that militaristic country, calculating to a nicety that he could throttle the Allies with his iron fist before America could emerge from her condition of peace and appear upon the battle fields of Europe; calculating to a nicety, in my judgment, that there was no longer need of his haughty self to respect the rights of this country relative to the war zone limits then existing, flung defiance to the wind and gave notice that no longer would he consider the rights of neutrals.

LEST WE FORGET.

Recall to your mind the scene when our late lamented war President, Woodrow Wilson, appeared in this very Chamber and with breaking heart delivered the war message to our Congress. Recall to your mind the stirring scene in which a state of war was declared to exist between your country and the foes of democracy. With what deep feeling of solemnity did you cast your vote plunging your country into a just war!

LEST WE FORGET.

Bring back to your mind's eye the hurried preparedness for this world struggle; conjure up in your memory the scenes that obtained in the departure of your sons and neighbor's sons; bring back into your memory the tears and heartaches which were involved in the sacrifices of the womanhood of America.

LEST WE FORGET.

It is needless for me to ask those who experienced the home leaving to renew that picture. The kiss of my aged mother, coupled with her half-stifled cry of anguish as I turned away from her, and the cold, death-like lips of my sweetheart's kiss can never be erased from my memory. Others will recall farewells with the picture of a sweet, babbling baby prominent in the foreground. It is needless to remind the soldier of those days in the training camps, in the hospitals, where death stalked unseen and took as its victims 62,106 of America's noble sons; it is needless to remind the overseas veteran of the experiences that confronted him upon foreign soil, of the hardships of camp life and the privations necessarily endured; it is needless to remind him of the damnable weather, of the muck and mud of the trenches, the chill of the night, and the hell of battle.

Do you think that they can forget the fall of a comrade by their side writhing in pain or silent in the stillness of death;



here the trunk of what was once a man; there the body of what was once a living being, possessed of the same desire to live and to love as is possessed by the moneyed interests of America now opposing the effort of a grateful country to pay her debt of honor.

LEST WE FORGET.

Time was when the ex-service man, offering his all, withstanding the onslaughts of the greatest military machine that history ever witnessed and breaking into disorder its famed storm-division troops was proclaimed the hero of the Nation, and now, in time of peace and security, the moneyed interests of the East object to the country giving evidence of its appreciation for the services of its soldiers in the time of the Nation's greatest peril.

In conclusion, I desire to reiterate that it has not been my purpose to impugn the motive of any ex-service man of the World War with whom I may differ in views upon this subject. I accord him the same right to his views upon this or any subject as I claim for myself.

I have stated the conclusions of my own mind, and I respectfully submit it to the conclusions of practically the unanimous soldiery of my district; and further, respectfully, submit that I give voice to the desire of my people that the Nation's gratitude should be expressed in some substantial form. [Applause.]

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

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

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CRAMTON, as Speaker pro tempore, having assumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 6820) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### THE SO-CALLED GASOLINE BILL.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I obtained permission to extend my remarks on the gas tax bill a short time ago, and I desire to date them as of to-day, because I want to bring in some matters that have come up later on that bill. I ask unanimous consent to date it to-day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the remarks he referred to may be dated to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for permitting me to discuss the so-called gasoline tax bill. Apparently it is of local importance only, but when all facts connected with it are fully analyzed, it forms a vital issue of principle that affects every man, woman, and child in the United States.

#### INESTIMABLE VALUE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Were it not for the publicity afforded nationally by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it would be impossible to get certain facts before the people of the country.

There was a time when editors reserved only one portion of their newspaper—the editorial page—for disseminating their own views, and the columns of the other pages were devoted to news items, to chronicle what happened to their readers without bias or prejudice. But no part of any column of any page of any daily in any of the big cities now belongs to the readers, for in this modern day the editors of the big metropolitan newspapers leave out what they don't like and color all news items to suit their own views. When Members of Congress fight for things the editors don't want, or fight against things the editors do want, such editors are not content with roasting such Members in editorials, but they go further, and either make no mention whatever of the facts brought to light by such Members or else twist same into some ridiculous meaning neither intended nor warranted. Thus the facts are not given to the people.

The unpurchasable country press is the people's only salvation. This country press published in towns and in the smaller cities is uncontrolled by ulterior interests, and its policies are not for sale. Just as far as circumstances will permit, it gives the uncensored news to its readers. But the country press is handicapped, for the only means it has of obtaining news beyond its immediate locality is what is sent by the big metropolitan press and the news-reporting agencies, which unfor-

tunately are controlled and influenced by the big newspapers. So in the Nation's Capital there exists but one true source of news, giving uncensored to the people the happenings of Congress and the respective views of its Members, and that is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### WHY BIG NEWSPAPERS DO NOT LIKE IT.

Naturally, big newspapers do not like it. When they treat Members of Congress unfairly the RECORD reveals it. When the press twists or colors the facts the RECORD shows it. When the press forms a dislike for a Member and punishes him with the "silent treatment," which means never to mention his name unless in a derogatory way, no matter how closely connected he may be with important legislation before the House, the RECORD discloses such discrimination. When the press purposely misconstrues and misstates the position of a Member, the RECORD demonstrates such unfairness to the reading public. For about 40,000 copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are mailed from Washington by the Government Printing Office the next morning after each day's session to the remotest parts of the United States into every State of the Union. They are read by the people at home and by the fair, honest editors in the towns and smaller cities, who ultimately find out first-hand when they have been bunkoed with false news sent them by news-reporting agencies and the big papers. Thus concerning the happenings of Congress the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has become the monitor of the monopolistic press, tending to keep it in line when it would distort the facts. Naturally the press is restive under this restraint. It does not like to be kept in line. It does not like a news medium with a daily circulation of 40,000 copies which can not be controlled by the combined press interests. This is why the big press constantly pokes fun at the RECORD. This is why the big press tries to incite the country press to poke fun at the RECORD.

#### RECORD CONTAINS VALUABLE INFORMATION.

Valuable information on practically every subject imaginable is disseminated in the RECORD, and it is now being read closely by the people at home. Only a few days ago appeared an editorial in the daily paper of my home city, written by the distinguished editor, Mr. Frank Grimes, who, by the way, had four brave brothers who valiantly served our flag during the recent war, and who for several years himself has ably edited the Abilene Daily Reporter, a newspaper that would be an honor to Washington, wherein Editor Grimes said that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was well worth reading, and that all people who had access to it were now reading it closely, and to advantage.

#### WELL WORTH ITS COST.

No money spent by the Government is better spent, for otherwise there would be no uncensored record of what daily happens here. It is a protection to every Congressman. For sooner or later the people will eventually find it out when either the big press or the news-reporting agencies discriminate against any Member. And American people will not stand for anything but fair play. And the people can afford to pay for its cost, for some facts they are not able to get through any other source. And I am now forced to use the RECORD in order to get before the American people the real facts connected with the so-called gasoline tax bill, so that they may see just how vitally affected they are by it, for the big press, controlled by Washington influence, has failed to relate such facts.

#### CHRONOLOGICAL SITUATION.

When this Congress met, the District of Columbia had auto reciprocity with every State in the Nation except Maryland, and Maryland had auto reciprocity with all the States, but not with the District of Columbia. Each had to procure licenses from the other.

Under the present law in the District of Columbia automobiles have to pay a property tax of \$1.20—the regular tax rate—per \$100 on the valuation of the car, and a license-tag fee as follows: Three dollars for cars not over 24 horsepower; \$5 for cars between 24 and 30 horsepower; and \$10 for cars over 30 horsepower. Virginia, on one side of the District, has a much larger registration fee and a much larger property tax on automobiles, and in addition has a gasoline tax of 3 cents on the gallon. Maryland, on practically the other three sides of the District, has a much larger registration fee and a much larger property tax on automobiles than has the District, and in addition has a gasoline tax of 2 cents per gallon.

Maryland proposed to the District that if Congress would pass a law placing a tax of 2 cents per gallon on gasoline, which would abolish incentive for motorists to buy their gasoline in the District rather than in Maryland, that Maryland would then agree to auto reciprocity with the District.

And to meet such proposal of Maryland this so-called gasoline tax bill was designed; but when they framed it, instead of merely providing for a gasoline tax of 2 cents on the gallon, as demanded by Maryland, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sought to abolish the present registration license fees and also sought to abolish all of the present property tax on motor vehicles, and framed the bill so that the only tax hereafter to be paid on motor vehicles from Rolls-Royce and Pierce-Arrow limousines on down should be the nominal sum of \$1 on each car, and said commissioners sent such bill to the House District Committee, requesting that it be passed immediately, in order to obtain reciprocity with Maryland.

#### CLEARLY A TAX-DODGING SCHEME.

In my minority report filed against this bill I stated that instead of calling it "the gasoline tax bill" its proper appellation was "the commissioners' latest tax-dodging scheme." Their selfish plan would not have looked so crude if their existing taxes had been high. But, as a matter of fact, they were paying less than half what people both in Virginia and Maryland were paying. Under the present law a \$15,000 new Rolls-Royce limousine here in the District has to pay a registration fee of only \$10 and a property tax of only \$1.20 on the \$100, while in Maryland it has to pay a registration fee of 32 cents per horsepower and a property tax of \$2.70 on the \$100, and in addition a 2-cents-per-gallon tax on gasoline; and in Virginia, say in the city of Alexandria, it has to pay a State registration fee of 60 cents per horsepower and a State property tax of \$1.50 on the \$100, and also an additional municipal registration fee, and a municipal property tax, and then in addition pay a gasoline tax of 3 cents on the gallon. Thus the people, both of Maryland and Virginia, and everywhere else in the United States, are now paying over twice as much taxes on automobiles as are the people of the District of Columbia. Yet the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sought by their bill to permit a \$15,000 Rolls-Royce limousine to escape all taxation except a nominal fee of a pitiful little \$1 besides the gasoline tax, and to permit the owner of 500 valuable taxicabs, running on the streets day and night, to escape all taxation except to pay a pitiful little \$1 on each car.

