

Senate and signed by the President before the adjournment of Congress. The next day the bill was called up. It was passed with one single dissenting vote. It caused me to look and think and try to understand what situation could come about which would cause a bill of that great importance to pass the House with so little opposition. It was a bill that carried millions of dollars outside of the Budget estimate, and was opposed for that reason by the President and by the Budget committee. What power did the man possess to carry his friends with him to that extent? I thought about the ability and personality and power of the man who could do a thing like that. It seems to me that through the great touch some men have by which they control their fellow men he had gotten hold of the hearts of the entire body that make up Congress, whether they be on the Republican or the Democratic side, and by reason of that power he was able to do the things he did do for his section of the country.

When I was back here last September Congress was not in session. Mr. HUMPHREYS and a few other Members were in Washington. I had an opportunity to associate with him day after day at that time, and I availed myself of that opportunity. I sat in his office for hours at a time and talked with him. He told me many things of interest and many times did I think I could see in him some of the reasons for these wonderful powers.

His life has been a life of study to me because frankly I have never seen a man who exerted such power over other men.

I am glad I knew him; I am glad it was my privilege to have associated with him even though it was during a brief period of time, because in his life I am sure we can see reasons for us to imitate his character. We can look to his example to show us how to be great and good men and how to do and accomplish things in the way of service to our fellow men.

I often think of the effect such a life has on other lives. Some one in defining success has said: He has achieved success who has lived well, laughed often, and loved much; who has gained the respect of his fellow men and loved little children; who has accomplished his task and filled his niche; who has left the world better than he found it, whether by improved poppy, a perfect poem, or a rescued soul; whose life has been a blessing and whose memory is a benediction.

I think I can see in the great life of BEN HUMPHREYS that this definition of success was fully met. In the closing remarks of that splendid address of John Temple Graves at the grave of Henry W. Grady we hear him say these words:

I have seen at midnight the gleaming headlight of the giant locomotive rushing onward through the darkness, heedless of dangers and uncertainty, and I thought the spectacle was grand;

I have seen the light come over the eastern hills in glory, driving the lazy darkness before it like mist before a sea-borne gale, till leaf and tree and blade of grass sparkled in the morning rays like myriads of diamonds, and I have known that it was grand;

I have seen the lightning leap athwart the storm-swept sky, hovering over chaotic clouds and howling winds, till cloud and darkness and the shadow-haunted earth flashed into noon-day splendor, and I have known that it was grand;

But the grandest thing next to the radiance that flows from the Almighty's throne is the light of a noble and beautiful life shedding its benedictions on the destinies of men, and at last finding its home in the bosom of God!

Surely the life of BENJAMIN G. HUMPHREYS was a noble and beautiful one, and an inspiration to all who knew him!

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, it was not my pleasure to know BEN HUMPHREYS as long as some of my colleagues. It was my privilege, however, to know him intimately, for I was fortunate enough to live at the same hotel in Washington, which gave me the opportunity to meet with him day after day. This brought us in close contact outside of our legislative association. It was also my privilege to be entertained in his own home at Greenville, Miss. A general favorite at the hotel, popular with all his colleagues in Congress, it was back home where everyone loved and respected him almost to the extent of adoration. I shall never forget the pride of the principal of the colored school at Greenville when she referred to Congressman HUMPHREYS as "My Congressman and our beloved fellow citizen who has been such a good friend to our race." In the House, on committees, at the hotel, and in his home he was always the same kindly gentleman.

Few men are blessed with, or have cultivated, such a lovable character. It followed that he in turn should be blessed with the friendship and trust of those who knew him, with the love and companionship of the sweet little lady whose personality

is as lovable as his own, who shared in his success and his sorrows, his victories and his disappointments, with a son who succeeds him in Congress and who inherits his sterling integrity, courage, and high character.

Massachusetts joins with Mississippi in a tribute to his memory and the sorrow of his loved ones. Poet, statesman, husband, father, and friend, your life is summed up in the words of Robert Louis Stevenson:

I would be true, for there are those who trust me;  
I would be pure, for there are those who care;  
I would be strong, for there is much to suffer;  
I would be brave, for there is much to bear;  
I would be friend to all, the foe, the friendless;  
I would be giving, and forget the gift;  
I would be humble, for I know my weakness;  
I would look up, and laugh, and love, and lift.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, leave will be granted to all Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and services of the late BENJAMIN G. HUMPHREYS. The Chair hears no objection. In accordance with the resolutions heretofore adopted, the House will stand adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Accordingly, at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, April 7, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

### SENATE

MONDAY, April 7, 1924

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we rejoice before Thee this morning. Thou hast given to us another opportunity for service. Do grant, we beseech of Thee, necessary wisdom, and may we find ourselves always ready to cooperate with the highest interests of Thy kingdom on earth as well as with the welfare of our loved country. Be very gracious unto us in Thy dealings. Lead us along pathways of truth and righteousness, and so be with us that we may honor Thee continually. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

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

S. 107. An act for the relief of John H. McAtee;

S. 796. An act for the relief of William H. Lee;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of the Alaska Commercial Co.;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of J. G. Seupelt; and

S. 2090. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Regular Army of Second Lieut. Ambrose I. Moriarty.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6815) to authorize a temporary increase of the Coast Guard for law enforcement.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 646) for the relief of Ethel Williams, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

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

S. 661. An act for the relief of Charles Hurst;

S. 1219. An act for the relief of Margaret Nolan;

S. 1861. An act authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Elwood Grissinger; and

S. J. Res. 72. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the New Orleans Association of Commerce New Orleans Quartermaster Intermediate Depot Unit No. 2;

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

H. R. 905. An act for the relief of Gerard E. Bess;  
H. R. 1359. An act for the relief of J. W. La Bare;  
H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of the Stone Towing Line;  
H. R. 2123. An act for the relief of the Thompson-Vache Boat Co., of Bonnots Mill, Mo.;

H. R. 2126. An act for the relief of C. C. Carson;  
H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of J. Jessop & Sons;  
H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Meeks;  
H. R. 2647. An act for the relief of Lena Garagnon Owens;  
H. R. 2656. An act to permit the correction of the general account of Robert G. Hilton, former Assistant Treasurer of the United States;

H. R. 2875. An act to provide for the addition of the names of certain persons to the final roll of the Indians of the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of the widow of Warren V. Howard;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Cornelia M. A. Tower;  
H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of L. A. Scott;  
H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of George A. Nickles;  
H. R. 4122. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to revise, with amendments, an act to incorporate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia," approved July 7, 1838, as amended;

H. R. 4374. An act for the relief of the American Surety Co. of New York;

H. R. 4432. An act for the relief of Orville Paul;  
H. R. 4461. An act to provide for the payment of certain claims against the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota;

H. R. 4760. An act for the relief of the estate of C. M. Cole, of Butler County, Ky.;

H. R. 5136. An act for the relief of Eva B. Sharon;  
H. R. 5169. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant a patent to certain lands to Johann Jacob Lutsch;

H. R. 5762. An act for the relief of Julius Jonas;  
H. R. 5967. An act for the relief of Grace Buxton;

H. R. 6012. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to ascertain the cost to the Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, and the amounts expended by it from December 1, 1906, to November 30, 1907, in closing and controlling the break in the Colorado River, and to render judgment therefor, as herein provided;

H. R. 6049. An act for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of Charles F. Peirce, Frank T. Mann, and Mollie V. Gaither;

H. R. 6384. An act for the relief of the Maryland Casualty Co., the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland, and the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. of Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 6498. An act for the relief of May Adelaide Sharp;

H. R. 6857. An act to provide for the addition of the names of Chester Calf and Crooked Nose Woman to the final roll of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, Seger jurisdiction, Oklahoma;

H. R. 7296. An act for the relief of John W. Dilks;

H. R. 7500. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Adger, Ada County, Idaho, for railroad purposes;

H. R. 8233. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8235. An act for the relief of Aktieselskabet Marie di Giorgio, a Norwegian corporation of Christiania, Norway;

H. R. 8237. An act for the relief of Bruusgaard Kiosteruds Dampskibs Aktieselskab, a Norwegian corporation of Drammen, Norway; and

H. J. Res. 222. A joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cummings, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland.

The message also communicated to the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. BENJAMIN GRUBB HUMPHREYS, late a Representative from the State of Mississippi.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 472. An act to authorize the deposit of certain funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and to make same available for appropriation for the benefit of said Indians;

H. R. 593. An act authorizing the issuance of service medals to officers and enlisted men of the two brigades of Texas Cavalry organized under authority from the War Department under date of December 8, 1917, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and further authorizing the wearing by such officers and enlisted men on occasions of ceremony of the uniform lawfully prescribed to be worn by them during their service;

H. R. 2812. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands not longer needed for the Rapid City Indian School;

H. R. 2876. An act to provide for the payment of claims of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for back annuities;

H. R. 2877. An act providing for the reservation of certain lands in New Mexico for the Indians of the Zia Pueblo;

H. R. 2883. An act to validate certain allotments of land made to Indians on the Lac Courte Oreille Indian Reservation in Wisconsin;

H. R. 3682. An act authorizing the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 4117. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a road within the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4439. An act to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code as amended;

H. R. 4803. An act to authorize the sale of lands and plants not longer needed for Indian administrative or allotment purposes;

H. R. 4804. An act to authorize the allotment of certain lands within the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6483. An act amending an act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1906, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto;

H. R. 6724. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Sibley and Scott, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Minnesota River; and

H. R. 6943. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village of Port Chester, N. Y., and the town of Greenwich, Conn., or either of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Byram River.

#### PROSECUTION OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY EX-OFFICIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting in response to Senate Resolution 178, of February 26, 1924, a report with respect to the prosecution of claims against the Government by ex-officials, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

The communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1924.

Hon. GEO. A. SANDERSON,

Secretary United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 178, dated February 26, 1924, I herewith furnish the Senate of the United States with all information in the possession of this department or any of its officials relative to the persons and matters included within the purview of said resolution.

I am not transmitting the names of any ex-members of the House of Representatives for the reason that the same would necessitate further delay, and I understand that Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, specifically stated on the floor of the Senate that, for the present at least, the names of ex-members of the House of Representatives, if any, need not be included.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. BECK,  
Acting Attorney General.

#### DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of useless records on file in the headquarters of the United States Marine Corps no longer needed in the transaction of business and having no permanent value or historic interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a joint select committee on the dis-

position of useless papers in the executive departments. The President pro tempore appointed Mr. HALE and Mr. SWANSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. COPELAND. I present a petition of the Staten Island Civic League, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEN ISLAND CIVIC LEAGUE,  
Staten Island, N. Y., March 31, 1924.

To the honorable the Congress of the United States,  
Washington, D. C.

Sirs: We respectfully submit to the Senate and House of Representatives, constituting the Congress of the United States, that the Staten Island Civic League, having 1,500 members, representing the commercial and industrial interests and the citizenry of the borough of Richmond, which is part of the city of New York—

Has unanimously endorsed the Edge-Kelly bill (S. 1898 and H. R. 4123) providing minimum salaries of \$2,000 per annum for letter carriers and postal clerks and a maximum of \$2,400, and earnestly requests the enactment of this measure.

Further, the Staten Island Civic League respectfully submits—

That the public is deeply and vitally interested in securing and retaining in the Postal Service men of experience, intelligence, accuracy, and fidelity.

That such men can not be had at wages less than those paid to laborers and mechanics.

That it is not true economy to have underpaid postmen, with the consequent loss of efficiency in the Postal Service, and with the inevitable lowering of the average quantity of work per man.

That watchmen and laborers in this city are paid from \$5 to \$6 a day, mechanics' helpers \$7, mechanics \$8 to \$14.

That the men who handle the mails of the people should receive at least as much as men employed as artisans.

That men who handle the mails are occupying positions of trust and responsibility, for which the Government should pay adequately.

Respectfully submitted,

STATEN ISLAND CIVIC LEAGUE,  
By FRANCIS F. LEMAN, President.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Converse County, Wyo., praying for the passage of immigration legislation, with quotas based on the census of 1890, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a memorial of sundry employees of the Rock Island Railroad, at Eldorado, Ark., remonstrating against amendment of the transportation act of 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of citizens of Vernon Township, Walsh County, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called McNary-Hangen bill, providing aid to agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. COUZENS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying an amendment to the Constitution granting equal rights to women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCKINLEY presented resolutions of the Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs of Moline and of the Rotary Club of East Moline, in the State of Illinois, favoring the passage of legislation establishing a wild game and fish refuge in the upper Mississippi by the purchase of 250,000 acres of bottom lands, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented resolutions of the Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs of Moline and of the Rotary Club of East Moline, in the State of Illinois, protesting against the passage of legislation authorizing the Sanitary District of Chicago to take water from Lake Michigan at the rate of 10,000 a cubic feet per second, and to appropriate \$5,700,000 to dig a 9-foot channel from Utica to Grafton, Ill., etc., which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CURTIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brewster, Levant, and Winona, Kans., praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Emporia, Kans., favoring the passage of legislation creating a Federal department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry members of the Cary Circle, of Wellington, Kans., praying an amendment to the Constitution regulating child labor, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Lyons, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation legalizing the manufacture and sale of beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Concordia, Leavenworth, Bushton, Potter, Spearville, Bunker Hill; of Lodge No. 44, Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers Association, of Topeka, and of Lodge No. 1928, Carpenters and Joiners, of Chanute, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of restrictive immigration legislation, with quotas based on the census of 1890, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wichita, 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 resolution adopted by the Missouri Pacific Mechanical Department Association, of Osawatimie, Kans., protesting against amendment of the transportation act of 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Alliance of Poles in America, at Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the so-called Johnson selective immigration bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the congregations of the Indianola Methodist Episcopal Church, the Third Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church, the East Eighth Avenue Evangelical Church, and the United Brethren of East Linden Church, all of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the passage of restrictive immigration legislation, with quotas based on the census of 1890, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of South Perry, Ohio, praying adequate appropriations for the Army and the Organized Reserves, so as to carry out the intent of the national defense act, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Rotary Club of Bucyrus, and the Ohio State Conference, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Springfield, both in the State of Ohio, favoring adequate appropriations for the support of the Army and the Organized Reserves, so as to carry out the intent of the national defense act, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Dayton, Cleveland, Toledo, and Canton, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson restrictive immigration bill, with quotas based on the census of 1890, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Circleville, Ohio, praying an amendment to the Constitution granting equal rights to women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, to which was referred the bill (S. 2448) to amend the organic act of Porto Rico, approved March 2, 1917, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 356) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 513) for the relief of Eustacio B. Davison, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 357) thereon.

Mr. HARRELD, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1629) authorizing the removal of the restrictions from 40 acres of the allotment of Isaac Jack, a Seneca Indian, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 358) thereon.

Mr. BAYARD, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, to which was referred the bill (S. 2572) to purchase grounds, erect and repair buildings for custom-houses, offices, and warehouses in Porto Rico, reported it with amendments.

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

A bill (S. 2940) authorizing the Secretary of War to sell a portion of the Carlisle Barracks Reservation (Rept. No. 359); and

A bill (H. R. 1831) to loan to the College of William and Mary in Virginia two of the cannon surrendered by the British at Yorktown on October 19, 1781 (Rept. No. 360).

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2543) for the relief of James A. Hughes, submitted an adverse report thereon.

#### RENTAL CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEYES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 203. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 203) submitted by Mr. BALL on the 3d instant was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the limit of the expenditures to be made under Senate Resolution 158, passed February 28, 1924, be, and the same is hereby, raised from \$2,500 to \$7,500, and the time for making a final report is extended to June 1, 1924.

#### DISTRICT GASOLINE TAX—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BALL submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 655) to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, 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 House recede from its disagreements to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, and 67, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment insert the following: "That a tax of 2 cents per gallon on all motor-vehicle fuels within the District of Columbia, sold or otherwise disposed of by an importer, or used by him in a motor vehicle operated for hire or for commercial purposes, shall be levied, collected, and paid in the manner hereinafter provided. The proceeds of the tax, except as provided in section 10, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States entirely to the credit of the District of Columbia and shall be available for appropriation by the Congress exclusively for road and street improvement and repair."

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment insert the following:

"Such refunds shall be made by check by the collector of taxes from moneys paid for taxes on motor-vehicle fuels and retained on deposit as hereinafter in this section provided. For the purpose of such refunds the collector of taxes is authorized at all times to retain in a special fund on deposit in a Government depository moneys paid him for such taxes, the total amount so retained on deposit not to exceed \$1,000 at any one time. Applications"

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment that retains the language of the Senate amendment but adds the subdivision letter "a" after the section number of the section containing the Senate amendment.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 17. (a) That the provisions of this act relating to the tax on motor-vehicle fuels shall take effect 30 days after the enactment of this act.

"(b) The provisions of this act relating to the registration tax on motor vehicles shall take effect January 1, 1925; and the provisions of the twenty-ninth paragraph under the head-

ing 'Contingent and miscellaneous expenses' in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918, except the third, fourth, and fifth provisos thereof, are repealed.

"(c) Any violation of any provision of law or regulation issued thereunder which is repealed by this act, and any liability arising under such provisions or regulations may, if the violation occurred or the liability arose prior to such repeal, be prosecuted or enforced to the same extent as if this act had not been enacted.

"(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the application to motor vehicles of the personal property tax in force at the time of the enactment of this act, which personal property tax shall continue to be levied, assessed, and collected on motor vehicles."