#### WHAT THE COMMISSIONERS HAD IN MIND.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia knew that under what was known as the outrageous half-and-half system that prevailed here until changed in 1921 to the 60-40 ratio the whole people of the United States through the general Treasury had paid half of all the general running expenses of the District of Columbia, including all improvements of the city, and are now permitting the nearly 500,000 citizens of Washington to pay a ridiculously low tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, on both real and personal property, with a personal property exemption of \$1,000 free from all taxation, and assessed at about half of the real valuation, and a tax on intangibles of only one-half of 1 per cent, and that since the change from the 50-50 system in 1921 the whole people from the Government's Treasury have been paying 40 per cent of all of such improvements and city expenses. And the commissioners knew that through the many department supply bills passed by Congress every year several million dollars more are spent on various local civic matters here in Washington for which Washington people would have to provide, but for which the Government has furnished the full 100 per cent. And the commissioners therefore reasoned among themselves about as follows: "We should worry! Why should we tax ourselves to raise money? Have not we the Government Treasury here in our midst, from which we have always gotten what we wanted?" And they saw a fine opportunity to lower the expenses of Washington people very materially, by getting Congress to abolish all property tax on their automobiles and reduce their registration fees down to a nominal \$1 per car. They knew that the Government had already provided the necessary money to pave the hundreds of miles of streets and boulevards, the million-dollar bridges across the Potomac, the several bridges across the Anacostia River, the numerous city street bridges in Washington, including the fine tiger bridge on Sixteenth Street, and the "million-dollar bridge" on Connecticut Avenue, and the 100,000 street lights all over the District of Columbia, the traffic policing of such streets, and the street-cleaning, snow-removing, and rainfall disposition, and that each year the Government was continuing the appropriating of huge sums of public money out of the Treasury for repairs, upkeep, maintenance, and replacement. So why should not the commissioners make the effort to still further lower their taxes and pass the burden over on the waiting Government?

The commissioners knew that if any Congressman or Senator dared to object, they had the Washington Post, owned by Mr. Edward B. McLean, the Washington Herald, owned by

Mr. William Randolph Hearst, the Washington Star, controlled by Mr. Theodore W. Noyes, the Washington Times, owned by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, and the Washington News, owned by the Scripps syndicate, besides the many other publications of local organizations in Washington, to center their combined attacks upon such obstreperous Congressman or Senator and punish him until he got himself back in line. They could give him "the once over" by publishing ridiculous news items about him. They could punish him by misconstruing his every act and word. They could attack him editorially. They could give him "the silent treatment" by making no reference to any work performed by him in committees or in Congress. They could so influence the press reporting agencies in the press gallery to punish him, and thus hamstring the recalcitrant Congressman in his home State and the counties of his district through the censored news items sent to his home papers. And they knew that they could make it very unpleasant for any Congressman who stood in the way of their plan. And these tax-dodging commissioners thought that they would be able to get away with it.

#### ACTION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE.

After due consideration, the House committee placed back into the bill the property tax the commissioners had left out. But through the continued insistence of the acting chairman, Mr. ZIEHLMAN, the committee by a compromise vote agreed upon an amendment that exempted all motor vehicles from the property tax up to a valuation of \$1,000, and by a vote of 7 to 6 the amended bill was reported to the House for action. This would have given the people of the District of Columbia a personal-property exemption of \$1,000 from taxation, and an additional exemption of another \$1,000 on automobiles, with the balance of the personal and real property taxed at the rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100.

#### ACTION BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Upon consideration the House of Representatives, by practically a unanimous vote, turned down Acting Chairman ZIEHLMAN's proposal, and decided that the property tax on motor vehicles should remain. And in lieu of the \$1 per car registration fee proposed by the commissioners, the House by a decisive vote provided that there should be a registration fee of 15 cents per horsepower on motor vehicles, in lieu of the \$3, \$5, and \$10 fees now charged. And the bill was thus passed and sent to the Senate.

#### UPROAR BY WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS AND PEOPLE.

That afternoon Mr. Hearst's Washington Times (February 12, 1924), at the top of the Washington page, in huge box-car letters, carried the startling headline

D. C. reciprocity gas bill is dead,

and then in a subhead typed in letters over half an inch high said:

Personal levy is cause.

And as a reason for the bill becoming "dead" within just an hour after being passed by the House, the Times thus proclaimed:

The 2-cent gasoline tax bill, establishing automobile reciprocity between the District and Maryland, is virtually in the scrap heap, so far as its chances of passage at the present session of Congress are concerned.

The action of the House in enacting the bill with the personal-property tax included kills the measure in the Senate, according to those in touch with the situation. The Senate will never accept the bill in its present form.

But in the next column the Times disclosed the real secret in the following statement:

When the commissioners first sent the gas tax bill to Congress they proposed a 2-cent gas tax and a \$1 registration or tag fee. They asked for the elimination of the personal-property tax on automobiles. \* \* \*

But when the bill passed the House yesterday it was changed considerably. The 2-cent tax was retained, the personal-property tax continued, and an additional tax of 15 cents per horsepower included as a substitute for the \$1 fee.

#### MAY CUT STREETS BUDGET.

The House bill also provides that all automobile taxes be used to maintain the highway system of Washington. This will undoubtedly at first meet with general approval. However, if this is done Congress will probably withdraw its annual 40 per cent appropriation and tell the District to raise all of the money it needs for streets through automobile taxation and without the help of Congress. Congress now pays about \$600,000 as its part for street improvements, and it would probably cease this payment if the bill in its present form is approved.



And that same afternoon, February 12, 1924, following the passage of the bill by the House, the Washington Star predicted that the people of Washington would kill the bill, carrying the following in unusually large headlines:

**FIGHT GAS TAX BILL IN SENATE AFTER PASSAGE BY HOUSE—MAY CUT TAX FEATURES.**

It is almost certain that the committee will decline to accept the House bill and will report the measure in its original form, without the personal property tax included.

As to the amendment offered by Representative CRAMTON, of Michigan, specifying that money raised from automobiles be used for street improvements, fear was expressed at the District Building that it would lead the Appropriations Committee of Congress to eliminate the funds appropriated each year on the 60-40 basis for street work.

The current appropriation act carries a total of \$1,448,300 for new paving and maintenance of existing streets. If Congress continued to make these regular allotments for streets on the 60-40 basis, and also made automobile taxes available for street work, the engineer department would have just twice as much money with which to give Washington good highways.

But if, as some city officials fear, the gas tax bill in its present form would merely lead to the elimination of street-paying funds from the appropriation act, the District would be the loser, for the reason that the Federal Government would thus be relieved of the 40 per cent it now pays toward street improvements. For the current year the Federal Government's proportion of the \$1,448,300 street appropriations is \$579,320.

You will note that it was the fear that Congress would not continue to furnish the \$600,000 each year for the repair of Washington streets, and also the fact that they were not relieved of the property tax and registration fees that caused the Washington commissioners to declare the bill "dead." And note that the Times tried to make it appear that the registration fee of 15 cents per horsepower was an "additional" tax, when it was not, but was in lieu of the present \$3, \$5, and \$10 registration fees, and on small cars would not amount to more than the present law.

#### TIMES STARTED ITS ATTACK.

And in this same issue the Times made a dig under my belt simply because I had contended that the people here should pay a fair rate of taxation, just as all other people in the United States pay, and should not have their expenses paid by the Treasury. It said:

The flat \$1 registration fee came under fire, and Congressman BLANTON, of Texas, leader of the fight to increase the tax burden upon the District motorists, proposed a fee of 32 cents per horsepower. Congressman J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, of Maryland, had this cut to the present rate of 15 cents.

#### BLANTON PLEADED.

As the last of these amendments was adopted, Congressman BLANTON took occasion to thank the House, stating:

"I now think I can vote for this bill; this is what we have been trying to do ever since it came in committee."

Now, what is there about this bill that is such a terrible nightmare to the Washington people, commissioners, and newspapers? Its registration fee of 15 cents per horsepower is very small. The people of Maryland, around three sides of the District, pay a registration fee of 32 cents per horsepower, which is more than double. The people of Virginia, on the other side of the District, pay a State registration fee of 60 cents per horsepower, which is four times as much as that provided in the bill passed by the House, and in addition the Virginia people living in cities pay a municipal registration fee.

What is there unreasonable about the property tax of \$1.20 on the \$100 left in the bill passed by the House that should cause the commissioners, people, and newspapers of the District to throw spasms? That is the present tax. There is no change. It is merely left as it is now. Is it high? Why, the people of Maryland are paying a property tax of \$2.70 on the \$100, or double the District property tax. The people of Virginia are paying a State property tax of \$1.50 per \$100 on the valuation of the car and, in addition, are paying a municipal property tax. And, as said before, the people of Maryland are paying a gasoline tax of 2 cents per gallon, and the people of Virginia are paying a gasoline tax of 3 cents on the gallon. Upon what meat have our favored people of Washington been feeding, that they should not be taxed as other people of the United States are taxed? They have been petted and pampered and provided for so long out of the Public Treasury that they are spoiled.

#### HEARST'S PERSONAL INTERESTS.

William Randolph Hearst owns the Washington Herald morning newspaper plant. He owns the Washington Times

evening newspaper plant. If he can keep the tax rate in Washington at only \$1.20 per \$100 and have the Federal Treasury pay all of the balance of the local expenses when people in all other cities in the United States have to pay a total tax of at least \$2.75 on the \$100, and some as high as \$6, \$7, and even \$8 on the \$100, it, of course, means quite a lot of tax money saved for Mr. Hearst, and, in addition, he makes his two Washington newspapers extremely popular with the nearly 500,000 people of Washington, who want to pay just as little taxes as possible.

#### HAS HIS TEXAS PAPERS ATTACK ME.

So on February 13, 1924, one of Mr. Hearst's hirelings, Hugh Nugent Fitzgerald, who makes his pen write the kind of stuff he is told to put in his editorials, made a very unfair and wholly unwarranted personal attack on me in a double-column-wide editorial in the Austin American criticizing my stand on this gasoline tax bill and bemoaning me personally. He headed the article "Texas Tom on Deck" and begun by saying:

Texas TOM BLANTON is raising hell again in the national halls of legislation—

and throughout his misleading article, written specially in an attempt to belittle me, he continually refers to me as "Texas Tom." A number of Austin citizens have sent me copies of the attack, and assured me that even if Mr. Hearst and his "hireling" do advocate the ridiculous tax rate of \$1.20 on the \$100 here in Washington, with the Government paying the balance of expenses, that the people of Austin who are posted do not, and that because of just such uncalled-for attacks as the one Mr. Fitzgerald made on me, and the kind of yellow-journal stuff he fills the American with, that many Austin people are reading San Antonio, Dallas, and Houston papers to escape it.