L. HEISLER BALL,

W. L. JONES,

WILLIAM H. KING,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

F. N. ZIEHLMAN,

FLORIAN LAMPERT,

THOMAS L. BLANTON,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3016) to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission to improve the parkway entrance; and

A bill (S. 3017) to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NORRIS. I introduce at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture a bill that I ask may be read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3018) to authorize the designation of deputy fiscal or disbursing agents in the Department of Agriculture stationed outside of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. LODGE):

A bill (S. 3019) to amend section 28 of the merchant marine act of 1920; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STANLEY:

A bill (S. 3020) to refund taxes paid on distilled spirits in certain cases; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

A bill (S. 3021) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Henry Catley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 3022) granting a pension to Refugio Salas de Baca; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3023) designating the State of New Mexico as a judicial district, fixing the time and place for holding terms of courts therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3024) providing for the acquirement by the United States of privately owned lands within Rio Arriba and Taos Counties, N. Mex., known as the Las Trampas grant, by exchanging therefor timber within the exterior boundaries of any national forest situated within the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 3025) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Oostanaula River in Gordon County, Ga.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 3026) authorizing the Secretary of War to permit the city of Corinth, Miss., to construct, operate, and maintain water and sewer mains under and along the Government approach roadway to the Corinth National Cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 3027) to promote the efficiency of the United States Public Health Service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3028) for the relief of John Tully; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A bill (S. 3029) to authorize the cession to the city of New York of land on the northerly side of New Dorp Lane in exchange for permission to connect Miller Field with the said

city's public sewer system; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3030) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under the extension by the Commissioner of Patents of the patent granted to Frederick G. Ransford and Peter Low as assignees of Marcus P. Norton, No. 25036, August 9, 1859; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 3031) for the relief of Anna Faceina;

A bill (S. 3032) for the relief of Perley F. Brewer;

A bill (S. 3033) for the relief of the heirs of A. S. Fogler, jr.; and

A bill (S. 3034) for the relief of Ida Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 3035) to provide for the appointment of a commissioner of reclamation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HARRELD (by request):

A bill (S. 3036) to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 3037) to prohibit the importation of meats, hides, hair, bones, or other parts of cattle, horses, sheep, goats, or swine until January 1, 1925, from certain countries where the foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAMERON:

A bill (S. 3038) to amend the Judicial Code, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 3039) for the relief of Luis Rosario and Jose M. Caballero (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 3040) for the relief of James E. Van Horne; to the Committee on Claims.

#### AMENDMENT TO TAX REDUCTION BILL

Mr. MOSES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6715, the tax reduction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. KING, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. HARRIS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (S. 2576) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### MINING OF POTASH ON PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. LADD. On April 3 I introduced a bill (S. 3005) to promote the mining of potash on the public domain, which I inadvertently asked be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Since it is a public-land matter, I ask that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

#### STANDARD FOR DIALS FOR WATCHES AND CLOCKS

Mr. STANLEY. At the request of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Patents be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1273) making the "Montgomery" type the national standard for dials for watches, clocks, and for other purposes, which appears to have been improperly referred to that committee, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Patents will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### REPORT OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL PATENTS BOARD

Mr. STANLEY. At the request of my colleague [Mr. ERNST], I ask that the report of the Interdepartmental Patents Board, laid before the Senate on December 10, 1923, and referred to the Committee on Patents, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ELWOOD GRISSINGER

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask that there be laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1861.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1861) authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Elwood Grissinger, which will be read.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 5, strike out the word "unauthorized," and insert in lieu thereof the word "unlawful"; page—

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. To my mind, it is merely a better way of expressing the intent of the act. The principal amendment is to follow. It did not strike me that that particular amendment was of any value.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The remaining amendments will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 6, strike out the word "unauthorized," and insert in lieu thereof the word "unlawful"; and on page 2, line 4, after the word "matter," insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That in any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general or special, that might be pleaded by defendant in an action for infringement under the law in any jurisdiction where such sale occurred, or otherwise, at the date of such sale.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is apparent that that is a safeguarding amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the House.

The amendments were agreed to.

#### ETHEL WILLIAMS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 646) for the relief of Ethel Williams, which was on page 1, line 5, to strike out "\$5,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,600."

Mr. HARRIS. The bill as it passed the Senate appropriated \$5,000 for injuries done by the War Department. The House reduced the amount to \$3,600. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

#### COURTS IN ARKANSAS

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, in my absence a few days ago the bill (H. R. 4439) to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code as amended, a bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, changing a county in Arkansas from one judicial district to another, was taken up and passed. I discovered afterwards that the author of the bill in the House did not want it to pass in its present form, and I ask unanimous consent to have the action on it reconsidered, and the bill placed on the calendar again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator from Arkansas that House bill 4439 has been passed, enrolled, and signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate.

#### WORLD PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to submit a resolution, which I send to the desk. I ask that the resolution may be read for the information of the Senate, and then I wish to ask the indulgence of the Senate to say a very few words in explanation of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be read.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 204), as follows:

Whereas the International Peace Conferences held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907 were found to present useful opportunities for the friendly exchange of views and opinions upon great world questions; and

Whereas the progress subsequently made at the Washington conference of 1922 in the direction of limiting armaments may well be conserved and extended in the near future if the attention of all nations be simultaneously focused upon a matter so vital to civilization; and

Whereas all proposals for the limitation of armaments necessarily presuppose the existence of a body of international law adequate to the present and future needs of the nations and of courts of arbitration and of courts of justice to interpret and to apply its recognized and accepted principles: Now therefore be it

*Resolved*, 1. The Senate advises the President of the United States that, in the judgment of the Senate, the time has come when a world conference similar to the conferences heretofore held at The Hague may with advantage be assembled for the consideration of questions affecting the peace of the world.

2. That the Senate further advises the President that, in the judgment of the Senate, the agenda at such a conference should include the following:

(a) A consideration of the further reduction of naval armaments and of the limitation of land and aerial armaments;

(b) A consideration of the ways in which international law may be made at once more certain and more responsive to present and future needs; and

(c) A consideration of plans for a world court either through further development of the present Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague or through the disassociation of the present Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague from the League of Nations.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I did not hear the statement which the Senator from Pennsylvania made when he submitted the resolution which has just been read. Does the Senator ask the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; I merely ask the indulgence of the Senate while I say a word or two in explanation of the resolution. I shall ask the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well, Mr. President; I shall be glad to hear the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this resolution does not contemplate an economic conference. It is therefore distinct from and not in any way incompatible with the pending resolution on that subject which was introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

The resolution seeks to take account of three important facts: One is the great and growing determination of the peoples of the world further to reduce naval armaments and to begin the process of limiting armaments on land and in the air. In the second place, the resolution seeks to take account of the necessity of increasing our emphasis on international law in proportion as we decrease our reliance on force of arms. And in the third place, the immense practical importance of finding a way in which to establish and strengthen a world court without attempting the impossible task of reconciling divergent views in regard to the League of Nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

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

Mr. NORRIS. I rise to inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania why he has omitted from his resolution a proposition seeking to decrease submarine activities in warfare? I notice he has not included that. He has included air and naval armaments, but has said nothing about submarines.

Mr. PEPPER. In using the term "naval armaments" I meant to include all forms of naval activity at sea. I did not mean to limit my resolution to armament upon the surface, but to include submarine armament as well. If that were necessary to be specified for the sake of clearness, I should be entirely willing so to specify it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that at the Armament Conference held in Washington there was an attempt made to reduce naval armament and it was reduced to quite an extent, but submarine warfare was not touched. While I think, technically, the Senator in using the term "naval armaments" is right in assuming that submarines are included, yet, taking into consideration the fact that they were omitted at the last arms conference, and believing that the Senator agrees with me that it is very desirable that any proposed conference should not be limited merely to the consideration of the kind of naval warfare that was included at the Washington conference but should specifically include submarine warfare, I think we ought to emphasize the submarine question and ought to include it in the resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to undertake to submit to the committee a suggested amendment covering the point the Senator has just raised.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania why he does not include a discussion of the economic conditions of the world in such a conference as he proposes?

Mr. PEPPER. As I have explained, that matter is covered by a resolution already pending, which has been offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and I have no disposition to interfere in any way with the consideration and discussion of that resolution at the proper time.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask further whether or not the Senator from Pennsylvania considers that the last disarmament conference was entirely satisfactory in its results? Was not France, for instance, left free from the necessity of keeping up with the naval procession, and did she not make use of the money which otherwise would have been employed to build capital ships? Did she not build submarines and aircraft and move into the Ruhr with the money which she could probably have used otherwise for the building of battleships?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have no intention of detaining the Senate by a lengthy discussion of this resolution or the many important points which will be germane to its consideration when it comes before the Senate, if the committee shall report it out.

I will merely say now, in response to the question of the Senator from New York, that I think the beginning made at the Washington conference was a useful and hopeful beginning, and that what has ensued has more than justified the wisdom of those who called it and carried it to a successful conclusion.

Mr. President, I have no intention to debate the League of Nations issue. I merely call attention to the fact that there is little difference of opinion in this country at the present time respecting the desirability of a world court, and a very great difference of opinion respecting the possibility of converting the existing Permanent Court of International Justice into a world court so long as it retains organic connection with the League of Nations.

The League of Nations is an established fact. The individuals who sit in its council and in its assembly have developed a definite group consciousness; they are for the league as it is. A discussion with them or through them of any proposal involving a changed relationship between league and court is likely to be futile.

But the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague is also a fact. There is as definite a consciousness at The Hague as there is at Geneva. Just as Geneva is becoming the experiment station of the world for all sorts of interesting international activities along administrative and executive lines, so The Hague is becoming and should remain the center of the world's arbitral and judicial activities.

This resolution, Mr. President, is based on the theory that the real entities to be reckoned with in planning for world peace are not leagues and courts, but the nations themselves. A league or a court is simply an agency for a limited class of international activities. Back of these agencies are the governments of the great powers and back of the governments are the people. In the last analysis the question must always be, What do the people want? Particularly when a question arises concerning the limitation of armaments or the relationship, if any, which should exist between a league and a court, the thing to do is not to invite permanent agents to meet and wrangle about their agency but to summon the principals to informal conference and trust them to work out the problem. The theory of this resolution is that the time has come for a conference of all the nations.

The precedents established at The Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907 and the experience gained at those conferences are of very great value. The real convener of The Hague conference of 1907 was the United States of America, although President Roosevelt chivalrously surrendered our initiative to the then Czar. But the way is now open, Mr. President, for the United States to move again and to move along lines which are friendly both to Geneva and to The Hague and which will converge, if this resolution is passed and is acted upon by the President, at a point which is different from both of them or which may be identical with one of them.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. My interpretation of clause (a) in the resolution proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania is that a new conference shall be held which shall have jurisdiction to consider the subject of the reduction of naval armaments with-

out limitation, and that this conference shall also discuss and consider limitation of land and aerial armaments. The provision of the resolution to which I have referred, clause (a), appears to be very broad. It reads

A consideration of the further reduction of naval armaments and of the limitation of land and aerial armaments.

The Washington conference dealt particularly with the subject of a limitation of naval armaments. I think the people of the United States, and perhaps the people of other countries, were disappointed in the fact that the result of that conference was merely a limitation upon the number of capital ships which the nations party to the compact should construct and maintain. The conference failed to deal with the classes of naval armaments which probably now are and certainly in the future will be employed most effectively, namely, submarines and kindred types of vessels.

I believe there is a necessity for a further conference upon the subject. I felt so at the time the Washington conference concluded its sessions. It did not seem to me then that there was a great ground of congratulation on the fact that the conference had succeeded in effecting a limitation of naval armament which in a sense had become obsolete, and I expressed disappointment at the fact that no limitation was imposed on submarines and kindred types of naval vessels.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this resolution is drawn with breadth, and was so drawn with deliberation. It is a resolution merely expressive of the sense of the Senate and serves to direct the attention of the President to the lines along which the Senate is thinking. If it proves to be the case that the resolution in its present form or in a modified form meets with the acceptance of the Senate.

With regard to the place of conference, the resolution is silent. I do not hesitate to express my own hope that the place of conference will be in Europe, and that it will neither be at The Hague nor at Geneva.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

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

Mr. SWANSON. The naval appropriation bill carries a provision on page 49 which it seems to me can answer the main purpose of the Senator's resolution. It reads:

The President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less and of aircraft.

That has passed the House. It gets rid of the mistake that was made in the treaties entered into as a result of the Limitation of Armament Conference held here.

We sacrificed two hundred and seventy-odd million dollars worth of ships which were nearly completed. Now, there is a proposition for competition in the smaller craft, and it would cost more to meet the competition than it would have cost to complete our Navy. We have allowed Great Britain, we have allowed Japan, we have allowed France, and we have allowed other nations to put no limitation on craft below 10,000 tons and no limitation on the number of men who can be enlisted in their navies. Now, competition has been started on a class of vessels which they did not possess at that time, and they are trying to induce us to sacrifice vessels some of which were nearly completed. What is the objection to letting this provision become law, and what is the necessity, so far as naval disarmament is concerned, of having the question sent to The Hague conference? Does the Senator oppose the provision in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I answer the Senator by saying that I do not oppose the provision in the naval appropriation bill to which he refers, but I beg to call attention to the fact that my proposal is distinct from it in two material particulars. The proposal to which the Senator refers contemplates a conference between five great powers for a specified purpose. That is well and good. I hope progress may be made along the lines indicated in the naval appropriation bill. But, Mr. President, what I am proposing is that the attention of all the nations of the world should be focused simultaneously, not merely upon the reduction of armaments on the sea and under the sea, but on the land and in the air; and that, likewise simultaneously, the attention of the nations of the world should be focused upon that which must proceed hand in hand with limitation of armament, and that is the development of international law, and the creation of world courts commanding the confidence of the nations for the adjudication of questions which concern the peace of the world, and properly fall-

ing within the competence of courts of justice, either of law or of arbitration, as the case may be.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. Fifty-four nations of the world are already in conference, and with committees appointed, investigating and trying to reach a conclusion for disarmament in the air, on sea, and on land. They have extended an invitation to this Nation to send a representative to that conference regarding reduction of armament and the expenses incident thereto. Has the Senator any objection to the United States sending a representative to that conference, not bound by anything in the world except to make a recommendation of this Nation for disarmament?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I decline to be drawn into a debate on the League of Nations issue.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not discussing the League of Nations. There is a conference in session, a conference of experts from 54 nations, and I think that Russia, which has not joined the league, is also in the conference. An invitation has been extended to us—

Mr. BORAH. If Russia is there, that would prevent our going. How dare the Senator suggest it?

Mr. SWANSON. Not necessarily. It might prevent Secretary Hughes from going to the conference but not us.

Mr. BORAH. We could not be found in company with Russia, even for the peace of the world.

Mr. SWANSON. I mentioned Russia, hoping that that would carry the Senator there.

Mr. BORAH. It would carry the Senator from Idaho but not the United States. Our institutions could not stand the strain.

Mr. SWANSON. If Russia goes, why does the Senator desire to stay out?

Mr. BORAH. I have not said I desired to stay out. What I have said was that the Senator has now ruined the whole proposition by suggesting Russia. He knows what a shudder that will cause.

Mr. SWANSON. Not I. I am stating facts.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has stated that Russia is represented there, and that excludes participation by the United States in a conference with any people. What is economic health, the peace of the world, and disarmament compared with association with Russia?

Mr. SWANSON. But it ought to carry the Senator. If Russia can afford to do it, it seems to me the Senator could afford to do it. What would the Senator do about that?

Mr. PEPPER. I have received no invitation to go.

Mr. SWANSON. I want to know whether this is an earnest effort to get a reduction of armament or whether it is a method of diverting the public mind from the only practical method of disarmament now before the world, for a new scheme; to go to The Hague, where disarmament has never been accomplished. There are 54 nations in session; they have appointed a committee, have fixed up a plan for disarmament, and they have asked the United States to come over and help them accomplish disarmament. Now, I want to know why the Senator objects to our going to a conference already in existence.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield to the Senator from New York in one moment. I want first to answer the question addressed to me by the Senator from Virginia.

If there is any thought in the Senator's mind that this resolution is introduced otherwise than in good faith, or otherwise than with an honest purpose to accomplish the ends which it specifies, nothing I can say to the Senator will disabuse him of the idea. All I say, for his acceptance or rejection, is that I believe the way to set about the ends specified in the resolution is through the convening of a third world conference on the lines of The Hague conference and in the way specified in the resolution. Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania why it is, if he is proposing a world conference, he does not have included in the call what for us at the present time is the most pressing thing in the world; that is, some method of restoration of trade and commerce. In the elevators in Chicago to-day there are 29,000,000 bushels of cereals. In the elevators in Philadelphia and in Baltimore there are no cereals. Why? Why are they dammed up in Chicago? Because the export trade is ruined, and our farmers in the West and in the Northwest are going to ruin because of the failure of the Republican Party to find a way to restore economic peace in Europe and to open the streams of trade and commerce.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, all I can say in answer to the question from the Senator is that, as stated in an earlier part of my remarks, the project of an economic conference is now before the Senate in the form of a resolution looking to that end introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I have no desire to cross wires with him, or in any way to make a proposal inconsistent with his. I am focusing attention upon another set of considerations and another phase of international cooperation.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, the Senator earnestly thinks that disarmament can be accomplished by having two conferences operating on the question of disarmament, one called by the United States at The Hague, and a League of Nations conference, with 54 nations participating, operating at Geneva. The Senator has an idea that we can create a new disarmament conference, call the nations together, and accomplish disarmament much better than by accepting the invitation to go to the conference, which has been working on this proposition, participated in by 54 nations. The main trouble has been that the United States has been missing. The United States would not go, and that is the reason they have not been able to accomplish practical disarmament. The Senator thinks it can be accomplished better this way than by having this Nation accept an invitation to attend a conference on disarmament, not to become a member of the league, not to do anything but to go and sit with these 54 nations for the purpose of accomplishing a practical plan of disarmament and recommending it to their government.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I answer the Senator by saying that I think substantial progress in the direction of disarmament or limitation of armaments on land and sea and in the air will never be accomplished unless in a conference with scope broad enough to take into account that which must be a correlative of reduction of armament, namely, the increased emphasis upon international law and a consideration of the agencies for giving effect to the principles and rules of international law. One trouble with the conference to which the Senator refers is that it is too narrow. It does not take account of those two things which are united and indivisible, and my proposal is that we should reconvene a world conference to take account of all the things that are specified in this resolution.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. Do I understand the Senator, then, to contend that disarmament is impossible until international law has been codified, and that he would not favor disarmament until international law has been fixed and codified and the rights of nations ascertained by international law? If that is so, we never will have disarmament.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think there was anything in my statement which justifies such an inference on the Senator's part. I may have referred to the codification of international law; certainly, if so, not during the last few moments. My thought is, however—and it is the thought that is embodied in this resolution, for the Senator's acceptance or rejection at the proper time—that decrease in reliance upon material force must be accompanied by increased emphasis on the importance of international law and the agencies for formulating it and making it effective; and it is in order that the whole subject—both phases of it, and not only one—may be before all the nations of the world at once that I am hoping for such a conference as is here suggested.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I may say, Mr. President—I will yield in one moment to the Senator from Utah—that while the resolution leaves undetermined the place where such a conference should be held, my own hope is that the conference, if and when called, will be called to meet at Brussels, and for three reasons:

In the first place, because we should thereby avoid the embarrassment of jealousy as between Geneva and The Hague.

In the second place, because Belgium, which has been the battle ground of Europe in the past, may well be in the future consecrated to efforts to maintain world peace.

Thirdly, and not least important, because I think it may well be that an invitation issued at the suggestion of the President of the United States by the King of the Belgians will be such an invitation as the nations of the world would be glad to accept.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. PEPPER. I promised to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, more than a year ago I offered a joint resolution which went to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and during this session I offered the same joint resolution. Would the Senator assent to the proposition contained in the joint resolution, which, in his time, if he will permit me, I should like to read; and will he be willing, as he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, to support if not the text of the joint resolution at least the spirit of it?

Whereas the political and commercial relations between the governments and peoples of the world have not recovered from the dislocations caused by the World War, and there are many outstanding questions which require adjustment before international amity may be restored and international commerce regain its normal course; and

Whereas the governments and peoples of the world desire and expect that the Government of the United States shall exercise its good offices to bring about a reconciliation of nations and a rectification of conditions which provoke war and preparation for war, prevent the use of the work and goods of the world in the production of capital and wealth, and impede the normal course of trade and exchanges throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President is authorized to invite the nations without exception—

That includes Russia.

Mr. BORAH. Thanks.

Mr. KING (reading)—

to convene in a world conference to be held at Washington to consider the present state of the world, particularly as affecting the political and commercial relations of the nations in the conference, and for the formulation and acceptance of a convention which shall promote international amity, reduce and restrict offensive armaments on land, sea, and in the air, arrange for the settlement, payment, clearing, and funding of international debts, stimulate production, facilitate international trade, stabilize international exchanges, remove impediments to commerce, and provide for the current settlement and adjustment of all questions affecting international political and commercial relations and the peace of the world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I confess that I was not familiar with the details of the Senator's joint resolution, and as he reads it to me it seems to me that many of its propositions are in exact conformity with the suggestions contained in mine. In so far as the two proposals differ, I shall reserve to myself the right to compare them and consider them in connection with one another in the future.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will not think that I plagiarized from him, in view of the fact that I offered this joint resolution more than a year ago.

Mr. PEPPER. It may well be that there has been some unintentional plagiarism on my part; but, after all, what I am venturing to do, sir, is to present for the calm consideration of Senators a proposal which it seems to me is one of no small importance, and I commend it to their consideration because I believe that most Senators are sensible of the enormous services that the people of the United States have rendered to the people of other nations, and are willing to do even more.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas. With the Senator's permission, I will ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD a certain document, and then I will yield the floor to him.

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for the question.

Mr. ROBINSON. Can the Senator state whether the subject matter of his resolution has been taken up in diplomatic correspondence or other communication?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it has not. It is a resolution which I have drafted and am introducing merely after informal conference with some of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. ROBINSON. I note that the resolution not only volunteers advice to the President that the time has come when he should call a world conference on the subject of disarmament or limitation of armament, but it also advises the President just what the agenda of the conference shall be. May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he finds any difficulty in the fact that the calling of conferences for the limitation of armaments is, under the Constitution, exclusively an Executive function? The negotiation of treaties and the convening of conferences respecting foreign relations, according to my understanding, is peculiarly Executive, and not legislative. While the Senate is vested with some jurisdiction respecting foreign affairs, it has no power to convene conferences in



which foreign nations shall be represented, that being within the Executive function. The Senator from Pennsylvania has not felt any embarrassment in volunteering advice to the President?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Arkansas respecting the locus, under our system, of the authority to initiate conferences or any other international relations. It is an executive question; but I have understood that the Senator from Arkansas, as well as other able Senators, have stood strongly for the right of the Senate to advise and suggest to the President the steps that in their judgment might with advantage be taken in the sphere of international relations. I should be quite at one, for example, with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who a few moments ago spoke very cogently in favor of advising the President to call a conference of the five great powers for the purpose of limiting naval armament.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the Senate that I find no difficulty in suggesting to the President the viewpoint of the Senate, or expressing the viewpoint of the Senate touching matters such as are involved in the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania; but some time ago, when the Senate had under consideration a resolution advising the President touching a different subject, exclusively within his jurisdiction—namely, when the Senate had under consideration the Denby resolution—the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators on the other side of the Chamber thought it was impertinent on the part of the Senate to offer advice to the President touching a matter exclusively within the Executive jurisdiction. I am curious to know just how it is that the Senator finds it impertinent to volunteer advice to the President in one matter of Executive jurisdiction, and yet finds it entirely consistent not only to suggest to him that he call an international conference, but to tell him what he shall put on the agenda of the conference.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, so far as calling an international conference is concerned, I take it that the words would be so vague as to be largely meaningless unless the purpose of the conference were to be stated with some approximation to definiteness. It can amount to nothing more than directing the President's attention to that which the Senate has upon its mind.

With regard to the other matter, if there be any inconsistency between advising the President in regard to a matter within the sphere of international relations and advising the President as to what he should do with respect to a member of his official family, where it is not the business of the Senate either to recommend a dismissal or to dismiss—if there be any such inconsistency, then I must plead guilty to it. Personally, I see none.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SWANSON. I have read the resolution, and I can not decide from the resolution whether or not it is the purpose of the Senator to let the President extend an invitation for the nations to assemble under certain conditions and provisions, as was done at what are called the first and second Hague conferences. This is really the assembling of a third Hague conference. In essence, is it not?

Mr. PEPPER. It is in essence the convening of a third world international conference to cover the purposes stated in the resolution, the place being left open for the reason that I personally indulge the hope that when such a conference is convened it will meet neither at Geneva nor at The Hague, but at a third point to be determined; and I have expressed my own preference for Brussels.

Mr. SWANSON. Of course the place where it is located makes very little difference; but there were two conferences, popularly known as the first and second Hague conferences, which had specific purposes and methods of representation. As I understand, the Senator's purpose is to call a third conference similar to those, practically, but at a different place.

Mr. PEPPER. Not necessarily in a different place, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. But, I mean, similar to it, regardless of the place.

Mr. PEPPER. Quite so. Irrespective of the question of site or place, the proposal is to call a third conference similar to The Hague conferences.

Mr. SWANSON. The Hague conferences were so effective in preventing war and so effective in producing disarmament

that the Senator thinks they should be reconvened, having been so effective in this respect in the past?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, with regard to that, I do not believe that we have any reason to be either encouraged or discouraged with international efforts in the direction of the peace of the world. If we were to measure at any given time the tangible results that have followed such efforts there would always be a difference of opinion, corresponding to difference of temperament between individuals as to whether it was worth while trying anything more.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. Personally, Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that international organizations in which the individual members are committed to particular courses of conduct are always and everywhere likely to fail; but I am also one of those who believe that conferences for wise purposes, attended by nations which do not commit themselves by covenant or otherwise as to the course which they will take, have almost uniformly resulted in good, and I believe that this conference would have a good result.

Mr. COPELAND and Mr. GLASS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from New York. I think he was on his feet first.

Mr. COPELAND. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think it might be a good idea to have a conference on the other side of the Chamber? Is there not some conflict between the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Idaho? I think he has recommended an international conference. Are we to have two, or is this the same one?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we seem to speak a different language in Pennsylvania from the language spoken in New York. This is the third time that I have answered the same question from the Senator from New York, and each time I have answered him by saying that this proposal is distinct from and not incompatible with the proposal of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

Mr. GLASS. It is not important, but I merely want to suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that it seems to me his resolution, in its last analysis, means just this, that the United States having refused to associate with other nations of the world is now proposing to extend to other nations of the world an invitation to associate with the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. If it so presents itself to the mind of the Senator, I am sure that my proposal must be at least susceptible of that construction; but I can assure him that was not the purpose with which it was introduced.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield now to the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator stated that he consulted with some of his colleagues regarding the resolution. I presume he consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I would like to know, if I am not asking him to violate a confidence, if the resolution is in accordance with the views of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and that this should be the settlement of the present foreign relations condition that confronts the country.

Mr. PEPPER. It is entirely true that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is one of my colleagues to whose attention I have brought the suggestion, but it is also true that neither the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations nor anybody but myself is committed to the proposal which I am now making.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I would like to have a little information from the Senator from Pennsylvania with reference to the resolution. The following are suggested as matters to go on the agenda:

A consideration of the further reduction of naval armaments and of the limitation of land and aerial armaments.

I suppose the Senator is aware that there are now representatives of some 50 nations at work on the problem. Is it the purpose of the Senator to have another organization at work on it,

and will the Senator tell why the United States should not send a representative to work with the representatives of the other nations now working on the problem?

Mr. PEPPER. I think, before the Senator came into the Chamber, I had covered that point in an answer to a similar question from another Senator on the other side of the Chamber. Let me say that, in my judgment, hopeful progress can be made in a world-wide conference on limitation of armaments only if the subject is discussed in conjunction with the further development of international law and the subject of courts for adjudication and arbitration. I am quite well aware of the movement to which the Senator refers. I am of opinion that small groups of nations, such as the five nations specified in the naval appropriation bill, may make very great progress, as was done in the Washington conference, in the way of binding themselves by treaty to accomplish a limited class of purposes. But I believe that it is nothing short of essential to any further progress that we should have world attention focused upon this subject simultaneously with the discussion of arbitral and judicial processes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Those are other branches of the general subject and are in the agenda. I was going to ask the Senator with respect to that, but I am directing attention now to subdivision (a), the assembly of a conference to discuss general disarmament. I was calling his attention to the fact that all the nations of the earth, save ours and a few others, are now engaged in an effort to solve their problem. Representatives of a permanent organization are at work on it, and I was wondering why the Senator wants to call another conference rather than join in that. But, of course, I have had his answer.

I want to call attention now to subdivision (b), a consideration of the ways in which international law may be made at once more certain and more responsive to present and future needs. I know of only two ways in which law can be developed—first, by codification, and, second, by judicial decision.

In 1907 we presented to the world a codification of international law. We have that. I am not aware that we can improve very much on that in the present state of mind. My own judgment about the matter is that the development of international law must hereafter proceed through adjudication. The Senator contemplates that in his subdivision. Is it the idea of the Senator that we ought now to attempt a further codification of international law?

Mr. PEPPER. No; not necessarily; but there is a third process in accordance with which international law may be developed, and that is by the common consent—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. By treaty.

Mr. PEPPER. The common consent of nations expressed by treaty; and that is by no means unimportant.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But, of course, if a code were adopted, that would imply ratification of the code by treaty.

Mr. PEPPER. I was drawing a distinction between a codification which merely reduces to orderly form principles and rules which exist and codification in a broader sense, which may include new matter of advanced character, representing a step forward in the evolution of law.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have expressed my view that the progress or development of international law must proceed hereafter by adjudication rather than by enactment.

Mr. PEPPER. I respect the Senator's view on that subject, but hold a different one myself.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Just what would the Senator expect to accomplish now? Entirely aside from adjudication by courts, what would he expect to develop in the way of international law?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss in detail at this time the various matters which are covered by the resolution. My thought was, sir, to start it upon its way and to make an initial statement which would set the minds of Senators to work upon it; and that I have accomplished. I beg the Senator not to draw me into a discussion of all that could be said on the subject, because I am standing in the way of other business which ought to come before the body.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course I did not expect to draw from the Senator anything more than a general statement of what he had in his mind. I would like to understand what the Senator is endeavoring to accomplish; but I pass from that to subdivision (c):

A consideration of plans for a world court, either through a further development of the present Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague or through the disassociation of the present Permanent Court of International Justice from the League of Nations.

Just what does the Senator from Pennsylvania mean by disassociating the present World Court from the league?

Mr. PEPPER. I mean this, Mr. President. At Geneva the League of Nations is conducting a very interesting and important series of administrative and executive experiments in international cooperation. At The Hague the Permanent Court of International Arbitration exists and functions under the several Hague conventions; and the Permanent Court of International Justice exists and functions in virtue of the protocol of signature providing for its creation under a certain article in the covenant of the League of Nations. At Geneva there is gradually growing up, as I have said, an increasing body of administrative and executive experiments in international cooperation. The Hague is becoming more and more identified, as I think it should be, with arbitral and judicial processes. My thought is that the same set of minds which are engaged in administrative and executive endeavors are peculiarly unfitted to have any relationship at all to the arbitral and judicial processes; and that the more we separate between Geneva and The Hague the better it will be for the administration of international effort at Geneva and for the forwarding of judicial processes of an international sort at The Hague. That is my answer to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But that does not seem to me to meet the question I have addressed to the Senator. I have not asked the Senator about a distinction between the League of Nations and the arbitral court at The Hague, to which his answer was addressed. I am asking what he means by disassociating the World Court from the League of Nations. The World Court—that is, the Permanent Court of Arbitral Justice, now sitting at Geneva—is not engaged in any administrative duties, is it? Its functions are purely judicial, are they not?

Mr. PEPPER. The Permanent Court of International Justice has a fourfold jurisdiction, which is defined in the protocol of signature. I had assumed the Senator was familiar with it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think I am very familiar with it.

Mr. PEPPER. That being so, I shall not take the time to enumerate those four heads. The Senator will remember that the judges of the Permanent Court are elected from a reservoir or panel of judges submitted by the judges of The Hague court to the League of Nations, and the concurrent choice of the assembly and council of the League of Nations elects the judges of the court, and under the protocol of signature vacancies are to be filled in the same manner as the original choice.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think the Senator has not quite accurately stated it. The choice is not restricted, of course, to the League of Nations but to those who signed the protocol, having a right to sit in the council and in the assembly at the time the choice is made and having no other relation whatever to the League of Nations.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is as familiar as anyone can be with the details of those settlements. I have some familiarity with them, perhaps not as great as his. But I was leading up to a specific answer to the Senator's question, which I make in this way: That my idea of disassociating the Permanent Court of International Justice from the League of Nations is that the council of the League of Nations and the assembly of the League of Nations should have no part whatever in the choice of judges to fill vacancies hereafter occurring in the permanent court. That is what I mean by disassociating the court from the league.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator would not, then, object to such a plan as that proposed by the resolution introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to have the judges selected by two bodies, in one of which bodies the 10 leading nations of the earth would be represented, and in the other body all the nations of the earth would be represented?

Mr. PEPPER. I think the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] was a most interesting and hopeful proposal looking in the right direction. I do not want to commit myself in detail to acceptance of that proposal, but it is in line with what I suggest as a process of disassociating the court from the league.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly. Is not that in substance and effect the exact condition under which the judges are at present elected, and you simply get rid of the name?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. What difference is there?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not propose to discuss it here. I am quite satisfied to let the whole discussion of the matter proceed in an orderly fashion after the committee has had an opportunity to pass upon it.

My judgment is that disassociation of the permanent court from the League of Nations is essential to the efficacy of the

court and to public confidence in it, and is also quite essential to the adherence of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks a document which I think may be found useful to Senators. I have had Mr. Carl Meyer, of the legislative reference service, prepare a table showing the nations participating in The Hague conferences, indicating which of them are parties to the treaty of Versailles, which of them have adhered to the protocol of sig-

nature, which of them are members of the League of Nations, and also showing the political changes that have taken place in the governmental structure of various nations of the world since 1907. I also ask unanimous consent that the incorporation of this document in the RECORD may be in a type which will make it legible for the use of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The table referred to is as follows:

Table showing nations participating in The Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907 and in the treaty of Versailles; also the political changes since the beginning of the Great War (1)

Names of countries	Participant in first Hague conference (2)	Participant in second Hague conference	Party to Treaty of Versailles (4)	Member of League of Nations (6)	Signer of the protocol establishing the Permanent Court of International Justice	New States created since 1907	Changed in form of government but still existing (since 1907) (23)	Existing in unchanged form of government (since 1907) (23)
Afghanistan	No	No	No	No	No			Yes
Albania	No	No	No	Yes	Yes		Yes (24)	Yes
Argentina	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Australia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			Yes
Austria	Yes (Austria-Hungary)	Yes (Austria-Hungary)	No	Yes	Yes (10)		Yes (25)	
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Bolivia	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Brazil	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (10)			Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (10)		26	26
Canada				Yes	Yes			Yes
Chile	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
China	Yes	Yes	4	Yes	Yes (10)		Yes (27)	
Colombia	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Costa Rica	No	No	No	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Cuba		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	13		Yes
Czechoslovakia		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (14)		
Denmark	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (10)			Yes
Dominican Republic	No	Yes	No	No	No			Yes
Ecuador	No	Yes	Yes	No	No			Yes
Estonia				Yes	Yes (10)	Yes (15)		
Ethiopia	No	No	No	Yes	No			Yes
Finland				Yes	Yes (10)	Yes (16)		
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No		Yes (28)	
Great Britain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	29		
Guatemala	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No			Yes
Haiti	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (10)			Yes
Hedjaz			Yes	7	No	Yes (17)		
Honduras	No	No	Yes	Yes	No			Yes
Hungary	Yes (Austria-Hungary)	Yes (Austria-Hungary)	No	Yes	Yes		30	30
India				Yes	Yes			Yes
Irish Free State				Yes	No	18	18	
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Japan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Latvia				Yes	Yes (11)	Yes (19)		
Liberia	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Lithuania				Yes	Yes (10)	Yes (20)		
Luxemburg	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes (34)
Mexico	Yes	Yes	No	No	No			Yes
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	8	8	8		8	
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (10)			Yes
New Zealand				Yes	Yes			Yes
Nicaragua	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No			Yes
Norway	Yes (Sweden and Norway)	Yes (Sweden and Norway)	No	Yes	Yes (10)			Yes (35)
Panama	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Paraguay	No	No	No	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Persia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Peru	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No			Yes
Poland			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (21)		
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (10)		Yes (31)	
Rumania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Russia	Yes	Yes	No	No (9)	No (9)		32	32
Salvador	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (12)			Yes
Serb-Croat-Slovene State	Yes (Serbia)	Yes (Serbia)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (22)		
Siam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
South Africa, Union of				Yes	Yes			Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			Yes
Sweden	Yes (Sweden and Norway)	Yes (Sweden and Norway)	No	Yes	Yes (10)			Yes (35)
Switzerland	Yes	Yes (3)	No	Yes	Yes (10)			Yes
Turkey	Yes	Yes	No	No	No		Yes (33)	
United States	Yes	Yes	5	No	No			Yes
Uruguay	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (10)			Yes
Venezuela	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			Yes

(1) Data compiled from: League of Nations, Official Journal 1920-1924; Journal Officiel de la République Française, Année 1920; German Official Gazette (Reichs-Gesetzblatt) 1919; the Statesman's Yearbook, 1923; World Peace Foundation, volume 5, 1923, Supplement No. 4; Scott, James Brown, The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907, New York, 1918; the Treaty of Versailles of June 28, 1919. Some of the most recent references were obtained through the kindness of Dr. James Brown Scott, secretary of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Miss M. Alice Matthews, librarian of that institution.