And when not long ago an honest reporter, working for Mr. Hearst here in Washington, fairly reported an address made by me just as it occurred, it was handed back to him by one of Mr. Hearst's editors and he was told to rewrite it and to "jazz it up," and when it appeared in the paper it was so jazzed up that one who had been present would not have recognized it. And with the exception of the Washington Star, which is one of the best and fairest newspapers in the United States, all the other Washington papers almost daily misquote, misinterpret, misrepresent, and attack my position on all questions arising. This is the penalty I have paid for several years and am still paying for fighting here for a just rate of taxation in Washington. But I am willing to pay the penalty, and I am going to keep up the fight until there is a fair rate of taxation.

#### CONTINUED STRENUOUS EFFORT TO OMIT TAX.

The Washington Board of Trade and the various citizens' organizations of Washington are now making an organized fight against the bill to strike out the property tax and also the 15 cents per horsepower registration fee. There has hardly been an issue of any paper that has been free of propaganda against such taxes. In reporting the proceedings before the subcommittee of the Senate on this bill, the Times of February 23, 1924, said:

#### REPLIES TO BLANTON.

Answering heated statements by Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, who appeared before to-day's subcommittee and urged inclusion of the property tax, that this city enjoys the lowest tax rate of any city in the United States, Chairman BALL reminded him that the District must not be criticized for this, inasmuch as Congress fixes the rate and is to blame.

Immediately after the subcommittee meeting the local representatives, headed by Edward F. Colladay, president of the Washington Board of Trade, held a closed conference in the Senate Office Building to thrash out the merits of the substitute or compromise gasoline tax bill submitted to them to-day by Chairman BALL.

Those who appeared as members of the District citizens' committee at to-day's subcommittee hearing follow:

Washington Automotive Association, Paul Lum, Stanley Horner, and W. D. Guy; American Automobile Association, M. O. Eldridge, George Offut, and A. M. Loomis; Washington Board of Trade, Edward F. Colladay, W. P. Rayner; Federation of Citizens' Associations, Charles Baker, W. S. Torbett; National Motorists' Association, Jesse Suter; Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, R. P. Andrews, Charles J. Columbus; truck interests, L. E. Smoot; and a representative of the Northeast Citizens' Association.

#### CLINGING TO THE GOVERNMENT TREASURY.

In passing this so-called gasoline tax bill the House of Representatives provided that all registration fees, gasoline tax, and property tax on automobiles in the District should constitute a special fund to repair and maintain the streets of Washington. But Washington people feared that it might be adequate to keep

up the streets, and that they would not get the \$600,000 per year from the Federal Government, which they have been enjoying so long, paid into their general funds. So in the Washington Star of February 24, 1924, Chairman Colladay, of the Board of Trade, thus expressed his fears:

Fear that the special fund would be the entering wedge for Congress to avoid contributing its share to the District was expressed by Edward F. Colladay, chairman of the special committee and its spokesman.

"This plan of yours," said Mr. Colladay, "is a new thing to me, and I don't feel qualified to give our final opinion on it until all members of the committee have been allowed to express their opinion in a conference of the committee. I will say that I view with alarm any attempt on the part of Congress to violate the fixed proportionate contribution principle which has been laid down for the fiscal relationship between the Federal Government and the District."

And on February 25, 1924, the Washington Star, on its front page, in large headlines, heralded the following:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEADERS BACK ORIGINAL GAS TAX BILL IN CONGRESS—SPECIAL JOINT CIVIC COMMITTEE AGAINST ANY CHANGE IN PRESENT 60-40 RATIO—EDITORIAL IN THE STAR IS READ TO MEETING—REPRESENTATIVES OF BUSINESS AND MOTORING BODIES GATHER IN BOARD OF TRADE ROOM.

Decision to reject any proposal for a gasoline tax for the District of Columbia other than that originally proposed by the District Commissioners was reached by the joint special civic committee at a meeting this afternoon in the board of trade rooms.

Following the reading of an editorial in the Evening Star touching on all phases of the proposed gas tax, the committee took immediate action.

#### STAND BY PRESENT RATIO.

It was the consensus of opinion that no plan which violated the 60-40 fiscal relations plan between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government should be accepted by citizens of Washington.

#### TRADE BOARD HITS BILLS—PREFERS NO RECIPROCITY TO PROPOSED MEASURES.

Better no automobile reciprocity between the District of Columbia and Maryland at all than under the terms of the two pending bills or the Ball substitute.

It was the contention of the committee that the passage of any such measures as those proposed would mark an entering wedge for the destruction of the 60-40 fiscal relationship between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

The committee in a formal resolution announced its opposition to the pending measures, and particularly on the substitute proposed by Senator BALL; said that it would prefer to have no reciprocity rather than this substitute, because it is an infringement upon the principle of fixed proportional contribution between the Federal and District Governments.

And on February 26, 1924, the Washington Times published the following:

#### RECIPROCITY BILL FACES VETO MOVE—TRADE COMMITTEE TO SEEK DEATH OF ANY BUT ORIGINAL MEASURE.

The committee unanimously opposed the House reciprocity bill, the Senate reciprocity bill, and the substitute bill which will be presented to the Senate subcommittee to-day by Senator BALL. Approval of the original bill drawn by the District Commissioners was reiterated.

Infringement on the principle of the 60-40 agreement is seen in Senator BALL's substitute bill, it was pointed out. The bill provides all the money collected from the gasoline tax shall go exclusively to the District and be appropriated at will of the District Commissioners for traffic improvement.

"But why should the people of the District pay this whole amount?" Edward F. Colladay, president of the Washington Board of Trade, asked the committee, "when Congress is agreed to furnish 40 per cent of all our expenses? It is just another trick."

#### BALL DETERMINED.

Senator BALL told the citizen representatives that he was greatly disappointed with the attitude taken, and that he proposes to stand by his substitute. He said he would place it before the Senate District Committee at the meeting to-morrow morning, and indicated he felt certain that the committee would accept it. He expressed his regrets that the local citizens would not accept his substitute, because he felt it was a fair bill and one which imposes no discrimination upon motorists here.

#### WASHINGTON PEOPLE DECLARED SELFISH.

The Washington News for February 27, 1924, said:

Senator EDWARDS, New Jersey, called attention to the difference in the tax rate paid in Washington and other cities. Here the basic

tax is \$1.20, while in Baltimore, at a similar valuation, \$3 is paid; in New York, \$5.40; in Jersey City, over \$4, and in Chicago, \$8.50. BALL and Senator JONES, Washington, said it would be unfair not to have a personal tax on autos.

#### SELFISH.

"It is truly a selfish proposition with District people," Senator WELLER, Maryland, said. "People here do not want to pay fair taxes."

#### WASHINGTONIANS UNWILLING TO PAY THEIR JUST SHARE.

The Washington Post for February 27, 1924, said:

#### SENATOR BALL REPLIES.

"I am extremely sorry that the citizens of Washington have taken this position," Senator BALL replied. "It is a position that Congress can not support. It takes a stand that exempts you from taxation. There is no excuse upon which a fair-minded man can exempt you from this taxation that is paid in other States."

"There is a lower tax rate here than in any comparable city. Maryland and Virginia each pay personal-property taxes. Why shouldn't you? One pays 2 cents a gallon gasoline tax and the other 3 cents. The money so raised goes to the highway improvement. That provision is in my proposed substitute."

"On what ground can I, or anyone else, stand now? Washingtonians are not willing to pay their just share of taxes, as evidenced by the decision of this committee. I can not go to Congress now and say that the people here are willing to pay their full share and that funds should be appropriated for improvement of the city when it is evident that they are not."

Senator BALL warned the civic and trade representatives that there is a growing belief in Congress that the taxpayers of the District should contribute more than 60 per cent for the maintenance of the municipal government.

#### ACTUATED BY PURELY SELFISH MOTIVE.

In addition to the above, the Washington Star for February 27, 1924, carried the following:

#### BALL SAYS TAXES LOW.

"I am extremely sorry," replied Senator BALL, "that the citizens of Washington have taken this position. It is a position that Congress can not support. It takes a stand that exempts you from taxation. There is no excuse upon which a fair-minded man can exempt you from this taxation that is paid in other States."

"There is a lower tax rate here than in any comparable city. Maryland and Virginia each pay personal taxes. Why shouldn't you? In these two States one pays 2 cents a gallon for gasoline tax and the other 3. \* \* \*

#### MUST PAY FAIR TAX.

In support of his contention that his substitute bill, which carries the 2-cent tax on gasoline, \$1 license fee, and the present personal-property tax, was fair, Senator BALL pointed out that the personal-property tax on automobiles paid in Baltimore is \$3 a hundred, while here it is \$1.20. He insisted that the taxes paid on automobiles in Washington are very much lower than in Delaware, New York, Maryland, and other States. He declared that the people of the District can not expect Washington to become a really big city unless the people here are willing to pay fair taxes.

Senator WELLER, of Maryland, said that the matter was of interest to the people of Maryland, who also want their reciprocity with the District in the matter of automobile licenses. He, too, argued that the taxes paid on automobiles in the District, even under the proposed gasoline tax law, would be much lower than in Maryland. Senator COPELAND suggested that the tax on automobiles in New York was higher still than in Maryland; that he paid, he thought, \$5 a hundred personal-property tax on automobiles there.

Senator WELLER declared that the people in the District in opposing the gasoline tax bill, which would lead to reciprocity with Maryland, were actuated by a purely selfish motive; that they did not want to pay a fair tax.

#### COMMISSIONERS' BILL NATURALLY PREFERABLE TO CITIZENS.

Naturally the bill specially prepared by the commissioners, which sought to abolish the \$3, \$5, and \$10 registration fees now paid and permit all cars from Rolls-Royces and Pierce-Arrows down to pay merely a nominal fee of \$1 each, and which also sought to abolish all property tax on motor vehicles, was preferred by Washington citizens, as such measure reduced their taxes immensely. Very naturally they would make a fight for the commissioners' bill.

It was no worry of theirs that the Government would have to pay a correspondingly greater amount in liquidating the balance of their expenses; and so the various citizens' associations began to meet all over the city, and they sent their delegates to the meeting of the Federation of Citizens' Associations



to make a concentrated fight against the bill as passed by the House and to have substituted for it the original commissioners' bill. The following is from the press report of such meeting:

**RENEW OPPOSITION TO GAS TAX BILL—CITIZENS' FEDERATION MEMBERS FEAR UPSET OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FISCAL ARRANGEMENT.**

The Federation of Citizens' Associations last night renewed its opposition to any automobile reciprocity legislation except the bill as originally drafted by the District Commissioners.

The delegates adopted a resolution calling the attention of all Washingtonians to the dangers which the federation believes lie in the substitute reciprocity measure proposed by Senator BALL.