(2) The final act of 1899 was signed by the plenipotentiaries of all the powers represented at the first (1899) Hague conference; see Scott, page 39.

(3) Switzerland signed under reservation of Voeu No. 1, which the Swiss Federal Council did not accept.

(4) For official text in English, French, and German in parallel columns, see R. G. B1, 1919, page 700f; for official French text see J. O., January 11, 1920, page 458f. The treaty was signed by all allied and associated powers except China, which refused to sign on account of the transfer of the Shantung concession to Japan.

(5) Signed by the plenipotentiaries of the United States but not ratified by the Senate. For dates of deposits of ratifications by 26 or the 27 signatory powers see J. O., 1920, pages 458, 3938, 3994, 4138, 5070, 5450, 5622, 9410, 20154.

(6) By November 1, 1923, 54 nations had become members of the league.

(7) Hedjaz applied for admission to the League of Nations; see News Bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association, volume 2, No. 46, September 28, 1923, page 2.

(8) Absorbed by the Serb-Croat-Slovene State.

(9) Now known as the Russian Union of Soviet Republics; these include White Russia, the Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan; see the Statesman's Yearbook for 1923, page 1277.

(10) Have accepted and put into force among themselves the optional clause.

(11) Latvia on September 11, 1923, accepted the optional clause, subject to ratification by the Saeima; see League of Nations, Official Journal, October, 1923, page 1133.

(12) Have signed but not yet ratified the protocol of the League Court.

(13) By the treaty of Paris, December 10, 1898, Spain relinquished all claims of sovereignty over and title to Cuba. A constitution, modeled after that of the United States, was adopted by Cuba on February 21, 1901. Independence was granted by the United States subject to certain conditions.

(14) On November 14, 1918, the Czechoslovak National Assembly formally declared the Czechoslovak State to be a Republic. The constitution of the Czechoslovak Republic was passed by the national assembly on February 29, 1920.

(15) Estonia declared her independence on February 24, 1918; the constitution was passed on June 15, 1920.

(16) On December 6, 1917, Finland was proclaimed an independent and sovereign State. Finland is a Republic according to the constitutional law of June 14, 1919.

(17) Attained its independence during the course of the Great War. Emir Hussein assumed the title of King of Hedjaz in November, 1916. The treaty of peace with Turkey recognized Hedjaz as a free and independent State. The present Emir is highly subsidized by Great Britain.

(18) The Irish Free State was established by royal proclamation of December 6, 1922, after a constituent assembly had adopted and passed on October 11, 1922, a new constitution, which declares the Irish Free State to be a "coequal member of the community of nations forming the British Commonwealth."

(19) On November 18, 1918, the sovereign free State of Latvia was proclaimed. The new Latvian constitution was passed on February 15, 1922.

(20) Proclamation of independence on February 16, 1918. The constitution adopted on August 1, 1922, declares that the State of Lithuania is an independent democratic Republic.

(21) The independence of Poland was proclaimed on November 9, 1918. The constitution of the Polish Republic was adopted by the "Sejm" (parliament) on March 17, 1921.

(22) On December 29, 1918, the first ministry of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes was formed, and the allied governments were notified of the creation of the new State, which soon afterwards was recognized. A new constitution was adopted on June 28, 1921.

(23) Minor changes have not been taken into consideration.

(24) At the outbreak of the Great War Albania was a Kingdom. The crown had been accepted by Prince William of Wied on February 21, 1914. Soon after the outbreak of the war William of Wied left Albania. The country is now headed by a council of regents.

(25) The Republic of Austria was proclaimed on November 12, 1918, and the new constitution was adopted on October 1, 1920.

(26) Boris III succeeded to the throne on the abdication of his father, King Ferdinand, October 3, 1918.

(27) China became a Republic on February 12, 1912.

(28) Germany became a Republic on November 9, 1918, when the abdication of the German Emperor was announced. Within a short time the reigning princes of the Federal States were either deposed or abdicated. The new Federal constitution was adopted on July 31, 1919.

(29) King Constantine abdicated on June 11, 1917, in favor of his second son Alexander. In 1920 (October 25) Alexander died from the effects of a monkey bite; and after a plebiscite Constantine was recalled on December 19, 1920. On September 27, 1922, Constantine abdicated for a second time. He was succeeded by his son George II. At present conditions in Greece are again unsettled.

(30) Hungary was proclaimed an independent republic (Hungarian People's Republic) on November 16, 1918, and Count Michael Karolyi became provisional President. However, Count Karolyi's cabinet was succeeded by a Soviet Government (1919) which proclaimed the dictatorship of the proletariat. This, in turn (August 7, 1919), made room

for a national government. The new Parliament elected a regent, who as long as the throne is vacant is to exercise the rights of the King.

(31) Portugal was a monarchy until 1910. After a short revolution the Republic was proclaimed on October 5, 1910. A new constitution was adopted on August 20, 1911. The Republic was recognized by the powers in September, 1911.

(32) Until 1917 Russia was an Empire. After several revolutions control of the Government passed into the hands of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic (R. S. F. S. R.). The United States has not recognized this Government. However, a number of States which have evolved from the old Empire, viz, Finland, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, have been generally recognized, both de facto and de jure, by the western powers. A number of other independent republics, after the adoption by them of the soviet form of government, are closely associated with the Moscow Government. These include Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Ukraine, and White Russia.

(33) On January 20, 1921, a fundamental law was adopted which declared that all sovereignty belonged to the people, and that all power, both administrative and legislative, was vested in the grand national assembly as being the sole representative of the people. The old designation, "Ottoman Empire," was abolished and the word "Turkey" substituted. Prince Abdul-Medjid was elected by the grand national assembly as the successor to the Caliphate; however, the temporal power of the Sultan has lost its former significance.

(34) The Grand Duchess Marie-Adelaide abdicated on November 6, 1919, in favor of her sister Charlotte (born January 23, 1896).

(35) The union between Norway and Sweden was declared dissolved by Norway on June 7, 1905. After several months' negotiation a mutual agreement for the repeal of the union was signed on October 26, 1905.

(Compiled by Carl Meyer, February 19, 1924. Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

On motion of Mr. KING the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) providing for the calling of an international conference on world relations was taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ETHER FOR RADIO COMMUNICATION

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2930, being Order of Business 323. It is a very short bill, and provides for the protection of the ether and its use for radio communication.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 323, which is Senate bill 2930. Is there objection?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the immigration bill, as the unfinished business, was considered all day on Friday last, and yet the actual time devoted to its consideration was only 20 minutes. I have been hoping that we could have unanimous consent to take up the unfinished business now, and I hope the Senator from Nebraska will permit us to do so.

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

Mr. HOWELL. The bill for which I ask consideration, I think, will take only a few moments.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the bill can be disposed of without debate, I shall not object.

Mr. HOWELL. I doubt if there will be much debate upon the bill.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Of course, at 2 o'clock we shall have to take up the immigration bill anyway, if being the unfinished business, and I shall not object.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and he lays the bill before the Senate. The bill will be read by its title.

The READING CLERK. A bill (S. 2930) reaffirming the use of the ether for radio communication or otherwise to be the inalienable possession of the people of the United States and their Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the bill may be read.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I endeavored to get the attention of the Chair for the purpose of objecting to the request made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL]. If I did

not succeed in interposing my objection in time, it is not my fault. I shall be very glad, indeed, so far as I am concerned, to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska, but I really do think the immigration bill is one of such transcendent importance that it ought to have the right of way. But for that I certainly should not object to the consideration of the bill of the Senator from Nebraska. I think, however, that we ought to take up the immigration bill and proceed with it without any interruption, so far as bills of secondary importance are concerned. So I object to the consideration of the bill which is asked by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is constrained to hold that it is now too late for the Senator from Maryland to object. The Chair tried to put the matter before the Senate as fully as possible.

Mr. BRUCE. Allow me to say that I was on my feet for the purpose of making the objection and that it was not my fault that the objection did not reach the Chair. The trouble is not with my vocal organs but must have been with some other physical organs. So I renew my objection. It certainly seems to me that when I am endeavoring to object before the declaration is made by the Chair, "There is no objection," and am doing my best to assert my objection, that objection ought to be sustained.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I do not wish to be discourteous—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is very much embarrassed about the matter. The Chair believes that he gave ample opportunity for objection, and he heard no objection save the suggestion made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but it does not seem to me that that affects my objection. The point is I was endeavoring and doing my best to object, and to make the Chair hear my objection, when the Chair said there was no objection. That is like saying, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace." I did object; that is a fact; and I objected before the Chair said that there was no objection. Under ordinary circumstances I should not make the objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah will state it.

Mr. KING. If a Senator rises and addresses the Chair for the purpose of objecting and does object, but the Chair fails to hear the Senator addressing the Chair or to hear the objection and announces there is no objection, would not the Chair, when his attention was called to the matter later, and the Senator asserts—of course, he does not need to assert upon his honor, because his statement is sufficient—that he did object, hold that the objection could be interposed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from Maryland states that he rose to object before the order was entered, the Chair will accept the statement of the Senator from Maryland without any hesitation at all.

Mr. BRUCE. Unfortunately for the Chair, the Chair was not looking my way when I made the objection. It seems to me that the objection should be sustained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Did the Senator from Maryland object before the Chair announced that no objection was heard?

Mr. BRUCE. I tried to do so. I would not say positively that I actually spoke, but I was trying to solicit the attention of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

Mr. BRUCE. It seems to me that is a question which ought to be determined by my voice rather than by the ear of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair accepts the statement of the Senator. Objection being made, the presentation of concurrent and other resolutions is still in order. If there be none, morning business is closed.

Mr. BRUCE and Mr. REED of Pennsylvania addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. I withdraw my objection, as there is some little difference of view on the part of a colleague who sits near me as to the order of events. I do not care to be placed in the position of objecting when any uncertainty may possibly attach as to my right to make the objection.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar be dispensed with and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business beginning with the amendment which was pending at the time of adjournment on Friday last.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 324, being the bill (S. 2576) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Maryland has withdrawn his objection, should not my request be put to the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska must renew his request.

Mr. HOWELL. I do renew the request.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, in order to make an end to this matter, with great regret, I object. I want to have taken up and finished the immigration bill. I trust the Senator from Nebraska will appreciate the reason for my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from California to object.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made by the Senator from California.

The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of what is known as the immigration bill. Is there objection?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before that request is granted I wish to state in just a few words to Senators who are objecting to anything else being taken up except the immigration bill that, under the rules of the Senate, at 2 o'clock that bill will automatically come before the Senate. There is no disposition on the part of any Senator, so far as I know, to displace that measure; at least, I am not in favor of displacing it. I want its consideration to be proceeded with and to have the bill disposed of as soon as possible; but, Mr. President, the rules of the Senate contemplate that a bill which has its place as the unfinished business and automatically comes before the Senate at 2 o'clock shall not therefore shut out every other measure between the time of concluding the routine morning business and the hour of 2 o'clock. I do not think Senators ought to insist on a monopoly of the time of the Senate. No Senator is opposing the consideration of the immigration bill under the rule.

Now I wish to call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that upon the call of the calendar so far there has always been included an understanding that only unobjected bills should be considered. That means—

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. That means that one Senator may object to any measure being taken up. I had intended this morning, until my colleague spoke to me about the bill he wanted to have considered, which is a bill which I favor and which I think he ought to be allowed to have considered, to ask the Senate during the morning hour up to 2 o'clock if it should take that long to consider the bill on the calendar providing for the development of Great Falls.

On a previous occasion when the calendar was called I directed attention to the fact that such a measure has passed the Senate three different times on one occasion in practically the same form as the bill which has now been reported by the committee to the Senate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment. It seems to me that if we are going, on the one hand, to let one Senator prevent any bill from coming before the Senate, and, on the other hand, be prevented from taking up bills that will occupy just a little time, probably a half hour or such matter, to which some one Senator may object so that action can not be had, it means that in between the individual objection on the one hand and the unfinished business on the other there can be no business of the Senate transacted.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I objected to the consideration of the bill of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], but, in view of the statement that automatically the immigration bill will come before the Senate at 2 o'clock, I hasten to withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska and lays before the Senate Senate bill 2930.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2930) reaffirming the use of the ether for radio communication or otherwise to be the inalienable possession of

the people of the United States and their Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, Mr. President, I wish to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow morning, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate shall proceed to consider Calendar No. 196, being the bill (S. 746) providing for the development of hydroelectric energy at Great Falls.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. What is the Senator's proposal?

Mr. NORRIS. I have asked unanimous consent that to-morrow morning, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate shall consider the bill the title of which I have stated, not to interfere with the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from Nebraska is that to-morrow morning, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 196, being Senate bill 746.

Mr. WADSWORTH. "Until 2 o'clock?"

Mr. NORRIS. If it shall take that long. It will not take that long, however.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have not objected to the consideration of Senate bill 2930, which the Senator from Nebraska has been trying to bring up; but I had hoped that we could take a recess to-night, and could commence with the immigration bill at 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I will change the request. If the Senate wants to take that course with the immigration bill, I do not feel disposed to interfere with it, and I will change the request. I ask unanimous consent now that as soon as the Senate disposes of the immigration bill—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is already a unanimous-consent agreement which will conflict with that.

Mr. ROBINSON. That can not be done, for the reason that unanimous consent has already been granted to take up the resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that members of the Tariff Commission should not participate in cases in which they or members of their families have a financial interest.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think this bill will take 15 minutes. The Senate has passed it before, but I can not get it up by unanimous consent, and I shall have to proceed to get it up in some other way.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We did not hear the full suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska. As I understood his proposition, it was that on the first day after the immigration bill is disposed of, after the conclusion of the morning business, his power bill shall be taken up.

Mr. ROBINSON. During the morning hour.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. During the morning hour. That would not interfere with the resolution of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. NORRIS. I will put in this way: I ask unanimous consent that the first day following the disposition of the immigration bill, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, the power bill be taken up, not to conflict with the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into regarding the resolution spoken of by the Senator from Arkansas.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, pending the request, I understand that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE], who made some objection earlier this morning, has withdrawn his objection. Am I correct in that? I understand that that is the case, and I shall be very glad to see the bill considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, may we have the reading of Senate bill 2930?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

The reading clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the ether and the use thereof for the transmission of signals, words, energy, and other purposes, within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, is hereby reaffirmed to be the inalienable possession of the people of the United States and their Government, but privileges to enjoy such use may be granted as provided by law for terms of not to exceed two years.

SEC. 2. In the event of war or during other national emergency the President may, in his discretion, terminate the privilege of any or all licenses to use the ether for any purpose, under the provisions of licenses granted by authority of Congress, and without rendering the United States liable to damages to anyone whomsoever,

SEC. 3. All such licenses heretofore granted by authority of Congress shall terminate within two years (if not sooner under the terms thereof) from the date of the approval hereof, and no such license shall be renewed, or any additional license granted, except upon the filing with the Secretary of Commerce of an application by such licensee or applicant, executed under oath, setting forth in the form prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, that the claims of such licensee or applicant to the use of the ether are in consonance with and limited to the recitations and provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question respecting section 3. The language is:

All such licenses heretofore granted by authority of Congress shall terminate within two years.

I inquire for what length of time have the licenses referred to been issued?

Mr. HOWELL. No license has been issued for a longer period than two years. Every license that has been issued will expire within the two years. The important feature of this bill is that when a licensee asks for a renewal of his license he must file a written application therefor under oath, in which he agrees to the recitations of this act. That is, he gives assurances that he does not claim a vested right to any radio wave or any right to use the ether. In other words, the purpose of this bill is to bring immediately to the surface any claim of vested right in the ether, if there are any claims at the present time.

Mr. ROBINSON. And, as I understand, it also is designed to make certain that in the event the United States itself shall find it necessary to use the ether it may do so without meeting with any obstruction or objection on the part of persons who have obtained licenses from the Government?

Mr. HOWELL. It makes it clear that the right to use the ether is a mere privilege granted by the Government, and that, in case of war or other national emergency, if the Government should see fit to terminate temporarily the use of these instruments, it could do so, and there would not be any claim of damages against the Government. It is to make it very clear that the ether belongs to the people of the United States and the Government of the United States, and that any rights to use it are granted under acts of Congress, and are mere privileges, not grants of right of any length of time longer than stated in the application.

There is a suspicion that there are some big interests that hope to claim ultimately a vested right in certain wavelengths or in the use of the ether. Not a sufficient time has elapsed to enable them to make the claim now; but if we wait 25 or 50 years we may be confronted with claims of that kind. The purpose of this bill is that the next time they go to the Secretary of Commerce and ask for renewal of their license—as they must, because no license is granted for more than two years now—in the application they file they agree that if the privilege is granted it is in accord with the recitations of this bill. That is all there is to the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then the language which I read in my first question to the Senator is not intended to revoke any right that has been granted, or to impair any contract that may have been issued under a license, but it is to make clear that the limitation is in fact two years, and that subsequent licenses shall be limited to two years?

Mr. HOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill retains to the Government the absolute right to regulate the whole business of radio.

Mr. HOWELL. It means that the Government is in possession of the ether, it controls the ether, and that if anybody has a right to use it, it is merely under rights granted by the act of Congress. We want to have it clearly understood and distinctly understood.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think the Senator is exactly right, and I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether there is any opposition from any source that he knows of to this bill?

Mr. HOWELL. I have not heard of any opposition.

Mr. HARRISON. The committee was unanimous?

Mr. HOWELL. The bill was reported out by the Committee on Interstate Commerce. A subcommittee was appointed. No hearings were asked. The bill has been on the calendar now for a couple of weeks, and I know of no objection whatever at the present time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I observe in line 7, page 1, the words "inalienable possession of the people of the United States

and their Government." Would that not be an affirmation of the proposition that no State would have any right in the ether for its use intrastate? Of course, I can understand that if you set certain ethereal currents into operation they will not terminate with the boundaries of the State; but the point that suggested itself to me was this:

Suppose that half a dozen or a dozen individuals in surrounding communities within a State set up their own radio service. They do not intend to communicate beyond the boundaries of the State. Would not this be a declaration that they would have no right to do so, because it affirms the right in the Government of the United States, and no power upon the part of the State to control the ether over the State, and no right in the people of a State to use the ether without obtaining a Government license, though their use might be confined to service within the State?

Mr. HOWELL. If there is a right in the State to use the ether within the State, no act of Congress could take it away from the State; but it is a practical question. Ether waves can not be limited to the area of a State. The question is one of practical development of a use of the ether. I hope that a policy will gradually develop, and that will be Government controlled, because, if it is not, the use of the ether will result in such confusion that it will destroy the value of the ether. So, as I say, this act of Congress could not take away any inherent right of the State, but it may tend to develop a policy which will be recognized by the States because of its being the only practical way of controlling it.

Mr. KING. I am not a scientific man, but I ask the Senator whether the word "ether" is sufficiently comprehensive? May they not differentiate the ether from the impulse that carries the wave lengths?

Mr. McKELLAR. It says here, in line 3, "and the use thereof."

Mr. HOWELL. It is the use of the ether.

Mr. McKELLAR. It says "the use thereof," which I think would probably cover the proposition the Senator makes.

Mr. KING. The point I am trying to get at is may they not differentiate between the ether and electrical impulses or electrical currents, and contend that you have affirmed your right to control the ether but not your right to control the subtle substance or the force which we call electricity, and which they may insist is the impulse utilized in the transmission of messages?

Mr. HOWELL. The Senator will notice that the wording is:

That the ether and the use thereof for the transmission of signals, words, energy, and other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will cover the whole thing.

Mr. HOWELL. The only known way of using the ether is through the sending forth of these electrical impulses.

Mr. KING. Is the Senator satisfied that the word "ether" is sufficiently comprehensive, that there may be no differentiation between ether and some other agency, and that it may not be shown that it is not ether that is utilized in the transmission of messages, but something else? That is the only point I have in mind. If the Senator has given sufficient scientific thought to that matter, I venture no suggestion even.

Mr. McKELLAR. If a distinction is to be made, Mr. President, it had better be made now. There has been no user of this energy up to date long enough to give anybody a vested right in the ether, and if these claims are to be made they had better be made as soon as possible. If this bill shall pass, that will bring them out.

Mr. KING. I have not made myself clear to the Senator from Tennessee. The point I was trying to make was this: It may be developed that it is not ether that is employed in sending these messages. The development of physical science and aerial science may be such that they may discover that what we commonly call "ether" is not the instrumentality by which these messages are conveyed.

If the control is limited to ether, or if it declared that the United States affirms its right to the licensing of the ether, and it should subsequently be developed that what we know as ether is not what really carries these messages, by that narrow construction which we would place upon what we intend to carry out we may cut ourselves off from affirming a broader power and a broader right and one which would comprehend what scientific discovery may possibly project as the means of conveying the messages.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I recognize as a fact that ether is something that we have not been able to separate and investigate, even to the extent of the corpuscles of electricity. However, the terms used here are those that are generally

used to convey to the mind in a general way, as far as we can do so at the present time with the terminology at our hands, what we hope to accomplish.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Though I do not know that this is the most opportune time at which to say it, I wish to say that what troubles me in relation to this bill is not any conflict which may arise between Federal rights and the rights of the States, but the conflict which may arise between rights of individual proprietors and the Federal Government. Legally speaking, I apprehend that it is not a correct proposition to say that "the ether and the use thereof for the transmission of signals, words, energy, etc., is hereby affirmed to be an inalienable possession of the people of the United States and of the Government of the United States."

The air is not the property of the people of the United States or of the Government, certainly, unless the old black-letter law principle has been changed. The individual proprietor of a parcel of land owns, to use the language of the old black-letter law, from hell to heaven. He is just as much the owner of the air as he is of the soil or the water on the soil. Consequently, it seems to me, as I have said, that it is incorrect to say that the ether, or the air, or any atmospheric element of any kind that enters into the air, is an inalienable possession of the people of the United States or of the Government of the United States. The air is not the property of the people of the United States and it is not the property of the Government of the United States. The air is the property of the individual proprietor of the soil under it. As I said, he owns from the center of the earth to the uppermost reaches of the ether.

Consequently, under the Federal Constitution if the Government has any right in the ether, or if the people of the United States have any right in the ether, if it is true that the ether is the inalienable possession of the people of the United States or of the Government, it must be by virtue of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution and by virtue of no other constitutional provision of any sort of which I am aware.

We all know that any private rights which may exist in the public waters of the United States are subject to the power of the Federal Government to regulate navigation and commerce. It seems to me that that is a subject which supplies a proper legal analogy, so far as this bill is concerned. So far as radio communication is resorted to in connection with interstate commerce, the Federal Government would have the right to regulate it, unquestionably, and of course the transmission of interstate messages, messages over wires or cables or otherwise between the United States and foreign countries, is subject to regulation by the Government under the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution.

Therefore I say that it seems to me that if we propose to enact a measure of this kind it ought to be clothed with the proper legal form. I do not think the Senate wants to make what I conceive to be an absolutely groundless statement in a legal sense.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator just a moment to remind him that in his own State a gentleman of very high scientific attainments, Mr. Rogers, of Hyattsville, as I remember his name, discovered a process whereby he can communicate with a vessel hundreds of miles at sea and 18 or 20 fathoms under the water. If the vessel is equipped with receiving apparatus, the vessel can receive communications from the shore; and if equipped with sending apparatus, it can send out communications. That is done through the earth. The messages do not go through the ether at all or through the air.

Mr. BRUCE. I am talking about the ether.

Mr. FLETCHER. I know that, but I am speaking with reference to the control of communication. I agree with the Senator that it must be based on the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Mr. BRUCE. That is right.

Mr. FLETCHER. This control must extend not only to the ether but to every other process of communication.

Mr. BRUCE. That is correct. Therefore, it does seem to me that this bill ought to be amended to provide that this provision be subject to the right of the individual proprietors, whoever they may be. Of course, we know such rights must necessarily be of a very unsubstantial nature. Radio communication in connection with interstate commerce is not likely to

interfere with any material, substantial, individual right of property; but all the same, as I say, the owner of the land is the owner of the air, and if this bill is to be framed correctly, it ought to be framed with due regard to that fact. The suggestion I would make would be to make the bill read in this way:

That the ether and the use thereof for the transmission of signals, words, energy, and other purposes, within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, is hereby, subject to any individual rights of proprietorship that may exist therein, reaffirmed to be the inalienable possession of the people of the United States.

Of course, the point I have been making is largely a technical point, and I do not think that it would have any practical importance except under very extraordinary circumstances, but it might have. The Government, of course, in exercising its control over radio communication might well come into conflict under some circumstances of a more or less special and extraordinary nature with the rights of individual proprietorship in the air. But if the Senator wants to state his proposition in a perfectly sound and legal form in this bill, it ought to be stated as I have suggested, "subject to the rights of individual proprietorship of the soil beneath the ether," whatever those rights may be.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the ether is something that has never been segregated, and in order to claim ownership therein over one's property one would have to have possession of it in a physical sense, which is impossible. We recognize the fact that the air which happens to be over property is for the use of the individual while it is over his property, but he is not permitted to commit a nuisance such as to make that air unsuitable for the enjoyment of the rest of the people. It is in a similar sense that we are protecting the ether and making it a possession of the United States. We are not making it so; it is. We are simply reaffirming what now is true.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will not the Senator accept this amendment: After the word "ether," on line 3, page 1, to insert the words "or other substance transmitting energy of any kind or character"?

Mr. HOWELL. Just a moment, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR (after a pause). I withdraw the suggestion at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I want to offer an amendment. Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the Senator will yield, I know that the Senator from Nebraska is anxious to get his bill passed to-day, so I ask, if there is no objection, that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for five minutes.

Mr. BRUCE. I am offering an amendment just now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is not yet before the Senate.

Mr. BRUCE. I offer this amendment: After the word "hereby," in line 5, page 1, I move that there be inserted the words "subject to any rights of individual proprietorship that may exist therein."

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to eliminate any possibility of individual proprietorship in the ether.

Mr. BRUCE. That can only be done, of course, by condemnation. That would be a very novel proposition as respects the pathways of the air.

Mr. HOWELL. If this amendment were adopted, it would mean that if somebody claimed a right about which he said nothing, 10 years from now he could say, "We have a right; this is our right." What we are trying to do is to protect the ether against individual claims.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] pertinently inquires of me where it is proposed to begin with this inalienable possession of the air?

Mr. HOWELL. It is not the air; it is ether. It is that indefinable substance that no one has ever seen.

Mr. BRUCE. It does not make any difference; a man owns his property from Orcus to the Elysian fields, from heaven to hell, and if the Government proposes to acquire it, it must do it by condemnation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2576, the immigration bill.

Mr. HOWELL. The Senator from Pennsylvania asked unanimous consent that the immigration bill be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At that moment the unfinished business was not before the Senate. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to submit that request now?

Mr. HOWELL. I ask that the Senator from Pennsylvania consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for not to exceed five minutes for the consideration of the bill which has been before the Senate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I join in the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE], which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "hereby," insert:

Subject to any right of individual proprietorship that may exist therein.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

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

#### NOTICE OF SPEECH—ORGANIZATION OF THIRD PARTY

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that to-morrow morning, with the consent of the Senate, and as soon as I may get the floor after it convenes, I shall want to discuss certain statements made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] in his speech in Maine April 3. The speech was discussed on Friday, but at that time there was nothing upon which to base an accurate idea of the speech except excerpts from newspapers. There were several papers introduced in the Record, but on Saturday, for the first time, the full text of the Senator's speech appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have this morning analyzed it very carefully. I desire to know upon to-morrow whether or not we have the correct construction of the speech, and therefore I desire the senior Senator from Pennsylvania to be here at that time. I particularly wish to discuss certain phases of the speech with regard to his accusations that these investigations are forcing and bringing about the organization of a third party.

#### RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2576) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, 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	Edwards	McCormick	Shields
Ashurst	Fernald	McKellar	Shipstead
Ball	Ferris	McKinley	Shortridge
Bayard	Fletcher	McNary	Simmons
Brandegee	Frazier	Mayfield	Smith
Brookhart	George	Moses	Smoot
Bronssard	Gerry	Neely	Spencer
Bruce	Glass	Norris	Stephens
Bursum	Hale	Oddie	Sterling
Cameron	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Pepper	Underwood
Caraway	Heflin	Phipps	Wadsworth
Colt	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Ralston	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Warren
Curtis	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	Weller
Dial	King	Robinson	Willis
Dill	Ladd	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask that the amendment be read as perfected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read as perfected.

The READING CLERK. On page 35, after line 15, add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 24. The Secretary of Labor is authorized hereafter, under such regulations as he may deem advisable, to pay extra compensation to immigrant inspectors and other immigration employees when, at the request of any transportation company, corporation, or individual bringing aliens to the United States, such officers or employees are required to report for extra duty or to work overtime, or on nights, Sundays, or holidays in connection with the examination of alien passengers or crews; and the transportation company, corporation, or individual requesting such extra service shall pay to the Secretary of Labor, as reimbursement, the amounts expended by him for such extra service in accordance with his regulations, and such reimbursement shall be credited to the appropriation, "Expenses of



regulating immigration": *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section relating to extra compensation shall not apply to ferry companies or international bridges or to transportation companies bringing aliens to the United States across the boundary from foreign contiguous territory.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this amendment has been submitted to the Committee on Immigration and has been approved by the committee and may therefore be properly regarded as a committee amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Census Bureau classifies the white population of the United States generally as "native white stock" and "foreign white stock." The former, or native white stock, are the descendants of the 3,000,000 whites enumerated in our first census of 1790, and it is estimated that this class in 1920 numbered 47,330,000, or 49.9 per cent of the total white population.

The foreign white stock, consisting of foreigners who have settled in this country since 1790 and their descendants, is estimated for the 1920 census to be 47,490,000, or 50.1 per cent of the total white population.

Mr. President, for the first time in the history of this great country the foreign white stock exceeds the native white stock. In 1900, 55.8 per cent of the white people in this country were of the native stock. In 1910 the percentage dropped to 51.9, and, as I have already stated, it was only 49.9 in 1920. The relative loss in the native stock, or gain in the foreign stock, was 3.9 per cent from 1900 to 1910 and only 2 per cent from 1910 to 1920. The World War is no doubt responsible for the marked check in the increase of our foreign stock during the last census decade, though it is not at all improbable that Congress would have placed a restriction on immigration earlier if the war had not done so.

In our census reports the white immigrant is classed as "foreign-born white." His children by his foreign-born wife then become "native whites of foreign parentage." The children of a white immigrant by an American-born wife are classed as "native whites of mixed parentage." The aggregate of these three classes of our population, sometimes erroneously referred to as "foreign white stock," was, in 1920, 36,398,958, or 76.6 per cent of the total foreign white stock and 88.4 per cent of the entire white population of the United States. The remainder of the total foreign white stock are those whose ancestors, further removed than father and mother, were foreign born.

The Americanization of these thirty-six and a third million of our population is, in many cases, only skin deep and is merely a mask to be quickly thrown aside when the interests of their dear fatherland are involved, as has been abundantly shown by the conduct of the so-called German-Americans during and since the World War.

Mr. President, our much-vaunted melting pot has almost ceased to function. The fire of American patriotism and American ideals does not fuse the huge chunks of foreign stock, and as a result we have rural settlements and urban communities where the people converse in foreign tongues. They get their news and many of their ideas of government, as well as of the duties and obligations of citizenship, from papers printed in a foreign language or published in a foreign land; in fact, many of them are still foreigners, body and soul, though they enjoy the privileges of American citizenship and live under the protection of American laws. It is well known that large numbers of them send parts of their earnings back to their native countries from month to month or year to year, and they themselves later return with all they have saved during their sojourn in America.

Mr. President, I have no prejudice against the foreigner that in years gone by came to our shores with his mind made up to become really and truly one of us, putting aside for good and all his allegiance to his native land; but when the foreign stock, as it does now, exceeds in numbers our native white American stock, it is time to call a halt on all immigration.

I fully realize that our very ideals and principles, of which we are justly proud, are the result of admixture of races, but it has become increasingly evident that the foreign stock is already so large that its assimilation will require many years.

There is grave danger to our country from immigrants who live in their own groups, read papers in their own language, work, live, and vote in their own groups, and not as Americans. Many appeared before our committee as representatives of racial groups and nationalities, and their principal arguments against the bill were based on the claim that it discriminated against the country of their birth.

I want to compliment the Secretary of Labor. Although he himself is an immigrant, he is an American citizen and is thinking about America. Except our Government representatives

and the Californians who appeared before our committee, hardly any came as Americans urging what was best for America.

In my own State one-sixth of the farm laborers have left within two years, and many friends of mine, some of them with large plantations and facing a shortage of labor, have urged me not to support restrictive immigration, so that foreigners would continue to come to supply labor for the North and East and our labor would not be molested. We can not lose sight of the future when we consider this measure—the very salvation of our country is at stake. This will not be the same America unless we change our immigration policy. We must think of our grandchildren and consider only the future of America.

It is well known that every nation in the world, except the United States and possibly a few others, encourages emigration of the least desirable of its citizens or subjects and strives to keep the most desirable within its own borders. As a result some of our immigrants have been of a kind not calculated to improve our stock. In saying this I am not unmindful of the many splendid men and women that have come here and helped in the development of our country. There was plenty of land to share with them then, and they came in numbers that could be assimilated, but not so at this time.

Half our white people, as I have stated, are now of foreign stock; a large per cent of them do not speak our language or understand our Government. The time has come when we should prohibit any immigration for at least five years, except the unmarried children under 21 years of age, fathers and mothers over 55 years of age, and wives or husbands of former immigrants that have become citizens of the United States. If we would do that, it would offend no one. For my part, I am not concerned over what those who think and act in national groups care about this matter. I am thinking of what is best for the future of our country.

I mean no reflection on our good citizens of foreign birth when I state the undisputed fact that many of those who have come to our country do not measure up to the average of the people of their native land. Our country will remain great as long as our people are so, but we can not continue great if we allow inferior people to fill up this country. We must have selective, restrictive immigration, and the present percentage quota should be reduced to 1 per cent, if we do not entirely prohibit immigration for the time being.

A few days ago I placed in the Record statements from Commander Quinn of the American Legion urging suspension of immigration and from President Gompers of the American Federation of Labor urging restricted immigration, to which I should like again to call attention.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] in his able and illuminating address explained the difficulty of arriving at a distribution of immigrants among the nations of Europe that would be fair and just to all our people and not give offense to foreign Governments that have been and are still our good friends. While I am opposed to consulting any other country as to our immigration policy, it being a matter for our people to decide, without outside interference, any embarrassment from this source would be overcome by the adoption of the amendment, which I have offered, to prohibit immigration for a period of five years, by the end of which time we should be able to arrive at a solution of this vexed question.

I prefer the census of 1890 as a basis of the quota. If, however, we decide to admit a limited number of immigrants, there is merit in the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania to base the quotas on national origin of the whole population of the United States and not on that of the foreign born only.

The Senator does not claim that an accurate division of our people into national groups can be made, but he does show it is possible to arrive at an approximate estimate that will be in some respects a less objectionable basis for the determination of our immigration quotas than the foreign-born population on any census year.