Most of the discussion centered on that part of the Ball substitute which provides that approximately a million dollars, to be raised by the 2-cent tax on gasoline, shall be made available as a special fund for street paving, lighting, and upkeep of bridges.

William S. Torbert and Jesse C. Suter told the delegates of the determined stand taken against the Ball plan by a joint committee representing various civic and trade organizations.

**ENDANGERS TAX BASIS.**

They emphasized the point that the Ball measure endangers the time-honored system under which the Federal Government has contributed a fixed proportion of the expenses of the Capital City.

Mr. Torbert stated that while the Ball measure stipulates that the special gas-tax fund is not intended to interfere with the regular annual appropriations, if the commissioners were given a million dollars of gas-tax money to spend on streets there would be no assurance that Congress would continue to make the usual 60-40 appropriations for street improvements.

**AND WASHINGTON CITIZENS WON—NO FAR.**

The following excerpts are taken from the article appearing on the first page of the Washington Star for March 12, 1924, to wit:

**ORIGINAL GAS TAX BILL GETS SENATE COMMITTEE O. K.—HOUSE RECIPROCITY MEASURE AMENDED TO CONFORM TO COMMISSIONERS' PLAN.**

The gasoline tax bill, virtually in the form recommended by the District Commissioners, was ordered favorably reported to the Senate to-day by the Senate District Committee.

The committee acted upon the House bill, amending it to conform to the plan suggested by the commissioners.

**ONE DOLLAR REGISTRATION FEE.**

The bill as reported also provides for a registration fee of \$1 each year for each motor vehicle operated in the District except for motor vehicles propelled by steam or electricity.

The action of the Senate committee to-day was a victory for the citizens of the District, who have protested vigorously against the introduction of the personal property tax on automobiles along with the gasoline tax.

It will be noted from the last paragraph of the above article that the representation is made that there was an attempt to add a personal-property tax on automobiles. This is not correct, for under the present law there is a personal-property tax of \$1.20 on the \$100. The commissioners' bill sought to abolish this self-same property tax, and the House of Representatives refused to let them do it. And the commissioners also sought by their bill to abolish the present registration fees of \$3, \$5, and \$10, and let all cars pay only a nominal \$1 each, and the House of Representatives refused to let them do it.

It was the commissioners who were seeking to abolish present taxes now existing. It was not the House of Representatives seeking to increase taxes. Maryland proposed reciprocity if a tax of 2 cents per gallon was imposed on gasoline. By paying such tax of 2 cents on gasoline the District of Columbia would gain reciprocity with Maryland and cease having to pay registration and license fees in Maryland. The House of Representatives decided by a decisive vote that Washington people should pay such tax, especially in view of the fact that Maryland paid 2 cents and Virginia paid 3 cents per gallon on gasoline, and practically all other States had a gasoline tax in addition to their registration fees and personal-property tax on automobiles. It is my purpose in this discussion to fully apprise the Members of the House and of the Senate of the real situation concerning taxation now existing in the District of Columbia, so that when this bill is finally agreed to in conference justice may be done to the people of the United States.

**RECORD MUST BE KEPT STRAIGHT.**

Mr. Theodore W. Noyes, editor of the Washington Star, in his issue of February 24, 1924, used two whole columns and a half of page 3—not the editorial page—in trying to defend

the \$1.20 on the \$100 tax rate in Washington, D. C. Likewise in his issue of February 26, 1924, Mr. Theodore W. Noyes devoted parts of four columns of page 3 of said Washington Star in another attempt to defend the \$1.20 on the \$100 rate of taxation here in Washington; and he also devoted more than a column of his editorial page in such defense. And in his issue of February 29, 1924, Mr. Theodore W. Noyes devoted practically another column of his editorial page to this tax defense. The fact remains, however, that the people of the District of Columbia are paying a total tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, with property assessed far below real value, and that the Government is paying all of the balance of their local city expenses, and has been doing it for years, when there is not another city, large or small, in the whole United States with a tax rate nearly so low.

**JUST HOW IT BENEFITS MR. NOYES.**

Up to and including the year 1922 property here was supposed to be assessed at two-thirds of actual value. Since 1922 it is supposed to be assessed at full value. Mr. Theodore W. Noyes owns a fine residence at 1730 New Hampshire Avenue NW., on lot 133 in square 153, which for the last five years has been assessed as follows:

Year—	
1920	\$51,500
1921	51,500
1922	54,700
1923	82,050
1924	82,200

I am reliably informed that this property is easily worth \$125,000 and could not be bought for that sum. Mr. Noyes's fine business property, known as the Evening Star Building, at the corner of Eleventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, has for the last five years been assessed at the following valuations:

Year—	
1920	\$505,226
1921	556,640
1922	947,640
1923	1,685,400
1924	2,205,475

I am reliably informed that this property is worth about \$3,000,000, and that little less than that sum would buy it, since the substantial improvements were made upon it in 1922-23.

Very naturally Mr. Theodore W. Noyes is much interested in keeping the tax rate down to \$1.20 on the \$100 and the assessed valuation down as low as possible, for if he had to pay a rate of \$2.40 or \$4.80, as people in most cities are paying, it would mean just double or treble the amount of taxes he is now paying, and if his assessment was raised to full value it would mean just that much more.

**WHAT IT MEANS TO EDITOR McLEAN.**

Mr. Edward B. McLean owns the Washington Post. His splendid business property, the Post Building, practically fronting on Pennsylvania Avenue, is situated in the central business section of Washington. It is assessed far below real value. And it means much to Mr. McLean that he has to pay a tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100. Editor McLean also owns a fine residence in the heart of the city at 1500 I Street NW., which is assessed at only \$600,604, and at the \$1.20 rate pays a tax of only \$7,207, when this property is easily worth double that sum. Editor McLean also owns a magnificent country estate, "Friendship," on Wisconsin Avenue NW., which is assessed at only \$492,944, and, at the \$1.20 rate, pays a tax of only \$5,915, when such property is easily worth \$1,000,000. Hence the low tax rate means a great deal to Editor Edward B. McLean.

**WHAT IT MEANS TO WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.**

Mr. William Randolph Hearst owns the Washington Morning Herald newspaper plant. He also owns the Washington Evening Times newspaper plant. If these plants were assessed at their real value, and if they paid the rate of taxation that Mr. Hearst pays in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and other cities of the United States where he owns papers, instead of the ridiculous tax rate of \$1.20 on the \$100 that he pays here his taxes in Washington would amount to several times what he now pays.

**NOW ASSESSED FAR BELOW REAL VALUE.**

Let me again call attention to various pieces of property scattered over Washington, showing that property here is under-assessed.

I have secured from the Rent Commission, the offices of the tax assessor and tax collector, and other reliable sources in Washington the facts concerning the rendition of numerous pieces of property which prove conclusively that property in the District of Columbia is assessed far below its value.

The Bradford apartments is assessed at \$229,407, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$2,752. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$450,000.

Tudor Hall apartments is assessed at \$266,653, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$3,199. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$362,576.

The Argyle apartments is assessed at \$207,437, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$2,489. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$344,000.

The Alabama apartments is assessed at \$219,870, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$2,638. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$305,000.

The Imperial apartments is assessed at \$207,500, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$2,490. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$350,082.

The Pelham Courts apartments is assessed at \$192,760, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$2,313. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$250,000.

The Riviera apartments is assessed at \$124,709, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$1,496. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$240,000.

The Earlington apartments is assessed at \$151,793, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$1,821. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is from \$225,000 to \$240,000.

The Savoy apartments is assessed at \$218,000, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$2,616. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$250,000.

The Lonsdale apartments is assessed at \$160,233, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$1,922. The owner of this property claimed before the Rent Commission that its value is \$240,000.

The residence of Mr. E. F. Colladay at 3734 Northampton is assessed at \$14,356, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$172, when it is reliably estimated to be worth far in excess of double that sum. It is to be expected that through the Washington Star he would lead the fight for this system of low taxation in the District, when the whole people of the United States pay the balance of the expenses.

The magnificent residence of Mrs. Marshall Field on Sixteenth Street NW. is assessed at \$139,722, and pays a tax of \$1,676. It is reliably estimated to be worth double that amount.

The magnificent Belmont residence at 1618 New Hampshire Avenue is assessed at \$472,502, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$5,670. It is reliably estimated to be worth double that sum.

The New Willard Hotel properties is assessed at \$2,594,705, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$31,136. This is the most valuable location in Washington, and is reliably estimated to be worth nearly double that sum.

The Raleigh Hotel property is assessed at \$1,972,200, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$23,666. It is reliably estimated to be worth at least half a million dollars more than that sum.

Hotel Washington is assessed at \$1,951,605, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$23,419. It is reliably estimated to be worth far in excess of that sum.

The magnificent, semicircular Wardman Park Hotel, covering quite an area of ground and housing many wealthy families, is assessed at \$3,105,346, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of only \$37,264, and I am reliably informed that you could not buy this property for much under \$5,000,000. The annual receipts paid this fashionable family hotel by its patrons would astonish any Member of this Congress.

The residence at 1835 Irving Street NW. is assessed at \$10,416, and at the \$1.20 rate pays a tax of only \$125, while it could be sold at any time for as much as \$22,500, a similar residence in the same block having recently sold for \$25,000.

The residence at 3100 Sixteenth Street NW., which recently sold for more than \$40,000, is assessed at \$15,181, and at \$1.20 pays a tax of \$182.

Garfinkle's department store is assessed at \$420,975 and pays a tax of \$5,051. Woodward & Lothrop (whole block) department store is assessed at \$3,468,833 and pays a tax of \$41,626. You could not purchase either of these properties for double the amount at which they are assessed.

The residence which I am renting at 1929 Kenyon Street NW. has recently sold for \$11,750. It is assessed at \$6,486 and pays a tax of \$77.84.

A distinguished southern Senator told me recently that for several years he had been trying to sell his residence in his home town for \$7,000, and that he pays more taxes on it in his home State than he pays on his residence in Washington, which under any condition is worth \$22,500 but which could be sold for \$25,000.

The Meridian Mansion at 2400 Sixteenth Street NW. is assessed at \$1,481,960, and at \$1.20 per \$100 pays a tax of only

\$17,783. When this property was before the Rent Commission for hearing its owner claimed that its real value was a little less than \$3,000,000, and admitted that its gross receipts from its rentals aggregated \$281,532.20 annually. When this property was sold on January 13, 1923, the revenue stamps on the deed, coupled with the trust therein assumed, indicated that the consideration was \$2,250,000. I have a statement signed by Mr. E. Kirby Smith, who then bought this property and now owns it, in which he says:

The usual assessment on property is 50 per cent of its valuation. This property could not be replaced for less than \$3,000,000 in addition to the land. I have spent quite a fortune furnishing and building over the place to make it attractive.