It has been pointed out that the percentages of foreign-born Americans from northern and western Europe and from southern and eastern Europe under the 1890 census are substantially the same as the percentages of Americans, native as well as foreign born, whose ancestors came from those two grand divisions of that continent, but this is not true for many of the separate countries of the two divisions.

To illustrate, let us take Germany, which would be the country most favored by the adoption of the foreign born according to the 1890 census as a basis for calculation of our immigration quotas.

Three per cent of our foreign born in 1890 amounted to 241,285, of whom 76,840, or nearly one-third, are German born. From the very illuminating table presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania and appearing on page 5470 of the RECORD it is seen that 13,577,510, or nearly one-seventh, of our entire white population are of German descent. In other words, the number of immigrants from Germany, if we adopt the foreign born of the 1890 census as a basis, would be more than twice as great as under the plan proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am opposed to allowing so many to come from one country.

For some of the countries, however, there is no great difference in the quota percentages under the two plans. For instance, about one-fortieth of our immigrants would come from Italy under one plan and about one-thirtieth under the other.

To the plan proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania, based as it is upon the whole population of the United States, native stock as well as foreign stock, no foreign nation can justly take offense. It is a plan that will appeal to all true Americans, whether foreign or native born. We should have only 100 per cent Americans in this country, and our immigration laws should be made for Americans and not to please foreigners.

There is another matter, Mr. President, to which I desire to call attention; that is the large numbers of immigrants that come across our northern and southern borders from neighboring countries which now enjoy privileges of unrestricted immigration to the United States.

During the last fiscal year 62,709 permanent and 13,279 temporary, or a total of 75,988 immigrants, came into this country from Mexico alone. These people speak a language different from our own, their method of living and their ideas of government are different, and they can not well be assimilated in the numbers that now flock to this country.

For these and other reasons which I might mention I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment I have introduced, placing the same restrictions upon immigration from countries of North and South America as from those of other continents. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate may also adopt my amendment prohibiting immigration for at least five years.

I ask to have printed and lie on the table an amendment to the effect I have suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] on behalf of the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should feel guilty if I permitted the speech of my colleague, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], to pass unnoticed. He lives in a State where 99 per cent of the citizens are American born, while I live in a city where out of 137,000 babies born last year 60 per cent had foreign-born parents. In view of my home surroundings, I really feel I am competent to speak about the quality of citizenship of persons of foreign birth. I should be untrue to a great group of my constituents if I did not testify here in this public way not alone to their virtues as citizens but to their marked patriotism in times of stress.

The great east side of New York City sent thousands of Jewish boys and thousands of Italians and a lesser number of Poles into the World War. We sent into that war persons of 40 different nationalities from the city of New York. I am here to say, Mr. President, that there were no finer patriots or more outstanding Americans than those sons of ours of foreign origin.

So far as I am concerned, I think we may well afford to go on with our proposed plan as to immigration. Of course, no one in America is going to favor unlimited admission of immigrants—we all believe in restriction—but, in view of the great restriction proposed by the bill before us, there can be no question that the number of immigrants will be so limited that there can be no danger of any invasion of our native ideas of citizenship. Under this proposed plan we will bring in so small a number that hardly more than the fireside friends or relatives of those now here will be admitted.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will not be unduly influenced by what my very good friend from Georgia, whom I so greatly love, has said regarding restriction of immigration. For myself, at a proper time I shall ask that the restrictions, instead of being placed at 2 per cent on the census of 1910, be placed at 3 per cent upon the census of that year. Even on that basis, due to the fact that it is proposed to wipe out exemptions from the present quota, we shall then have a greater restriction than we have at present.

I trust, however, that the general proposals presented by the committee may prevail, and that we shall pass the bill as it has been reported here and not place a greater restriction upon the admission of men and women from the other side.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE obtained the floor.

Mr. COLT. Will the Senator from California yield to me merely that I may introduce a table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I do.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, in reply to some of the figures which were presented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], I desire to say that I think it will surprise the Senate if I merely read from a table found in the census report of 1920.

The increase in our population from 1910 to 1920 was 13,088,958. Of what was that increase made up? It was made up of native-born whites of native parentage, of 8,933,382; it was made up of native-born whites of foreign parentage, of 2,778,228; it was made up of the native-born whites of mixed parentage, of 1,010,139; and it was made up of the white foreign born of 367,209; that is, of the total increase of 13,088,958 in our population from 1910 to 1920, 8,933,382 was made up of native stock, or native whites of native parentage. In other words, the proportion which the increase in the native whites of native parentage formed of the total white increase during the last decade was 68.3 per cent. And the Census Bureau states that "the proportion which the increase in the native whites of native parentage formed of the total white increase during the last decade, 68 per cent, was probably similar to the corresponding proportion for the decade 1840-1850." In other words, the immigration fell off to such an extent from 1910 to 1920, and the mortality among the foreign born here was so great, that 8,933,382 of the increase of 13,088,958 was from native stock.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I am compelled to leave the Senate Chamber, and I assure the Senator that I shall take only just a minute to speak upon the pending amendment.

This is another step in what I believe has been determined upon as a policy on the part of many to compel every department of our Government to pay unnecessary overtime for work on Sundays and holidays, which means, in my opinion, an extra burden wherever adopted in the Government service. If this becomes a general law, applying to the Government service in the District of Columbia or in the field, I predict now that it will mean tens of millions of dollars expense to our Government in the future.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the Senator began his remarks. What is the matter to which he is referring?

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment that is now pending before the Senate is an amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] for extra compensation to immigrant inspectors and other immigration employees when, at the request of any transportation company, corporation, or individual bringing aliens to the United States, such officers or employees are required to report for extra duty or to work overtime, or on nights, Sundays, or holidays, in connection with the examination of alien passengers or crew, and so forth.

Mr. President, this amendment has grown out of action that has been taken by Congress in the past in a few cases, the latest being legislation covering the customs service employees. That will always be pointed to as a precedent, and this amendment offered to the immigration bill is the first one that has followed that precedent.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thought that provision was stricken out in conference.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not remember that it was.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I voted against it, and I thought it was stricken out in conference.

Mr. SMOOT. It was not. The Senator knows that my time has been taken up night and day with other matters, and it has been impossible for me to be on the floor much of the time of late; but if we are going to continue this policy, and if we undertake now to put this amendment upon this bill, it will be pointed to in the future as another precedent.

It is true that these transportation companies and corporations will have to pay the expense; but it is the Government employees that will receive it, and when the practice is once begun the result will be that we will not have a department of our Government but that will be paying for overtime work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not think I got the full import of the amendment. Does it propose to provide that the transportation companies shall pay the Government employees in part?

Mr. SMOOT. They are to reimburse them for the overtime. I am speaking only of the principle.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is exactly right about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I am speaking of the principle now, not that this particular amendment is going to cost the Government any money; but the one that refers to the customs service will cost the Government money, and I am sure that this amendment is offered because of that very action. This is for the immigrant inspectors. They are going to claim the same privilege that was granted to the customs employees, and that is why this amendment is offered to this bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, the Senator will remember that in the customs service they were to have extra pay for night work after 6 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, or any time.

Mr. CARAWAY. Any holidays.

Mr. SMOOT. Any holidays, or on Sunday or night.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the customs service by whom were they to be reimbursed?

Mr. SMOOT. By the Government. The Government pays that money.

Mr. McKELLAR. This has the additional vice of having outside institutions or corporations paying these additional salaries.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The amendment provides that if, at the request of a transportation company, these men are compelled to work nights or Sundays, then the transportation company will pay the Secretary of Labor. The money goes into the Government Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would mean exactly the same thing. They would have two masters instead of one. They would have as masters both the Government and the transportation company.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not want to interrupt the Senator in his time, but in my own time I should like to answer that suggestion.

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason why I call this matter to the attention of the Senate now is that every such action taken is going to be pointed to in the future in every appropriation bill carrying compensation for employees of the Government. Mr. President, I do not hesitate to say that at this time. This very principle has been presented to Congress many times in the past since I have been a Senator of the United States. Up until late years it has not been successful, and I sincerely trust that no further steps will be taken along this line.

I know, as the Senator from Pennsylvania says, that this is not going to cost the Government anything; but it is recognizing a principle. I suppose the Senator from Pennsylvania will say that that has already been recognized with the customs employees. I suppose that is true; but it was a mistake, Mr. President.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that the principle is a bad one. I should be glad to see it abolished all along the line; but it is the height of injustice to have these men work alongside of customs examiners and have the customs examiners getting this overtime and the immigrant inspectors who are working just as hard and just as long, not getting it.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us hire a few more employees, if necessary, to do this work right, Mr. President. The very words that were uttered by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be uttered time and time again when this question comes up for all of the other departments of our Government. I am not finding fault with the Senator at all. I admit that if the employees of the customs service are to be paid in this way, then so should the immigrant inspectors, because, as the Senator says, they work side by side; but this matter never would have been presented to the Senate if it had not been for the action of the Senate in relation to the customs employees. We have taken false steps and my hope is that before this Congress is through that those steps will be retraced, and the laws incorporating the principles be repealed.

Mr. President, I do not want to say anything more at this time. This amendment is not going to cost the Government

of the United States anything directly, but it is only another step toward a policy mapped out and that will be followed up until all of the employees of the Government will be given notice that "You need not work very hard. If you do not do this work in your regular hours, you can have overtime, and it will be paid for." I do not believe the time ever ought to come when the Government of the United States will not have employees enough to do its work without overtime. They will do better work in that way. If more employees are needed, let us employ them and pay them, and not pay for overtime.

I thank the Senator from California for yielding to me.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this same method of pay has been adopted by Congress, as I said, for the customs inspectors under the act of February 7, 1920. It has been provided for the meat inspectors who work in the packing houses under the act of July 24, 1919. It has been applied even to the immigrant inspectors who are inspecting aliens coming from Mexico over the land border.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understood the Senator from Utah, however, there is this distinction: Customs officials or employees are paid by the Government. Is it true that those making inspections in the packing business are paid by the Government, or are they paid by the packers?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. My understanding is that they are paid by the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the great departure which the Senator's amendment makes—I judge this from the statement made of it by the Senator from Utah—is that here the transportation companies, in effect, pay the overtime. If that is the case, all of these inspectors will be partly in the pay of the United States Government and partly in the pay of the transportation companies whose business it is to bring immigrants over here. It never in the world would do to have a divided allegiance of that kind.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No, Mr. President; I think the Senator has misunderstood the situation. At the present time, if a ship comes in on Sunday and the shipowner wants to clear his ship of passengers, he applies to the collector of the port and agrees to pay him what it will cost the Government to work his men overtime. It is all done for the benefit of the shipowner, to allow him to get his ship emptied promptly. We want to put exactly the same method into effect for the immigrant inspectors.

I agree with the Senator from Utah that if we were starting this is a new policy it would be subject to great doubt. I think we do not pay our immigrant inspectors or our customs inspectors enough. I should like to see us raise their pay and not give them the overtime; but we pay them a very meager salary now, and where they are compelled to work on Sundays or holidays or nights at the request of the steamship company it is only right that the Government should pay them overtime, and the steamship company should indemnify the Government.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that some 25 years ago, when I was a quite young chap, I was in the customs service as an inspector; and I know that even as far back as 25 years ago a policy similar to that suggested by the Senator in his amendment was at least permissible and was the custom at the port at which I was an inspector.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Ships frequently come in late at night. An inspector has been on duty all day. This is true of immigrant inspectors just the same if they have to serve the Government on night duty. The Government used to allow the companies to pay the Government the amount of overtime, and that has been the custom, I know, for a great many years. It was when I was a quite young chap in the customs service as an inspector some 25 years ago.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think the first time it was recognized in the law, though, was in the act of 1920.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand, it never has been recognized in the law that the transportation companies should pay for the overtime and the extra pay.

I join the Senator in saying that the United States Government ought to have all the inspectors necessary, and we ought to pay them what their services are worth. If we ask an un-

usual amount of work, at an unusual time of the day or night, we ought to pay them salaries commensurate with the unusual nature of their services; but the Government ought to pay the salaries. The transportation companies, which have interests antagonistic to those of the Government, should not pay any part of the salaries of the inspectors. If those men know that the transportation companies are paying a part of their salaries, it is perfectly human for them to feel exceedingly kindly toward the transportation companies. We are trying to pass an immigration restriction bill, and yet we are asked to put the officers, who make the inspections partly in the pay of the transportation companies, which want to bring in as many immigrants as possible. I do not think we ought to do that. I think it is wrong in policy and wrong in principle, and that we should not agree to this amendment. I do not think that even the customs law, which the Senator has cited, is a precedent for it, because in that case the Government pays for the overtime, and in this case the transportation companies pay for the overtime.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator did not understand me. I said that in the customhouses and in the meat-packing establishments and down on the Mexican border, in the customs department, the company pays the Government, and the Government pays the men. That is true in all those cases.

Mr. McKELLAR. The laws making such provisions should be repealed. That is absolutely wrong in principle and wrong in policy. This Government should not have employees looking to the Government for part of their pay and looking to interested companies for the other part of their pay. We can not get proper service under those circumstances.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The men are paid directly by the United States Government, and the only transaction in which the company participates is the payment into the United States Treasury.

Mr. STERLING. Would the employee have any claim at all against the transportation company?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Absolutely none. He does not get the transportation company's check. It is merely part of his own pay check, which he gets from the Government at the end of the month.

Finally, Mr. President, it is a matter of common fairness to men who to-day are working for much less than the average salary, and whose work calls for tremendous effort and strength. The present time is what they call the "closed" season in immigration, because all the quotas have expired, and every device which the wits of dishonest men can work up is being used to cheat one's way into the United States now, and these men are our only guards against that kind of cheating. This is a matter of common justice to them, and it is worth noticing that all the steamship companies, which will pay the bill in the end, have joined in asking us to pass this law, so that these men can get proper compensation.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will offer an amendment providing what is proper compensation for these employees, I will go as far as he or any other Senator will in giving not only proper compensation but even liberal compensation; but I am unwilling to say by my vote that the companies shall participate in paying our inspectors, under the conditions the Senator has just named, right now, when every trans-Atlantic transportation company is trying to get every immigrant into this country it is possible to get here, and, as the Senator says, using all kinds of devious methods to get the immigrants in. Surely, if that is the case, we should not provide a system by which the inspectors shall be partially paid by the Government and partially paid by the transportation companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE addressed the Senate. After having spoken for a few minutes,

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator yield, that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

Adams	Bursum	Couzens	Edwards
Ashurst	Cameron	Cummins	Ferris
Borah	Capper	Curtis	George
Brandegee	Caraway	Dial	Gerry
Brookhart	Colt	Dill	Glass
Bruce	Copeland	Edge	Harris

Harrison  
Hefflin  
Howell  
Johnson, Minn.  
Jones, N. Mex.  
Kendrick  
King  
McCormick  
McKellar  
McKinley

McNary  
Mayfield  
Moses  
Neely  
Norris  
Oddie  
Overman  
Pepper  
Ralston  
Ransdell

Reed, Pa.  
Robinson  
Sheppard  
Shields  
Shipstead  
Shortridge  
Simmons  
Smith  
Stanfield  
Sterling

Trammell  
Underwood  
Walsh, Mont.  
Warren  
Watson  
Weller  
Willis

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] are detained in attendance on a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate conclude its business today it take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

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

Mr. SHORTRIDGE resumed his speech, which is, entire for the day, as follows:

Mr. President, I have been under so many obligations to Members of the Senate that I hesitate to ask to have those obligations added to; but I request that Senators permit me to proceed to state, as briefly as I may, our views, without interruption. After I shall have finished I shall be only too glad to endeavor to answer any appropriate questions which Senators may be prompted to put to me.

The importance of the subject before the Senate can not be overstated. We have before us a Senate bill on the immigration question, and there is pending in the House a bill upon the same subject. If I were asked to express a preference, I would say, in a word, that I prefer to stand upon the bill pending in the House as it is rather than upon the bill pending here. The amendments which I have suggested seek to lift out of the bill pending in the House and to incorporate in the Senate committee bill certain provisions which have to do with one branch only of the great national question of immigration. The Senate committee bill contains in section 3, on page 4, a definition of the word "immigrant," and my first amendment seeks to strike from that section the word "study," which is used in connection with those who may enter into our country.

I have also offered other amendments which would exclude all aliens ineligible to citizenship, with certain specified exceptions. These amendments recognize and in no degree annul any existing treaty of commerce and navigation.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendments which I offered be at this point incorporated in my remarks.

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

The amendments are as follows:

On page 4, line 21, reject the committee amendment inserting the word "study."

On page 5, line 6, after the comma following the figure "7," strike out all down to and including the comma following the word "immigration" in line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "an alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade under and in pursuance of the provisions of a present existing treaty of commerce and navigation."

On page 15, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

"(C) No alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States unless such alien (1) is admissible as a nonquota immigrant under the provisions of section 3; or (2) unless such alien is an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of, carrying on the vocation of minister of any religious denomination, or professor of a college, academy, seminary, or university; or (3) unless such alien is an immigrant who is a bona fide student over 15 years of age and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of study at an accredited college, academy, seminary, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Secretary; or (4) unless such alien is an immigrant previously lawfully admitted to the United States who is returning from a temporary residence abroad; or (5) unless such alien is the wife or the unmarried child under 18 years of age of an immigrant admissible under subdivision (2) of paragraph 'C' of section 10 and is accompanying or following to join him."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I repeat that the importance of this subject matter can not be overstated. Of course, we have before us other problems of very great importance, problems which

are receiving and, of course, must continue to receive the earnest attention of the Senate. The overshadowing question of taxation is receiving the close attention of the Finance Committee, many of whom are engaged in that matter to-day. Manifestly we are all deeply interested in legislation affecting agriculture in its larger aspects. Nothing to any extent has been said here touching our great American industry of mining, concerning which I have introduced a bill in the hope that sooner or later, perhaps during this session, that bill might be taken up for consideration by the committee and ultimately by the Senate. The subject of reclamation comes very close to many sections of my State and of our country. Of course, every man who contemplates the Nation as one and looks abroad considers as of very great importance the subject of our shipping expressed by the term "our merchant marine."