That comes from the owner himself. He admits just what I have been contending, that property is assessed far below its real value in the District of Columbia.

In the Record for February 26, 1924, beginning on page 2944, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIEHLMAN] placed reports of various sales of property and assessments given him by Tax Assessor Richards in an attempt to prove that property was not underassessed. His list embraced only five sales made in 1923, notwithstanding that there were hundreds of sales of very valuable pieces of property made in 1923. His list embraced sales made in 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922, as against the present assessment. This, of course, was manifestly unfair, for it is well known that property has been gradually going up all the time, and is much higher now and in 1923 than it was in the years he gave. But let me point out some of the pieces of property reported by him in such list. And at the same time I want it to be remembered that it is impossible to get the real value from the consideration shown in deeds, for a practice has grown up here in the District of Columbia of not stating the real consideration in the deed. For instance, when the magnificent Argonne Apartments on Columbia Road were sold on November 10, 1923, to Stacy M. Reed, the revenue stamps and recitations in the deed indicated that same was sold for \$1,730,000, plus accrued interest due on one trust for \$1,250,000 and another trust of \$225,000. But who knows exactly how much interest was due. And then, later, when this property was sold to C. A. Snow at quite an additional consideration, Mr. William S. Phillips, who arranged the sale to Mr. Snow, very frankly told me that he had agreed with Mr. Snow to keep the real consideration price secret, although he would say that the amount of revenue stamps on the deed would indicate within \$50,000 of the real consideration. Yet, this magnificent Argonne Apartment property is assessed at only \$1,523,154, and at the \$1.20 per \$100 rate pays a tax of only \$18,277.

So it may be seen that you must have information other than the bare recitations in a deed to ascertain what the real consideration was when property is sold and what its real value is; and Mr. Richards can not cite sales prices from considerations stated in deeds to prove value. But even citing sales made in years preceding 1923 did not prove his point, for many pieces of such property cited by him to Mr. ZIEHLMAN were underassessed, according to his own figures.

Now let us examine some of the properties which the gentleman from Maryland has placed in the Record as coming from the assessor's office in an attempt to prove that property is not underassessed in the District. I quote:

Lot 39 in square 220 at 1413 H Street NW. sold in August, 1922, for \$165,000 and is assessed for \$132,700. Thus, according to his own statement, the owner of this property is assessing it at \$32,300 less than its value, for all property here is worth just as much now as it was in August, 1922.

He cites lots 8 and 9 E in square 223, at the southeast corner of Fifteenth and New York Avenue NW., which in December, 1922, sold for \$900,000 and is assessed for \$635,200. Thus, according to his own statement, the owner of this property is assessing it at \$264,800 less than its value.

He cites lot 82 in square 247, at 1319 L Street NW., which in April, 1922, sold for \$45,000 and is assessed for \$19,723. Thus, according to his own statement, the owner of this property is assessing it at \$25,277 less than its value, which shows that same is not assessed even at half value.

He cites lot 87 in square 247, being rear of 1347 Massachusetts Avenue NW., which even as far back as December, 1920, sold for \$7,500, is assessed at \$4,825, which is assessed at less than two-thirds of its former value, which has greatly increased since 1920.

He cites lots 805 and 807 in square 247, at 1349 L Street NW., which in April, 1920, sold for \$85,000, and are assessed for \$64,629. Thus the owner of this property is assessing it at \$20,371 less than its value, according to his own statement.



He cites lot 820 in square 247, at 1133 Fourteenth Street NW., which in March, 1922, sold for \$45,000, and is assessed at \$32,109. Thus, according to his own statement, the owner of this property is assessing it at \$12,891 less than its value.

He cites lot 828 in square 247, at rear of 1318 Massachusetts Avenue NW., which in April, 1922, sold for \$4,000, and is assessed at \$1,486, which is considerably less than half value.

He cites lot 830 in square 247, at rear of 1123 Fourteenth Street NW., which in April, 1920, sold for \$2,000, and is assessed at \$775, or considerably less than half.

He cites lot 831 in square 247, in rear of 1314 Massachusetts Avenue NW., which in October, 1920, sold for \$10,000, and is assessed at \$5,255, or practically at half valuation.

He cites lot 834 in square 247, at 1120 Thirteenth Street NW., which in March, 1922, sold for \$18,000, and is assessed at \$11,541, which is less than two-thirds valuation.

He cites lot N in square 247, at rear of 1110 Thirteenth Street NW., which in June, 1922, sold for \$9,500, and is assessed at \$3,405, or just a little more than one-third of its valuation.

He cites lot 27 in square 285, at 1227 I Street NW., which in January, 1922, sold for \$55,000, is assessed at \$33,234, and according to his own statement is underassessed \$21,766 below its value.

He cites lot 807 in square 248, being the Dewey Hotel, at 1330 L Street NW., which in January, 1919, sold for \$200,000 (and now worth a great deal more), is assessed at \$154,193, or an underassessment of \$45,807 less than its value.

He cites lot 37 in square 248, at 1316 L Street NW., which in April, 1922, sold for \$23,500, and is assessed at \$14,273, or an underassessment of \$9,227 less than its value.

He cites lot 38 in square 248, at 1314 L Street NW., which in September, 1922, sold for \$22,500, and assessed at \$13,173, or an underassessment of \$9,327 less than its value.

He cites lot 17 in block 250, at 1336 I Street NW., which as far back as April, 1920, sold for \$250,000, and assessed at \$195,970, which is \$54,030 less than its value was in 1920, and it is worth considerably more at this time.

He cites lot 35 in square 250, at 1332 I Street NW., which in April, 1921, sold for \$300,000, and assessed at \$237,316, or an underassessment of \$62,684 less than its value in 1921, and it is worth much more now.

He cites lot 826 in square 250, at 832 Thirteenth Street NW., which in September, 1922, sold for \$22,500, and assessed at \$12,108, or an underassessment of \$10,392 less than its value.

He cites lots 40 and 832 in square 253, at 1337-9 F Street NW., which in August, 1922, sold for \$299,000, and assessed at \$203,675, or an underassessment of \$95,325 less than its value.

He cites lot 803 in square 253, at 1307 F Street NW., which in May, 1922, sold for \$175,000, assessed at \$138,236, or an underassessment of \$36,764 less than its value.

He cites lot 35 in square 285, at 1219 I Street NW., which in April, 1921, sold for \$23,000, and assessed at \$15,008, or an underassessment of \$7,992 less than its value.

He cites lot 47 in square 288, at 729 Thirteenth Street NW., which in April, 1922, sold for \$260,000, and is assessed at \$215,170, or an underassessment of \$44,830 less than its value.

He cites lot 823 in square 288, at 740 Twelfth Street NW., which in April, 1920, sold for \$100,000 and is assessed at \$60,950, or an underassessment of \$39,050 less than its value.

He cites lots 811 and 812 in square 289, at 612-614 Twelfth Street NW., which in December, 1921, sold for \$160,000, and are assessed at \$131,771, or an underassessment of \$28,229 less than their value.

He cites lot 813 in square 289, at 610 Twelfth Street NW., which in December, 1921, sold for \$90,000, and is assessed at \$67,238, or an underassessment of \$22,762 less than its value.

He cites lot 821 in block 290, at 1210 F Street NW., which in November, 1921, sold for \$125,000, and is assessed at \$100,494, or an underassessment of \$24,506 less than its value.

He cites lot 39 in block 290, at the northeast corner of Thirteenth and E Streets NW., which, according to his own statement, is underassessed \$25,560 less than its value, according to the cited sale in December, 1922.

He cites lot 10 in square 293, at 321-325 Thirteenth Street NW., which in September, 1921, sold for \$41,500, and is assessed for \$17,968, or an underassessment of \$23,532, showing that it is assessed at much less than half valuation.

He cites lot 17 in square 319, at 733 Twelfth Street NW., which in April, 1921, sold for \$35,000, and is assessed at \$17,955, or just about half valuation.

He cites lot 800 in square 319, at 1107 G Street NW., which in October, 1921, sold for \$97,818, and is assessed at \$64,045, or an underassessment of \$33,773 less than its value.

He cites lot 801 in square 319, at 1109 G Street NW., which in July, 1919, sold for \$100,000 (probably worth double now), and is assessed at \$67,235, or an underassessment of \$32,865 less than its value was back in 1919.

He cites lot 813 in square 319, at 723 Twelfth Street NW., which in March, 1922, sold for \$60,000, and is assessed at \$32,632, or an underassessment of \$27,378 less than its value.

He cites lot 814 in square 345, at the southwest corner of Tenth and H Streets NW., which sold in December, 1921, for \$96,000, and is assessed at \$71,829, or an underassessment of \$24,171 less than its value.

According to his own statement, lots 18, 19, 818, and 819 in square 347, which he cites as being sold in November, 1922, are underassessed \$44,642 less than their value.

He cites lot 20 in square 372, at 940 K Street NW., which in May, 1921, sold for \$10,500, is assessed for \$4,880, or at much less than half of its valuation.

He cites lot 800 in square 372, at 903 New York Avenue NW., which as far back as April, 1919, sold for \$50,000, is assessed at \$35,000, or \$15,000 less than its value in 1919, which has about doubled.

He cites lot 807 in square 372, at 923 Tenth Street NW., which in April, 1922, sold for \$6,000, is assessed at \$2,317, or a little more than one-third of its value.

He cites lots 812 and 813 in square 373, at 939-941 I Street NW., which in September, 1922, sold for \$36,500, is assessed at \$19,570, or an underassessment of \$16,930 less than its value.

He cites lot 1 in square 373, at 945 I Street NW., which in March, 1922, sold for \$20,000, is assessed at \$12,000, or an underassessment of \$7,900 less than its value.

He cites lot 804 in square 381, at 921 Louisiana Avenue, which in October, 1920, sold for \$55,000, and assessed at \$43,043, or an underassessment of \$11,957 less than its value way back in 1920.

He cites lot 18 in square 382, at 931 B Street NW., which in May, 1920, sold for \$28,500, and assessed at \$18,205, or an underassessment of \$10,295 less than its 1920 value.