There is another subject in which I am deeply interested, and in which practically all Senators are equally, if not more, interested—whether the one way or the other—and that is the subject of an appropriate, a just, an equitable act of legislation in respect of the soldiers of the late great tragic war. There are other and many subjects which engage the attention of the Senate.

I am not unmindful of the importance of international conferences. Of course, everybody wants peace on earth, peace at home, and peace abroad, and therefore it was quite appropriate that another resolution has been this day introduced looking toward a consummation of the prophecy or dream in which the world has indulged since time began.

I say this with the utmost respect for those who are respectively urging these various subject matters; but I hope the Senate will agree with me that there is one subject matter which in a sense rises above and is more important than any or all of those to which I have thus briefly referred, and that, I venture to say, is the subject matter immediately before the Senate; for the subject matter of immigration comes home to the very vitals, the very heart of the Nation. Therefore I hope that Senators will be patient when I arrest their attention to one phase of this great national problem.

At this stage I wish to say with all candor and all earnestness that in considering the immigration problem I divest myself of all party feeling; I cast out of my mind all party prejudice if I have any; I forget partisanship entirely; I think first and always of America; and I speak here to-day not my own feelings or conviction only, for I am privileged, I am warranted, in speaking the mature and deliberate judgment of many great national organizations and of many of the great Commonwealths of our country. I say, therefore, that, however important other matters may be, this question rises above them all, and manifestly in view of the fact that our present laws upon this subject are soon to expire it is of pressing importance and necessity that we speedily pass an appropriate immigration law.

Why have I thus troubled Senators with these many words concerning the importance of this legislation? From my point of view the importance of this legislation springs out of the form, the character of our Government. We have a republic, a representative form of government. Republics are not exempt from mutability or decay. Republics are no natural system. They are the highest form of civilized government where the rights of men are held of value. A republic is subject to internal dangers as well as foreign menaces. I have only to appeal to the learning of the Senate and ask them to look over the history of the world and see the republics that have risen, flourished, decayed, and fallen. Over the many broken monuments that were reared to liberty, reared to republics, grow to-day the moss or trailing vines.

I would impress this thought, this fact, upon those who may differ from me as to some features of this legislation, because my fervent prayer is that this Republic of ours shall live on through the long centuries to come. In order that it may live it is absolutely necessary that we maintain a certain type of citizenship. A "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—a thought originally expressed by Daniel Webster and put into those immortal words by Abraham Lincoln—such a government must receive from the people whatever makes it strong, whatever makes it righteous. Therefore, since this is the form of our Government, at the very outset of my remarks I would impress upon Senators the necessity of preserving in America a certain type of citizenship drawn from certain races of the human family. As I view it, we are vitally interested in the type of men who shall be permitted to enter into our country and permanently abide therein.

I beg Senators' pardon for saying these things, but it may be that our poor words may go elsewhere, and I would have this country recognize what we all appreciate—that our Govern-

ment was framed by wisdom; it has been guided by wisdom; it must be guarded and guided by wisdom or else all is lost. In order that it may be so guarded and guided we must seek for and have a certain type of citizenship. But above all things, in order to assure the stability, in order to make certain the future strength and righteousness of the Nation, we must strive for homogeneity among the citizenship. Therein lies the strength of a republic. As nearly as we can, we should seek for and have racial homogeneity; but assuredly we should have homogeneity in the sense of common belief, common aspirations, common devotion. We should seek to have even more than we have to-day, one people—one people not many peoples. If I may emphasize that thought as leading up to what I shall say touching one branch of immigration, we should seek to develop a people who reverence one constitution, who believe in the fundamental principles of our Government, who owe no allegiance to any other form of government or to any other existing Commonwealth, State, nation, or empire.

Very likely we shall always have in America different races of men. I do not look far enough into the future to see all the present races merged into what we might call the American, so far as blood or racial characteristics are concerned; but I am striving and we are all striving to have a nation of homogeneity in belief, in patriotism, in devotion, in aspirations, and in that sense one people.

Mr. President, of course, under our form of Government there is necessity for the highest intelligence, and therefore we are concerned with the types of men or races that shall be permitted to enter the United States and permanently abide therein. Our fathers who formed the Constitution, and who early adopted a policy, recognized that there were some races peculiarly fitted to participate in this Republic. We have had a national policy as to who should become citizens. I seek to impress this upon the minds of all: That we have had a fixed, well-known policy since 1790 to this hour as to naturalization.

The act of 1790 provided for the naturalization of "any alien being a free white person." With the amendment to that law which came after the Civil War, that has been the policy of this Republic for now over a century. In 1790 the races existed over the earth substantially where they now live, and that act of 1790 excluded from citizenship practically one-half of the human race.

I am well aware that a very distinguished lawyer, resident in New York, has recently suggested that the men of that day were not acquainted with the Orient; that they knew little of the millions who then lived, and now live, yonder beyond the setting sun; but let no supposition like that be entertained. Anyone familiar with the literature of that period, anyone acquainted with the learning of Hamilton, or of the great Judge Wilson, of Pennsylvania, or of Ben Franklin, or of Adams must know that the men of that day were not only great constructive statesmen but that they were profound historians and were familiar with the world and the people thereof. They were well aware of the existence of myriad millions of men living outside of Europe. Wherefore the law of 1790, which limited naturalization or citizenship to a well-defined portion of peoples on the earth. That has been our policy, and until very recent days there has been no one to question the wisdom of that policy.

It appeared to the men of that day, as I hope it appears to the men of this day, that here was a Republic set up, and that that Republic called for a certain type of citizenship. Therefore, they adopted, and we have adhered to, that policy. It is true that but recently an ambitious Empire has sought to disturb and break in upon that policy. A subject of the Empire of Japan sought naturalization under existing laws. That effort was defeated, and defeated by the Supreme Court in the case of Ozawa against The United States, which is reported in Two hundred and sixtieth United States reports at page 178. The opinion of the court in the case was written by a former Senator, now Mr. Justice Sutherland. The hour is such that I will not take the time to do more than refer to that decision.

The decision is, in effect, as I have indicated, that such was our policy, that such is our policy, and that under the law the subject of the Empire named was not eligible to citizenship. That decision excludes from citizenship over one-half of the human race. It excludes from citizenship not only the subjects of the Empire named, but the subjects of China, of Siam, of Java, and the Malay populations of millions who live yonder beyond the Pacific.

What I am saying is not instructive to the Senate, but perhaps it may be well for me to emphasize it, because our position is that our naturalization policy should continue. If we may

judge the future by the past, then I undertake to say that we should continue to adhere to this century-old policy of naturalization. I would be guided, as Patrick Henry said yonder in Richmond, "by the lamp of experience," for, to quote his immortal words, "I know of no way of judging the future but by the past." Applying that method of looking into the future, I am saying to the Senate to-day that we should not depart from this policy of naturalization.

The time may come in the far remote future when others are here in our places; the time may come in the providence of God in the far distant future when other ideas may be acceptable or other policies desirable; but as the world is now constituted, as the races of men are now distributed over the earth, it would be, in my judgment, unwise to change this policy. Why do I emphasize that thought? It is because an effort has been made to break in upon it, which effort, I repeat, was defeated in the case to which I have referred. I submit to the thoughtful men in the Senate, men charged with guarding this Nation and who by virtue of their learning are supposed to be able to look into the future, that we should not change that policy and that, running side by side with it, we should adopt a policy of immigration in harmony with it.

Under the present law, Mr. President, the oriental, as I shall speak of those great groups and races of men, may not acquire citizenship of the United States; he can not become a citizen. I love to believe that to be a citizen of the United States is to be, to paraphrase, greater than a king. Citizenship of the United States is a great privilege; to be a citizen is to have a voice in the making and in the interpretation and in the execution of the laws of this Republic. It is a great privilege. Under our existing law no oriental can enjoy that great privilege.

Is that wise? I think it is. And if it be wise, why should we admit into this country for permanent residence people who may never become citizens of the Republic? That is the question; and that question embraces, so to speak, the amendments which I have offered to this bill.

There are some questions which to my mind seem so simple as not to require argument in their support; and yet I hasten to say that other minds, perhaps profounder than mine, entertain a different view; wherefore I will add a few words, I hope in justification of my position that it is unwise to admit into our country to reside permanently, in mass, races of people who may never become citizens of the Republic.

There are racial reasons why that is so. There are certain races which will not assimilate. They are foreign to each other. There are certain laws of Nature which man can not suspend, and there are certain laws of Nature which it is not desirable for man to undertake to suspend. There are different races of men, with different characteristics, with distinct and separate views of life and of death. There are different races of men upon the earth who, living apart, may live in peace and prosperity and happiness, but when brought together to live on the same soil the result is friction, hostility, trouble, sometimes growing into civil contention or civil war. There are different races where there should not be social intercourse or intermarriage.

When we speak of the oriental it is with kindness, with the utmost sympathy, certainly with not a thought of offending or of doing injury. I think of them, if I may humbly say so, as the great ambassador of God, Saint Paul, spoke of them; but we are a different people, and it is not desirable that we should undertake to intermingle by way of intermarriage. We do not want a hybrid people born of these essentially distinct, separate races. Therefore, Mr. President, it is not racially or socially desirable that we should introduce into our country, or permit to come here and permanently abide, vast numbers of a foreign, alien people, such as the oriental.

The strength of a nation—not to speak of its progress, its honor, its glory—the very strength of a nation lies in the oneness of its people. I have only to invite the thoughts of men to travel over the earth and see those races which have maintained their nationality, their institutions, and it will be perceived that those nations which were unified, knit together have survived, while those made up of divergent interests, divergent races, hostile races, unsympathetic races have either fallen by virtue of dangers from within or have become an easy prey to dangers from without. So that from a social or a racial point of view it is not desirable to admit into our Republic a people or any peoples who will not assimilate or can not assimilate or who may never become citizens of the Republic.

There is another reason, Mr. President, which appeals to me very strongly. For economic reasons we are opposed to the coming into America of the oriental—for economic reasons. I

am not disposed nor is it necessary to go into the details. I state broadly that the American father, the American mother, the American child can not successfully compete with the oriental, with the races which our present laws deprive of citizenship. But what races are they? I have indicated in a general way. They are, generally speaking, the races which lie beyond the Pacific, in the islands of the Pacific, and make up practically one-half of the human race. And right here, lest I forget, speaking as I am without manuscript, let me say that our position is not in hostility to any one group of orientals. We have not singled out one group. My proposed amendments apply to all the oriental races. If I am obliged to direct attention to any one particular group, it is because that group as among them all is the only one that is protesting or objecting to this legislation. Our view applies to them all. That should be understood, and I hope it will be understood by those here present and those who may take an interest in this day's business.

I say we are opposed to oriental immigration because the American father, mother, child, with our type and standard of life and living, can not successfully compete with them. That proposition is so easy of demonstration that I content myself with the mere statement of it. It is manifestly so. It is a fact and not a theory.

There was a man who had the rare faculty of stating an economic or a historical truth in such epigrammatic phrase as to plant the thought forever in the minds of a people. That man was Grover Cleveland. There was another man, too, who could utter a great truth in an epigrammatic form, and that was the man whom I never cease to praise, Andrew Jackson. I am very glad, the thought coming into my mind, to say that the people of North Carolina and other States are now happily doing what Andrew Jackson said should be done, namely, plant the factory alongside of the cotton field; for in that sense he was a protectionist, believing that the factory planted alongside of the cotton field would add to the prosperity of the State, as we know it does and is doing at this hour.

I content myself for the moment, Mr. President, with the statement that according to our standard, the American standard, we can not in California, Oregon, Washington, or in any State where the oriental enters in considerable number, compete with him. Is there anyone who wishes us to engage in that impossible competition? As for me, my whole philosophy in respect to tariff legislation, in respect to immigration, is based upon the fundamental proposition that we must uphold our type and standard of life and living; and when I use the words "American labor," I think of labor in its multifarious phases—on the farm, in the city, in the forest, on the railroad, on the ship, wherever men toil, wherever women toil, wherever children toil. I think of them and I know, and every one should know, that according to our standard we can not, we should not, be asked to compete with peoples of a lower standard. Therefore I am speaking not alone for my State.

I trust my love goes beyond the boundaries of California. I am here this day speaking not only for California, but I am warranted in saying that I am speaking for the great American Federation of Labor, a federation made up of millions of men and women, laboring men and women, patriotic men and women, men and women who do the hard toil of the world in our country. This great organization of American labor has again and again in formal resolutions indorsed the position which I am this day taking, namely, that we should exclude from America races that are not eligible to citizenship.

I will not pause here to read their formal resolutions, but I invite the attention of thoughtful Senators to the last utterance of the American Federation of Labor at its convention held in Portland, Oreg., where again it expressed its deliberate, matured opinion and judgment in favor of the exclusion of all aliens ineligible to citizenship.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Then, as I understand, the Senator does not agree with the position taken by Secretary Hughes, that we ought to extend the same quota to Japan that we extend to the other nations?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. What Secretary Hughes feared was lest by this legislation we offend against existing treaties. We have avoided that altogether in the bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. He recommended that if we adopted the census of 1890 in fixing the quota, Japan would have only a small number, probably a couple of hundred, and he recommended that that be done rather than to exclude all aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, as is being argued by the Senator,

My question to the Senator is, Does he agree with Secretary Hughes in that recommendation?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Of course I do not; but I should add, in justice to the discussion, that when that suggestion was first made by the Secretary of State, it was made before the House committee had amended the bill so as not to interfere with or effect to any degree the existing treaty with Japan of 1911. I think, as I said the other day, that the Secretary of State will now see clearly that we do not propose in this bill in any wise to modify, annul, or disregard the provisions of the treaty of 1911.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator yield to a question?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Was it not very plainly stated in the letter of Secretary Hughes to Congressman JOHNSON on February 8 that the violation of the treaty was but one of his reasons, and that the reason he most strongly urged was that a statutory exclusion would be deeply resented by the Japanese people, and was unnecessary?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. He may have so stated, but if he did, he was entirely wrong. Moreover, this contemplated legislation is not intended to be and it should not be regarded as in any sense offensive to this particular empire. It is not aimed at that empire, but with great respect for our Secretary of State, or for anyone else, while I would not give just cause for offense, still, if in the exercise of our acknowledged right as an independent Nation we think it wise and in the interest of America to pass this law, I am not going to be deterred from favoring it lest it might give some offense to some particular foreign people. I am confining my remarks to-day entirely to the Oriental phase of this question, but as I shall point out in a few moments, this bill recognizes the existing treaty with Japan of 1911. I shall then take up briefly the discussion as to whether it violates an existing so-called agreement, sometimes spoken of as the "Gentlemen's agreement," between this country and Japan.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is that gentlemen's agreement? No-body has ever seen it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am going to endeavor to explain it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the Senator passes that subject, will he yield?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask this question: Will the Senator explain what effect will follow if the amendment he has offered shall be adopted?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I will.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many Japanese come in under the present arrangement, and how many would come in in the event the amendments offered by the Senator were put into the law?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. At this point I can not answer your question in a few words. The amendments which I have offered amount to provisions that are now in the bill pending in the House, and if those amendments are agreed to, the treaty of 1911 between us and Japan will be fully recognized. That treaty is a treaty of commerce and navigation. There is, indeed, no limit to the number of traders who may come. All international traders, of course, may come; students may come, travelers may come, ministers of the gospel may come—

Mr. McKELLAR. May they all stay indefinitely?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am speaking of the treaty of 1911, and I have not a copy of that treaty before me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I remember about all these.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. By the amendment which we put in, in addition to all who may come in under the treaty of 1911—and there is no limit to the number who may come pursuant to the provisions of that treaty—

Mr. McKELLAR. In a temporary way?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Precisely. We permit students to come. In addition to any who may come under the treaty of 1911, we permit students to come to attend our colleges and universities; we permit ministers of their religion to come, together with their families, and we especially provide that those who were here lawfully, and are now temporarily absent, may return, and, having come here lawfully, of course may remain. So when I come to that point in my remarks it will be made perfectly plain that the objections which were some days ago suggested by the Secretary of State are completely met.

While I am not, of course, authorized to speak his mind—I do not know his mind—still I think all Senators will agree with me that his first objection has been fully met, for he was concerned, as are all of us, lest we, a great, powerful nation, should be violating its pledged word, a treaty of the Nation. I was concerned about it, he was concerned, and therefore the proposed amendment, which recognizes in its full scope and its

full meaning the existing treaty with Japan. I repeat myself—but I do so in order to make it perfectly plain—in addition to those entitled to come pursuant to treaty we also permit these other classes to enter and abide in this country, students, ministers and their families, and those lawfully here but temporarily absent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator enlighten me about another matter?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says that students and ministers of the Japanese church and traders may come and may stay ad libitum. Do I understand there is no limit put upon those three classes at all, and their families? Would not that let in a very large body of men and women?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If it would be of any assistance to the Senator, I have the language of the treaty here. It is quoted by Secretary Hughes in his letter.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I should be glad to quote the words of the treaty. Undoubtedly there is no limit as to the number of those admissible under that treaty. That was one of the reasons why former President Roosevelt was so indignant over that treaty of 1911, as I will point out in a moment. There is no limit set as to the number, but the language of the treaty of 1911 between us and Japan provides:

The citizens or subjects of each of the high contracting parties shall have liberty to enter, travel, and reside in the territories of the other; to carry on trade, wholesale and retail; to own or lease and occupy houses, manufactories, warehouses, and shops; to employ agents of their choice; to lease land for residential and commercial purposes; and generally to do anything incident to or necessary for trade upon the same terms as native citizens or subjects, submitting themselves to the laws and regulations there established.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under that provision, how many came here from Japan in 1923?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I have not the figures before me.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I can tell the Senator, if he wishes.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I would be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The number of immigrant Japanese was 5,652. The number of nonimmigrant Japanese was 5,919, a total of 11,571. The emigrant Japanese—that is, those returning from this country—were 2,844 of the immigrant class and 8,328 of the nonimmigrant class, or a total of 11,172.