He cites lots 800 and 801 in square 429, at 700 Seventh and 707 G Street NW., which in March, 1921, sold for \$140,000, and assessed at \$50,000, or just a little more than one-third valuation, and this property is worth far more now than in 1921.

He cites lot 823 in square 429, at 708 Seventh Street NW., which in December, 1921, sold for \$78,000, and assessed at \$54,245, or an underassessment of \$23,755 less than its value.

He cites lot C in square 429, at 728 Eighth Street NW., which in July 1921, sold for \$20,000, and is assessed at \$9,416, or less than one-half of its valuation.

He cites lot 23 in square 431, at 400-404 Seventh Street NW., which is assessed at an underassessment of \$65,660 less than it sold for in January, 1923, according to his own statement.

He cites lot 807 in square 431, at 432 Seventh Street NW., which as far back as November, 1920, sold for \$100,000, and is assessed at \$56,100, or at \$43,900 less than its value.

He cites lot 809 in square 453, at 623-625 H Street NW., which in May, 1920, sold for \$25,000, and is assessed at \$12,557, or at just about half valuation.

He cites lot 826 in square 454, at 612 H Street NW., which in April, 1922, sold for \$14,500, and is assessed at \$7,568, or just a little more than half valuation.

He cites lot 42 in square 455, at 635 F Street NW., which in February, 1920, sold for \$200,000, and is assessed at \$126,614, or an underassessment of \$73,386 less than its value.

He cites lot 36 in square 456, at 628-630 F Street NW., which in July, 1919, sold for \$90,000, and is assessed at \$65,815, or an underassessment of \$24,185 less than its value way back in 1919.

He cited lot 827 in square 457, at 626 E Street NW., which in May, 1922, sold for \$29,000, and is assessed at \$16,996, or an underassessment of \$12,004 less than its value.

He cited lot 13 in square 459, at 619 C Street and 628 Louisiana Avenue, which in May, 1922, sold for \$15,000, and is assessed at \$8,892, or a little more than half valuation.

He cited lot 804 in square 461, at 607 B Street and 604 Pennsylvania Avenue, which in April, 1922, sold for \$26,000, and is assessed at \$18,357, or just a little over half valuation.

He cites lot 407 in square 289, at 1212 G Street NW., which in February, 1923, sold for \$115,000, and is assessed at \$99,170, or an underassessment of \$15,830 less than value.

#### VALUATION AND ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE FOR SAME YEAR.

You will note that in the data furnished by Tax Assessor Richards to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIEHLER] he has cited sales of property during the years 1918, 1919, 1920, and so forth, and then compared same with the assessment of

such property for the present year. He should have given the assessment for the year when the sale was made.

I challenge both Mr. Richards and Mr. ZIEHLMAN to cite any property or properties in the District of Columbia that were assessed in 1918 for anything like the value they sold for in 1918, or that were assessed in 1919 for anything like the value they sold for in 1919, or that were assessed in 1920 for anything like the value they sold for in 1920, or that were assessed in 1921 for anything like the value they sold for in 1921, or that were assessed in 1922 for anything like the value they sold for in 1922, or that were assessed in 1923 for anything like the value they sold for in 1923. If he will ascertain the real consideration value and not merely the camouflaged one expressed in the deed, he will find that he can not give such a list. From the House floor on January 30, 1924, I said:

And I have received an insolent note through the mail, stating:

"You needn't kick, for you Members of Congress and Senators get the benefit of this tax rate of \$1.20 on the \$100, and it makes that much less expense you have to pay out on your fine residences."

I do not own a residence here. If I did, I would be willing to pay the same rate of taxation on it that citizens of other cities have to pay. And all of you colleagues who are fortunate enough to own property here in the District of Columbia know full well that it is not rendered at anything like its full value. And I challenge Assessor Richards and Commissioner Rudolph to name the residence of one Congressman or of one Senator that is assessed for as much as 75 per cent of its real value. They can not do it. And if they can not, then will they contend that they permit Congressmen and Senators to render their property under a lower system of assessment than they do other people of the District? Surely they would not contend that.

#### I REPEAT THE CHALLENGE.

I again challenge Tax Assessor Richards to name the residence of even one Congressman or of one Senator here in Washington that is now assessed for as much as 75 per cent of its real value. He can not do it, and he knows it.

#### THE OLD SLOGAN HAS WORN THREADBARE.

Whenever a Member of Congress seeks to change the unjust system of allowing the people of Washington to pay the ridiculous tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, the newspapers and citizens' associations immediately resort to their old battle cry:

That Washington is the Nation's Capital and must be made the most beautiful city in the world; that the Government should pay a big part of the local city expenses because it owns so much property here.

Washington is the Nation's Capital and should be made the most beautiful city in the world, and I will go just as far as any other man through all legitimate and proper means to make it the most beautiful city in the world. Before the Government built all of its fine institutions here Washington was a mere village. Property here was of little value. It is because of the fact that the United States has spent its millions here that has caused some lots to jump in value from \$100 to \$100,000. Every piece of property owned by the Government in Washington is daily enjoyed by the people of Washington.

The local pay roll of the Government is a bonanza to the merchants and business enterprises of Washington. The Government pays its nearly 100,000 employees in Washington their wages promptly every two weeks in new money that has never been spent before. Chicago, or any other big city in the United States, would gladly exempt the Government from paying all taxes on its property to get it to move its Capital to such city.

Because we want to make it the most beautiful city in the world is no reason why the Government should pay for building million-dollar school buildings and employing 2,500 teachers and buying the school books for the 70,000 school children of the thousands of families living in Washington who have no connection whatever with the Government except to bleed it on all occasions and to grow rich on the Government pay rolls expended here. Because we want to make Washington the most beautiful city in the world is no reason why the Government should pay for the army of garbage gatherers, the army of ash gatherers, the army of trash gatherers, the army of street cleaners and sprinklers, the army of tree pruners and sprayers, and the street lighting system for the several hundred miles of private residences owned by rich tax dodgers who have no connection whatever with the Government; nor is it any reason why the Government should pay for their water system, their sewer system, their police protection, their fire protection, for playgrounds for their children, for parks for their enjoyment, for their municipal golf grounds, for their numerous public tennis courts, for their bathing

beaches, for their skating ponds, for their cricket grounds, for their baseball and football grounds, for their horseback riding paths, for paving the streets in front of their residences and maintaining and keeping them in repair, for building their million-dollar bridges, furnishing million-and-a-half-dollar market houses, their municipal, trial, and appellate courts, their jails and houses of correction, their municipal hospitals, asylums for their insane, special asylum schools for their deaf and dumb, asylums for their orphans, a university for their 110,000 colored people, their municipal libraries, their municipal community-center facilities, salaries of all their municipal officers, employees, buildings, furnishings, equipments, sanitary and health departments, and the hundreds of other things that all other cities of the United States must furnish and pay for themselves, but a very substantial part of which the people of Washington have been getting out of the Federal Treasury for years.

The magnificent Capitol and its beautiful grounds are daily enjoyed by Washington people. The Congressional Library, which cost \$6,032,124, in addition to the sum of \$585,000 paid for its grounds, and for the upkeep of which Congress annually spends a large sum of money, is daily enjoyed by the people of Washington. The Government furnished and maintains the magnificent Botanic Gardens here for the pleasure and enjoyment of Washington people. The Government furnished and maintains the wonderful Zoo Park with all of its interesting animals for the instruction and amusement of Washington children. The Government furnished and maintains the extensive and most beautiful Rock Creek Park, with its picturesque picnic grounds, its miles of wonderful boulevards, its incomparable scenery, all for the pleasure of Washington people. Congress has spent millions of dollars reclaiming and purchasing the lands now embraced in the Potomac Parks and Speedway, daily used and enjoyed by Washington people. The Government has spent several million dollars building the various bridges spanning the Potomac River, and huge sums for the bridges spanning the Anacostia River, and spent \$1,000,000 building the beautiful "Million Dollar Bridge" on Connecticut Avenue. The Government has spent millions of dollars on the Lincoln Memorial, grounds, and reflecting pools, the Washington Monument Grounds, Lincoln Park, on East Capital Street, and the numerous beautiful little parks scattered all over the city, all for the pleasure and benefit of Washington people. Let me again repeat:

#### TAXATION SYSTEM HERE IS CRIME UPON WHOLE PEOPLE.

Prior to the fiscal year of 1915, when the Borland Act became effective, all of the streets within the District of Columbia had been paved upon the 50-50 basis, half the expense being paid by the District and the other half by the Government of the United States. The District auditor advises me that when the Borland Act became effective fully 90 per cent of all the streets within the old limits of the city of Washington had already been paved, the Government of the United States paying for half of all of same. Under the Borland Act each abutting property owner now pays for 20 feet and excess is paid for by the District and Government 50-50 up to June 30, 1921, and 60-40 since that date.

Congress made the following appropriations for repairs and maintenance of streets since the 60-40 plan became effective, to wit:

Fiscal year 1921	\$575,000
Fiscal year 1922	575,000
Fiscal year 1923	460,000
Fiscal year 1924	550,000

And the Government of the United States paid 40 per cent of all of the above.

Congress made the following appropriations for repairs to suburban streets and roads within the District, to wit:

Fiscal year 1921	\$250,000
Fiscal year 1922	250,000
Fiscal year 1923	225,000
Fiscal year 1924	275,000

And the whole people of the United States paid 40 per cent of same.

Congress made the following appropriations for the paving and grading of streets:

Fiscal year 1921	\$614,200
Fiscal year 1922	144,840
Fiscal year 1923	232,500
Fiscal year 1924	573,300

And the whole people paid 40 per cent of same.

Congress made the following appropriations for the construction and maintenance of sewers:

Fiscal year 1921	\$515,000
Fiscal year 1922	523,000
Fiscal year 1923	502,000
Fiscal year 1924	690,000



And the whole people of the United States paid 40 per cent of same.

Until the Borland amendment became effective in 1915, the whole people paid 50 per cent of the expense of paving all the streets and thoroughfares of Washington and of their repair and maintenance, without abutting property owners paying any part of same, and the 50-50 basis continued to 1921, the Government paying 50 per cent, but since then only 40 per cent of all of the above. Prior to 1915, to secure sewer service, the owner was charged \$1 per front foot, and never thereafter did he have to pay anything additional. But since 1915 he is now charged \$1.50 per front foot, and thereafter he pays no annual assessment whatever for such service. In other words, where the owner's lot was 20 feet front he paid \$20 before 1915 and \$30 since then, for service, and all of such expense of making his excavations and furnishing him sewer connection for all time thereafter without further charge, is borne by the District and Government, 50-50 before 1921 and 60-40 since 1921.

For water connection the owner is charged \$2 per front foot, which covers less than 66 per cent of the cost of making the connection for him. And the charge thereafter is illustrated as follows: The residence rented by me at 1929 Kenyon Street NW. has 20 feet frontage, a basement, two stories, and an attic. There are seven members in my family. I am charged \$7.65 per annum. This is a lower water rate than any other city in the whole United States enjoys.

And the District gets several extra millions annually from the United States Treasury where the whole people pay the full 100 per cent. The Washington Times for Thursday, January 10, 1924, on page 2, in an article headed "District given \$1,647,700," mentioned the several local institutions here in the District which are given the sum of \$1,647,700 direct out of the Treasury concerning which there is no division of 60-40, but all is paid by the whole people, for said items are in the Interior Department appropriation bill, now before the House, all of which comes out of the people's Treasury.

This system has prevailed here simply because the 437,000 people in Washington are organized with citizens' associations, who will attempt to ruin any Congressman who fights the situation, and because the people of the United States do not know about the situation. Whenever the people find it out they are going to have it stopped.

What particular halo is there about the head of the rich tax dodgers living in Washington that they should be permitted to pay a total tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, assessed at about half valuation, while the people of every other city in the United States have to pay all the way from \$2.75 to \$6.50, and the balance of the local expenses of the people of Washington has to be borne by the whole people? Why should it be continued? Why should Washington people be more favored than all of the balance of the people in the cities of this Nation?

Yet, because so much of their expenses have been paid out of the Treasury in the various supply bills that all of the revenue resulting from their little tax of \$1.20 on half valuation has not all been used, because the Government was footing the bills, an effort is now being made by the District Commissioners to have such balance of nearly \$5,000,000 declared a surplus to the credit of the District and they be permitted to spend same. It would be a crime against the whole people to let them touch one dollar of same.

During the recess of Congress I wrote to the mayor of every city of any size in the United States and asked them to advise us of their local tax rate, of the charges for water, sewer, paving, and so forth, and what rate, in their judgment, they thought Washington people should pay as a minimum. I want to insert just a few in this report. The consensus of opinion was that the rate here should be at least \$2.50 per \$100, and there was a large per cent who were in favor of it being much higher, and the rates for taxation ranged from \$2.75 to over \$6.50, and in all these cities the people were charged more for water, sewer, and paving.

Let me again quote a few excerpts from the letter sent me by the mayor of the city of Peoria, Ill.:

[City of Peoria, Ill. Mayor's office. Edward N. Woodruff, mayor.]

NOVEMBER 1, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Answering your questionnaire of October 15 concerning relative tax rates of the cities of Washington and Peoria:

The tax rates on each \$100 taxable valuation levied against the real and personal property of the citizens of Peoria for the year 1922 is itemized as follows:

City corporate tax, including library, tuberculosis, garbage, and police and fire pension fund.....	\$1.94
Street and bridge.....	.24
School district.....	2.70
Park district.....	.41
	\$5.29
State.....	.45
County.....	.59
County highway.....	.25
	1.29
Total, all purposes.....	6.58

Unless there is a tremendous revenue derived from sources other than from taxes, the rate of \$1.20 for Washington is ridiculous. While I have never had my attention called to this disparity, I am amazed that the light has not been let into financial affairs of the Capital City long before this time.

You should be supported by every colleague in your effort to compel the citizens of Washington to do theirs, even as every citizen outside the District is doing his.

Wishing you success, I am,

Very truly yours,

E. N. WOODRUFF, Mayor.

The foregoing statement from the mayor of Peoria, Ill., fairly indicates the sentiment of the people over the United States. It might be enlightening to quote from a few of the letters received the tax rate of some of the cities over the United States as certified to me by the mayor of such cities.

The tax rate paid by the people in Baltimore, Md., \$3.27 on the \$100; in New Orleans, La., \$3.16 on the \$100; in Portland, Oreg., \$4.52 on the \$100; in my birthplace, Houston, Tex., \$4.29 on the \$100; in Ogden, Utah, \$3.33 on the \$100; in Cheyenne, Wyo., \$3.75 on the \$100; in Fort Smith, Ark., \$3.32 on the \$100; in New Bedford, Mass., \$3.13; in Burlington, Vt., \$3.10 on the \$100; in Pittsburgh, Pa., \$3.22 on the \$100; in St. Louis, Mo., which is a distinct political subdivision of the State, the city tax is \$2.43 on the \$100; in Boston, Mass., \$2.47 on the \$100; in Rochester, N. Y., \$3.36 on the \$100; in Portland, Me., \$3.40 on the \$100; in Boise City, Idaho, \$4.29 on the \$100; in Mobile, Ala., \$3.40 on the \$100; in Detroit, Mich., \$2.75 per \$100; in Duluth, Minn., \$5.79 on the \$100; in Atlanta, Ga., \$3.15 on the \$100; in Kansas City, Mo., \$2.93 on the \$100; in Minneapolis, Minn., \$6.52 on the \$100; in Salt Lake City, Utah, \$3.18 on the \$100; in Oakland, Calif., \$4.02 on the \$100; in Austin, the capital of Texas, \$3.54 on the \$100; in Denver, Colo., \$2.76 on the \$100; in Trenton, N. J., \$3.22 on the \$100; in Racine, Wis., \$2.87 on the \$100; in Nashville, Tenn., \$2.80 on the \$100; in Charlottesville, Va., \$2.85. And let me illustrate as the tax rate runs generally over Texas: In Paris, Tex., \$4.10 on the \$100; in Port Arthur, Tex., \$3.54 on the \$100; in Tyler, Tex., \$4.61 on the \$100; in Denison, Tex., \$3.32 on the \$100; in Waco, Tex., \$3.63 on the \$100; in Amarillo, Tex., \$3.55 on the \$100; in Temple, Tex., \$3.15; in Wichita Falls, Tex., \$5.05 on the \$100; in Beaumont, Tex., \$4.04.

Mr. Edward F. Bryant, tax collector for San Francisco, Calif., has sent me a statement certifying that the following is the tax rate paid by the citizens in the following cities: In Seattle, Wash., \$8.80 on the \$100; Chicago, Ill., \$8 on the \$100; in Reno, Nev., \$7.38 on the \$100; in New York, N. Y., \$5.48 on the \$100; in Philadelphia, Pa., \$6 on the \$100; in Detroit, Mich., \$4.43 on the \$100; in San Francisco, Calif., \$3.47 on the \$100; in Los Angeles, Calif., \$3.89 on the \$100.

What excuse have we to offer to our constituents back at home who are paying the above tax rates for permitting by our votes here the 437,000 people in Washington, D. C., to continue paying the measly little pittance of only \$1.20 on the \$100, based on a half to two-thirds valuation, when our constituents have to pay all the balance of the expenses of this great city?

WASHINGTON PEOPLE NATURALLY THRIVE.

Why, of course, under such a system it is but natural that the people of Washington should thrive and accumulate property. When a man, whose fine residence fronts 30 feet on some fashionable street now has to pay only \$45 to have sewer connection, the Government paying 40 per cent of all the expenses of excavation, connection, and maintenance, and he having such service free thereafter until eternity; and he having to pay only \$60 for getting water connection, the Government paying 40 per cent of all excavation, connection, and maintenance, besides owning the main water conduit, and the owner having to pay thereafter only a nominal amount each year for water, it constitutes such a very desirable arrangement with the Federal Treasury that the newspapers and citizens' associations here fight for its continuance.

FROM POVERTY TO MULTIMILLIONAIRE.

When our now distinguished citizen, Mr. Harry Wardman, left England and first came to Washington, he asked the

hardware firm of Rudolph & West to credit him for a saw and hammer, but they demanded the cash. Since then he has built 4,000 residences in Washington, some of the finest in the city, and he has built 300 apartment houses, embracing the largest now in the city, and he now owns more improved real estate than any other man in Washington. While his own energies and qualifications figure largely in his success, still what the Government has done for Washington has made his wonderful success possible.

#### WASHINGTON MUST PAY A REASONABLE TAX RATE.

The people of Washington must become reconciled to having their present ridiculous tax rate of \$1.20 on the \$100 raised to a reasonable rate, proportionate with what the people of other cities in the United States have to pay. The Government must stop paying for their running expenses such as are paid by the people of all other cities. The Congress must continue making this the most beautiful city in the whole world, but the people living here and enjoying the most beautiful city in the whole world must be willing to pay at least the minimum that people pay in the city where there is the lowest tax rate in the various States. They must do their part. They can not afford to be tax dodgers. They can not afford to be selfish. They can not afford to ask Congress to bear their ordinary civic expenses. And when this so-called gasoline tax bill is finally passed, it must contain a registration tax and property tax reasonable and in proportion to what other people pay elsewhere. Otherwise Congress will hear from the tax-burdened American people in the 48 States of this Union.

#### A PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I will say that if the Speaker were in the chair he would rule against me; but for the purpose of keeping the record clear I want to ask if the Chair can or will entertain a motion to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Resolution 72 and substitute it for House Resolution 191, reported favorably by the Committee on Military Affairs and now on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can not entertain that request at the present time.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, March 17, 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:

403. A letter from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting a statement showing, by location, salary range and bureau designation of employees receiving an aggregate annual salary of \$2,000 and over as of March 1, 1924, for central office, and as of February 1, 1924, for the field; to the Committee on Appropriations.

404. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Cowlitz River, Wash., with a view to preparing plans and estimates of cost for the prevention and control of floods (H. Doc. No. 225); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

405. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Niagara River, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

406. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation "to validate an agreement between the Secretary of War, acting on behalf of the United States, and the Washington Gas Light Co."; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 579. A bill providing for the appointment of a superintendent and two assistant superintendents of delivery in certain post offices of the first class; with amend-

ments (Rept. No. 311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. 1631. An act to authorize the deferring of payments of reclamation charges; with an amendment (Rept. No. 312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4735) granting a pension to Charles E. Bowser, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7959) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 7960) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the Commonwealth 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.

By Mr. FREDERICKS: A bill (H. R. 7961) to establish a hydrographic station at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 7962) to create and establish a commission, as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, to regulate rents in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7963) to increase pensions of persons who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War, and of widows and former widows of such persons, and Army nurses of said war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JARRETT: A bill (H. R. 7964) relating to the salary of the official court reporter of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTNES: A bill (H. R. 7965) to require the labeling of flour in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 7966) to amend sections 136 and 138 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACKERMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 215) to facilitate the payment of personal income taxes and to relieve the Treasury Department of unnecessary time, expense, and labor in connection with the collection of the 1923 personal income taxes in 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 216) authorizing appropriations for the payment of expenses of delegates to represent the United States at the general assembly of the International Institute of Agriculture, to be held at Rome in May, 1924, and for the payment of the quotas of Hawaii, the Philippines, Porto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the support of the institute for the calendar year 1924; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: Resolution (H. Res. 223) for the consideration of the bill (S. 1631) entitled "An act to authorize the deferring of payments of reclamation charges"; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 7967) to provide for an examination and survey of Bradfords Bay, Accomac County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7968) for the relief of Chief Boatswain John W. Stoakley (retired), United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOK: A bill (H. R. 7969) for the relief of Henry Oates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLEETWOOD: A bill (H. R. 7970) granting a pension to Laura Murdick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 7971) to make a preliminary survey of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, Grand River and Verdigris River, in Oklahoma, with a view to the control of their flood; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 7972) granting a pension to Fannie Jacobs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOST: A bill (H. R. 7973) for the relief of Lawson W. Rush and Sallie A. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 7974) granting a pension to Albert N. Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 7975) granting a pension to Sadie L. Treadwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7976) to enroll Rosetta McCarty on the final roll of citizens of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians by blood; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7977) to enroll Alfred Wilson on the final roll of citizens of the Creek or Muskogee Tribe of Indians by blood; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 7978) granting a pension to Charles D. Showerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7979) granting a pension to Sarah J. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 7980) granting an increase of pension to Julia J. Ray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7981) for the relief of Benjamin F. Green; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7982) for the relief of J. R. P. Whitecotton; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 7983) for the relief of George O. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 7984) granting a pension to Alice Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7985) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. O. F. Moore, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 7986) granting an increase of pension to George H. Higgins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7987) granting a pension to Garrett Mahoney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7988) granting a pension to W. G. Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7989) granting a pension to Dessie M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7990) granting a pension to Fritz Stocker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7991) granting a pension to Clara C. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7992) granting a pension to Joseph Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7993) granting a pension to Benton Abbott; 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:

1746. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of users of motor vehicles of National City, Calif., urging repeal of all unfair war excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1747. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Providence Beneficial Association, Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1748. Also, petition of Sons of Jacob Lodge, No. 175, I. O. B. A., of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1749. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of Massachusetts Child Labor Committee, indorsing Joint Resolution 184, granting power to Congress to legislate child labor laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1750. By Mr. COOK: Petition of Paul Moran and 55 citizens of Huntington, Ind., in support of the Brookhart-Hull bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1751. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Herbert W. McKay and the other rural carriers at Crosswell, Mich., requesting favorable action on the Paige bill (H. R. 7016); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1752. By Mr. FENN: Petition of the Hartford Grade Teachers' Club, of Hartford, Conn., favoring an amendment to the

pending Immigration bill, in regard to the question of the "divided family"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1753. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Kiwanis Club, of Mendota, Ill., opposing any change or amendment of the transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1754. Also, petitions of the Illinois State Teachers' Association and sundry citizens of Streator, Ill., favoring the proposed child labor amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1755. Also, petitions of the Illinois Agricultural Association, the Mazon Farmers' Elevator Co., and sundry citizens of Grundy and La Salle Counties, Ill., favoring the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1756. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Appalachian Mountain Club, recommending favorable consideration of House bill 3682, which carries an appropriation for development of roads in national parks; to the Committee on Roads.

1757. Also, petition of Massachusetts Forestry Association, recommending favorable consideration of House bill 3682, which carries an appropriation for development of roads in national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1758. Also, petition of Roger Wolcott Camp, No. 23, Department of Massachusetts, United Spanish War Veterans, recommending early and favorable consideration of House bill 5934; to the Committee on Pensions.

1759. By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the board of trustees of the Eastern State Penitentiary, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against House bill 6205; to the Committee on Labor.

1760. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of Council No. 104, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Williamsport, Pa., favoring House bill 6540, known as the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1761. By Mr. KING: Petition of Clark Mills Carr Camp, No. 26, Spanish War Veterans, in support of Senate bill 5 and House bill 5934; to the Committee on Pensions.

1762. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Clovis (N. Mex.) Kiwanis Club, favoring the continuation of the citizens' military training camps as provided for in the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1763. By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Petition of members of the Sons of Jacob Lodge, No. 175, I. O. B. A., of Providence, R. I., opposing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1764. Also, petition of the members of the Providence Beneficial Association, opposing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1765. By Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Petition of 26 users of motor vehicles in Connecticut, requesting repeal of war-excise taxes on motor vehicles and repair parts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1766. Also, petition of 76 United States citizens of Italian extraction, of Waterbury, Conn., in opposition to the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1767. By Mr. ROSENBLOOM: Petition of Radnici Naprey Lodge, No. 249, S. N. P. J., Farmington, W. Va., signed by Mr. Matt Laus, president, and Mr. Egnati Dijanovic, secretary, protesting against provisions of the pending immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1768. By Mr. SITES: Petition of Division No. 414, International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Lebanon, Pa., asking that immediate hearings be held on House bill 5836, a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, as amended March 4, 1915, and June 26, 1918, and that said bill be enacted into law at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1769. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Affiliated Technical Societies of Boston, favoring the Mellon plan of tax reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1770. Also, petition of Bethian Class (300 members), Tremont Temple Baptist Church, Boston, Mass., favoring an appropriation to be used to prevent the activities of so-called "Atlantic rum fleet"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1771. By Mr. WEFALD: Petition of Minnesota Federation of Architectural and Engineering Societies, urging the reforestation of the State of Minnesota, the preservation of the natural resources of the State and the enlargement of the Superior National Park; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1772. Also, petition of the Angus (Minn.) Commercial and Community Club, urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1773. Also, petition of farmers mass meeting held at the township of Sannes, Red Lake County, Minn., urging the revision of the Esch-Cummins railroad act, the Fordney-McCumber tariff law, and other acts, so they will benefit the farmers, and also urging the enactment into law of the Norris-Sinclair bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1774. Also, petition of the Winger (Minn.) Local Council of the Minnesota Wheat Growers' Association, urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1775. Also, petition of the Minnesota Editorial Association, urging the enactment into law of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1776. Also, petition of the Exchange Club of the city of St. Paul, Minn., urging the passage of the upper Mississippi wildlife and fish refuge act and the game refuge public shooting ground bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1777. Also, petition of the Fosston (Minn.) Wheat Growers' Association, urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1778. Also, petition of the Fosston (Minn.) Business Men's Association, urging the enactment into law of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1779. Also, petition of citizens of Gary, Minn., urging the enactment into law of the Norbeck-Burness bill and the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1780. Also, petition of the voters of Crookston Township, Minn., urging the enactment into law of the McNary-Haugen bill for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1781. Also, petition of the Red River Valley Live Stock Association, Crookston, Minn., urging the enactment into law of the Norbeck-Burness bill and the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1782. Also, petition of 31 farmers of Home Lake Township, Minn., urging the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1783. Also, petition of 25 farmers of Pennington County, Minn., urging the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1784. Also, petition of 25 farmers of Shelly Township, Minn., urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1785. Also, petition of 23 farmers residing in Georgetown Township, Clay County, Minn., urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1786. Also, petition of 24 farmers of Onstad Township, Marshall County, Minn., urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1787. Also, petition of Minnesota School Board Association, urging the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1788. Also, petition of the Grain Growers' Council, No. 5, Climax, Minn., urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill providing for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1789. Also, petition of the Ada (Minn.) Parents and Teachers' Association, urging the adoption of Senate Resolution 441, which has for its purpose and furnishes a plan for the outlawing of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1790. Also, petition of the board of governors of the Minnesota State Agricultural Society, urging the passage of the amounts recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the control of animal tuberculosis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1791. Also, petition of the St. Paul (Minn.) Post, No. 6, American Legion, urging the purchase by the United States of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics; to the Committee on the Library.

1792. Also, petition of the Kaleb E. Lindquist Post, No. 4, of the American Legion, Roseau, Minn., urging the passage of the soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1793. Also, petition of the Greenbush (Minn.) Council, No. 8, of the Minnesota Wheat Growers' Cooperative Marketing Association, urging the adoption of a duty on wheat and wheat products imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1794. Also, petition of the civil service employees at Warroad, Minn., urging the adoption of the Lehibach bill abolishing the Personnel Classification Board and transferring its functions to the Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1795. Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., urging the checking of the drug and narcotic trade and the holding of a conference to be held in London or Paris or one of the capitals of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1796. Also, petition of the Minnesota Live Stock Breeders' Association, South St. Paul, Minn., urging the passage of an appropriation by Congress of sufficient funds for the use of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry to successfully suppress the foot-and-mouth disease which has recently broken out in the vicinity of San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1797. Also, petition of the Crookston (Minn.) Association of Public Affairs, indorsing the principle of a readjustment in the classification and salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1798. Also, petition of the Colored Voters' League of St. Paul, Minn., urging the passage of the Dyer antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1799. Also, petition of the Kiwanis Club, Crookston, Minn., urging the enactment of the bill providing for the reclassification of postal employees and urging the enactment of the bills providing for increase in salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1800. Also, petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Mahanomen County, Minn., urging the passage of the resolution introduced by Senator King, of Utah, providing for an investigation of the affairs of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1801. Also, petition of Minnesota Federation of Architectural and Engineering Societies, urging the preservation and extension of the parks in the city of Washington, D. C., through the creation of a capital park commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1802. By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of residents of fourth Massachusetts district, re reduction of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, March 17, 1924.

(Legislative day of Friday, March 14, 1924.)

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Ernst	Lodge	Shields
Ashurst	Ferris	McCormick	Shipstead
Ball	Fess	McKellar	Shortridge
Bayard	Fletcher	McKinley	Smith
Borah	Fraser	McLean	Smoot
Brandegee	George	McNary	Spencer
Brookhart	Gerry	Mayfield	Stanfield
Broussard	Gooding	Moses	Stephens
Bruce	Hale	Neely	Swanson
Bursum	Harrell	Norris	Trammell
Cameron	Harris	Oddie	Underwood
Capper	Harrison	Overman	Wadsworth
Caraway	Heflin	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Cole	Howell	Phipps	Warren
Couzens	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Watson
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	Weller
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Willis
Dial	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	
Dill	Keyes	Robinson	
Edge	Ladd	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.