Mr. McKELLAR. Who went back?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Who went back. So we gain in Japanese for the year by immigration and emigration, net, 399 persons.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the present law?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Under the present law.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suppose by "immigrant class" the Senator means those who came over for the purpose of residing here?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; and by "nonimmigrant class" I mean tourists, students, government officials, and persons of that sort.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. As to those figures, I shall have something to say before I conclude. The fact of the matter is, answering the question of the Senator from Tennessee, there is no limit set to the number who may come for the purposes specifically set down in the treaty, and it is very difficult, indeed, to determine how many come under the treaty and how many have come under this so-called "gentleman's agreement." Nor is it easy to ascertain how many have smuggled themselves in by all sorts of subterfuges, on board ship or across the border. Before I conclude I think I can remove from the mind of any Senator any thought that the bill which we propose will violate this treaty.

Mr. McKELLAR. Since the Senator has been interrupted, may I ask him this: About 10,500 came over last year; to what extent will the Senator's amendment, if adopted, lessen that number?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It is very hard to answer that with accuracy, for this reason: That it is quite impossible to tell how many could or would come during a following year, under or pursuant to this treaty of commerce and navigation, because there is no limit set to the number who may come. Secondly, inasmuch as we propose to admit students who come to attend our colleges, of course I do not know how many students will seek admittance. We propose to admit ministers or priests of their religion, whether it be Shintoism or Confucianism or other religions, and I do not know how many ministers or priests will come. As to the others which we propose to admit, I do not know accurately how many who were here legally have

now gone abroad and are in Japan. They, however, if originally here legally, under this bill would be permitted to enter.

Right in that connection, it is a notorious fact, which no man with any regard for his reputation will dispute, that there are thousands—ten, twelve, probably fifteen thousand now—Japanese born in California, and therefore citizens of the United States, who have returned to and are in Japan being educated, and being citizens of this country under our Constitution they, of course, may return. How many will return the coming year, I do not know.

Mr. President, I have indulged in a great many words in regard to citizenship. I have suggested that it was unwise for us to have here in our country vast masses of people who could not become citizens. But see how the problem is complicated and the danger increased when we remember that the children of these ineligible are citizens, the parent not a citizen, owing allegiance to a foreign country, the child a citizen, owing allegiance to the United States of America.

I will speak of that a little later on, but we wish to avoid that; we wish to stop it, and the time has come to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does one of the Senator's amendments deal with that question? Would it prevent the child of a Japanese alien from becoming an American citizen?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. No; we are not dealing with that problem in this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was just wondering how the Senator was going to get at it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It could only be approached by way of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should think so.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That is the only way in which the problem may be approached.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many children are born of Japanese aliens each year in California?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I have the accurate figures, which I will give the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from California will put those figures into the RECORD?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; I will put them into the RECORD. I suggest to the Senate that there is presented a situation which is charged with unrest, with friction, and with danger. Our Secretary of State in the performance of his duty, of course, was particularly concerned with this legislation. As the bill was first introduced in the other House—I beg Senators to note this, if they will—it did not contain the present provision covered by my amendment, which respects fully and unequivocally the treaty of 1911, so that neither Japan nor China nor Siam nor any of the nations of the earth can object to our action if we adopt this measure upon any suggestion that it is violative of any treaty of commerce and navigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand, there are about 100,000 Japanese in California, are there not?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. And to what extent have they increased in the last 10 years?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. We claim that they have practically doubled.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were about 50,000 of them 10 years ago, and there are now about 100,000?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Fully.

Mr. McKELLAR. That includes both those who are born in this country of Japanese parents and Japanese immigrants into the country?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That includes the present Japanese population in California, which, in round figures, amounts to 100,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the laws of California the State does not permit the Japanese to own land?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. We do not for agricultural purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, in California are the Japanese permitted to own land for any purpose?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. They may, under the treaty of commerce and navigation of 1911, "own or lease and occupy houses, manufacturing, store ground, or ground for warehouses and shops" to "carry on trade, wholesale and retail."

Mr. McKELLAR. And for their residences also?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; I suppose so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I had an idea—I do not recall very accurately where I got it—that the California laws prohibited Japanese from becoming owners in fee simple of any land. Am I now to understand that the prohibition applies only to agricultural land?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Turning away from other propositions in order that I may answer the Senator from Tennessee and

state the facts, I will say that California claimed that an alien had those rights and only those rights which are guaranteed by a treaty. That, as we lawyers know and as the courts have held, is a sound legal proposition. Therefore we in California claimed that under the treaty of 1911, *ex industria*, our country had not granted the right to own or to lease land for agricultural purposes. We passed a law in California to that effect.

Mr. McKELLAR. When was that law passed?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It was passed two or three years ago. By that law we provided that the Japanese should not own or lease agricultural land. We contended that they could not, through subterfuge or indirection, defeat the law by means of what are called "crop contracts." Of course, that law was questioned and cases were instituted testing the law. Those cases went on up to the Supreme Court here in Washington, and but recently, during the present session of Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States in three decisions, written by Mr. Justice Butler, upheld our law, which provides that a Japanese can not own agricultural lands; that a Japanese can not lease lands for agricultural purposes. And the Supreme Court upheld our contention that the law as to owning and leasing could not, by indirection, be violated or defeated by way of so-called "crop contracts." Such were the rulings of the Supreme Court in these cases: Webb, attorney general of California, et al., against O'Brien et al., decided November 19, 1923; Parterfield et al. against Webb et al., decided November 12, 1923. I take great comfort in those decisions. They can be invoked by the good men and women of Tennessee; they can be invoked by the good men and women of Maryland or of North Carolina.

Those great decisions, which I have here, lay down a vital principle of law under our system of government, and that is that as to aliens whose rights are measured by a treaty, where the treaty does not give affirmatively the right to own land within the State, the State of Tennessee or the State of Maryland or the State of North Carolina, as in the case of the State of California, can determine that the alien shall not own or lease land—for example, as in the case of this treaty—for agricultural purposes. In other words, the decision holds that it is competent for the State, under our system of reserved rights, to determine who shall own its land. That is a vastly important proposition. We fought for it in California immediately for ourselves, but the people in other States can invoke the decision, as, perhaps, they may some day be called upon to invoke it.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from California just one question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. How much of the entire area of California did the Japanese acquire before the statute to which the Senator has referred was enacted?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In point of area—having in mind the vast extent of California—it might be said to be small, but in effect it is great, for the Japanese acquired land either by purchase or lease in the fertile valleys, in the fertile sections of our State. Before the debate is concluded I shall beg to put into the RECORD a tabulated statement showing where the Japanese acquired the land, by purchase or by lease, and to what extent they cultivated it.

Of course, we have a State of 700 and more miles in length, a thousand miles of seacoast, and two or three hundred miles in width, with mountains and valleys. The Japanese people, for whom when they are at home I have admiration and good will, are an agricultural people. They entered into the fertile sections of our State. Perhaps the cupidity of some of our own people invited them as well as their own desires. However, they became congested in sections of our State, and hence the friction, the agitation, the legislation, the litigation, and the decisions—decisions of vital and far-reaching importance to every State in the Union.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator do they remain segregated or do they intermarry with the white or colored races of California?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. They remain segregated. They do not intermarry. They remain foreign, alien. I can not too strongly emphasize that fact. The law of the State of California, as I presume is true of the law of the State of Tennessee, prohibits the intermarriage of these races.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was just going to ask the Senator a question along that line. California has a law prohibiting



the intermarriage of Japanese and either white or negro citizens?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes, I referred a moment ago to the phrase of a great man for whom I have for many years entertained a profound admiration, and that is Grover Cleveland. I may have differed with him on some questions, but I was with him on many others. I shall never forget what he, through Mr. Secretary of State Olney, said when England reached out her mighty paw to grasp a portion of Venezuela. Nor shall I ever forget that great utterance of Grover Cleveland when he said that "a condition, not a theory, confronts us." He spoke as I would speak concerning this oriental question as it affects California. The condition is there; the hostility is there; the profound feelings of our people are there. Whether they are justified or not some may question, though I shall hope to show that we are justified.

I should add that I am not speaking my individual views alone; I have stated and I repeat that the American Federation of Labor again and yet again by formal resolution has declared its position; the American Legion, made up of so many thoroughbred, 100 per cent Americans, in their convention lately held in San Francisco, as in earlier conventions, declared their position to be as I am stating our position to be. The National Grange, made up of many men and women from all the States of our Union, have formally taken the same position. I do not mention the many patriotic State associations which have taken action on this question, but these three great national organizations, the American Federation of Labor, the American Legion, the National Grange, all appreciate what I am poorly stating, namely, that inasmuch as these people can never become citizens, inasmuch as they are alien in tongue, in instincts, in habits, in mode of life, are ineligible to citizenship, it is undesirable that they enter this country to abide en masse in any State of the Union. That was the position, as I shall endeavor to show you in a moment—the unbending, the publicly expressed position of our fighting President, Theodore Roosevelt.

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

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask what percentage of the citizenship of California, irrespective of party, would the Senator say was opposed to Japanese immigration?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I undertake to say that the overwhelming sentiment of California is in favor of the position we are this day taking. That that is so in Oregon the learned Senators from that State will vouch; that it is so in the State of Washington the Senators from that State will give evidence; that is so as to Arizona, as to Nevada, as to Colorado, and as to Idaho, in fact as to all the Western States that have come into direct contact with this oriental problem.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator one further question?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, then I will gladly have him ask me another question. I desire, however, to answer his last question a little further. The opposition comes from three sources, with which I shall deal with the utmost respect. A certain opposition comes from good Christian men and women; another opposition comes, as to some phases of this question, from certain commercial interests; and a third opposition comes from a certain type of men who seem to love other countries more than they love their own. Perhaps that is too strong a term; so I will say a third opposition comes from men who seem to exalt other countries, who are concerned with the sensibilities of other countries, who are timid and alarmed lest other countries might be offended. But the great mass of the men and women of California, of Oregon, of Washington, and of the West are in favor of the exclusion of all aliens ineligible to citizenship, with these specified and many exceptions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator to give us the figures as to about how many Japanese were smuggled in from Canada or from Mexico. Have any figures ever been compiled on that phase of the question? I have great sympathy for the position the Senator has taken, but I want to get the facts.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Of course, it is impossible to state accurately how many have been smuggled in, because they come in surreptitiously, and so we can not, unless they are immediately discovered, ascertain the number thus coming in. What we are concerned about is the number who were there, if you please, in 1900, the number who were there in 1910, the number who were there in 1920, and the number who are probably there as of this year, 1924; and I propose to show that there has been a steady increase in the total oriental population of the State.

The steady increase is due, of course, to those who come in as traders under the treaty. It is due to those who have been permitted to come in under this so-called "gentlemen's agreement." It is due to those who have smuggled their way in, and of course it is in part due to natural causes, namely, the birth rate—and the Japanese are very prolific.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON. Permit me to ask the Senator whether or not there is, in his knowledge, an effort being made to colonize the Japanese in Mexico, or if no effort of that kind is being made, whether or not it is being done?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I think I am warranted in answering the Senator by saying that there is an effort on behalf of the Japanese Government, for reasons perhaps good to them, to colonize Mexico. We have some statistics as to the numbers who have been permitted to go to Mexico. We know that they do not remain in Mexico; they smuggle themselves across our southern border into California, Arizona, and other of the American States.

Mr. WATSON. That was the question I wanted to ask the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield further?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Senator anything like a definite idea as to the number of the Japanese who have thus come into the United States?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I do not know that we could possibly state the number who have come in surreptitiously. Of course, as to those who come in, presumably legally, there is a record of their number, but it is otherwise with those who smuggle in.

In that connection, Mr. President, we read in the daily papers that the Japanese are being welcomed into Brazil and Argentina, South America. That may be so.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, is it not true that several countries have absolutely excluded them?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Australia excluded them. British Columbia, in effect, has done so. I know of no nation that welcomes them. If there be such, let them go thither; but I know of no nation to-day, unless it be Argentina and Brazil, or unless it be Mexico, that welcomes them.

Mr. OVERMAN. How about Canada?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Canada does not welcome them.

Once for all, Mr. President—and I repeat it, that all may understand our position—of all the nations or races which are to be excluded by this law there is but one protesting; wherefore we are obliged to direct our attention to that particular nation. We do not invite that discussion. It is urged upon us.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is Japan?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That is Japan.

The first objection is advanced more by our own people than by them. It is said that we violate the treaty obligations of this Republic. So, once for all, that the most stupid or perverse-minded man elsewhere may understand it—every Senator understands now that we do not, but in order that the most stupid or perverse-minded man elsewhere may understand it—let me say that we have proposed specifically to recognize the existing treaty of commerce and navigation with Japan. Whatever rights are guaranteed to Japan under that treaty are to remain. We are not disposed to question the terms of the treaty. There it is. This Nation has set its hand to it. There is the treaty, and there let it be, and let it be observed. So let us have done with this puerile discussion elsewhere that we propose to trample upon an American treaty. Far from it. We lift it up; we stand by it; and we are only anxious that Japan shall stand by it and observe it.

But there is another objection urged by those who seem to be so concerned over the sensitiveness of other peoples and who argue as though we had no feelings. With the utmost respect for all nations on earth, I have the highest regard for my own; and I would have gentlemen elsewhere understand that I am thinking, always thinking, of the men and the women and the children of America; and, in so far as I can shape the laws of this country, they shall be shaped with first regard to the welfare of the men and women and children of America.

I wish other nations well. May they prosper! God grant them peace and happiness! And right here let me say that this particular Empire of Japan, a little swollen up with pride, almost unto bursting with vanity, should pause and remember that she has done and is doing exactly what we propose to do.

In her wisdom Japan excludes the Chinese from Japan. Why? She has a perfect right to do so. It is an acknowledged right of all sovereign nations; and Japan wisely has taken this course, for she has statesmen, she has men who think of Japan. They love her. They enthrone her in their hearts, and her statesmen say that the Japanese can not successfully compete with the Chinese. Therefore the Japanese exclude the Chinese from Japan, and for the same reasons, Mr. President, the Japanese statesmen exclude the Koreans from Japan.

Korea is ancient, gray with the centuries, dominated by Japan, under the control of Japan, in a political sense a part of Japan; yet Japan does not permit the Korean laborer to come and permanently reside in Japan and for economic if not political reasons. Wherefore, in all kindness, respecting her, admiring her, we are saying that it does not become her statesmen to complain of us when we are doing exactly what she has done, and is doing, in respect of immigration.

Another thing, Mr. President in that connection: Toward Japan this Nation meditates no harm. We are not conspiring against that nation. We do not contemplate invading her. We do not envy her. We do not hate her. We do not covet any of her possessions. We would have her prosper and develop in the arts and sciences. She has a noble history. We have been her friend. We are asking nothing in return for what we have done, but we have been her friend. We would have the most cordial relations with her—international relations, trade relations. We would invite her students to our universities and schools. We are not averse to her ministers and her priests coming here to minister to the Japanese resident. We are not opposed to her because of her views touching life or death or the hereafter. We have no ambitions which run athwart her if she is peacefully inclined. We have no designs upon her. We are simply thinking of our own country and legislating along lines which we are convinced make for the peace and the prosperity of both nations. We wish to check the increase of a foreign, alien people, who can not become citizens of the United States, and whose presence provokes domestic trouble and may cause national estrangement.

Now, Mr. President, called elsewhere and sorry to have taken up so much time, I should like to conclude my remarks in the morning, if I may, under the rules of the Senate. Can that be done if that is agreeable?

Mr. McKINLEY and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois. Mr. McKINLEY addressed the Senate. After having spoken for a few minutes,

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am yielding to the Senator. I really did not yield the floor. I was about to ask the Chair a moment ago whether I could not suspend for the purpose of accommodating the Senator from Illinois and resuming in the morning. I did not wish to yield the floor entirely.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I understand that there are other Senators who wish to speak briefly before adjournment on other matters; and therefore I ask that after our recess at noon to-morrow the Chair will recognize the Senator from California to permit him to finish his remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that when the immigration bill is taken up again the Senator from California shall be entitled to the floor. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, is it the purpose of those in charge of the bill to try to finish it to-morrow?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No, Mr. President; I do not believe that is possible.

Mr. HEFLIN. There are some of us who would like to say something on the bill. I do not know how long the Senator from California is going to speak. He has spoken at length this afternoon, I understand. I am always delighted to hear the Senator, but I rather hate to give way to him for the whole day if he should choose to use it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I can assure the Senator that I shall not use more than half or three-quarters of an hour to-morrow; and the time consumed this afternoon has been due to the many interruptions that I have permitted in discussion with friends.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair hear any objection to the request?

Mr. WILLIS. I reserve the right to object, Mr. President. If I can get the floor, I will state why.

Mr. McKINLEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will yield, I do not object; but a little while ago the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] announced it as his purpose to address the Senate to-morrow morning immediately after the Senate meets, and I suggest that we ought not to enter into any unanimous-consent agreement that is going to embarrass us here. I think that the statement of the Senator from California only amounts to a notice, anyhow. There will be no difficulty about it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In point of truth, Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor. In point of fact, I started to address the President of the Senate, and my voice rather lowered when my friend from Illinois rose and commenced to speak. Now, that is the fact, I had not yielded the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the junior Senator from Ohio, I think the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] would be entitled to the floor first on to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair may say that no one is entitled to the floor when the Senate resumes the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. It has been the custom, though, when a Senator announces that he will speak on a certain day, for other Senators to yield to him and let him make his speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California has just said that he has not finished his speech, and therefore the Chair assumes that he will be on even terms with the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thought the Senator from California had yielded, because I knew the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHBURST] wanted to get the floor. I thought the Senator from California had yielded, and the Senator from Illinois commenced a speech, and the Senator from California seemed to acquiesce in that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was of the same opinion, and recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I do not want to multiply words. I yielded to one Senator after another here for an hour or more to-day, so that I did not commence the discussion until approaching 3 o'clock; and then during the discussion I was glad to yield to various Senators, so that in point of truth I had not quite concluded, nor had I yielded the floor. I knew, however, that the Senator from Illinois wished to speak, as he had requested of me, and I was about to say to the President that I should be glad to resume in the morning when the Senate met; and hence the misunderstanding.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, in view of the statement of the Senator that he will not speak over half an hour on to-morrow, I have no objection to letting the Senator from Nevada follow him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, then, hears no objection, and it is so ordered; and the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

#### MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. McKINLEY resumed and concluded his speech, which is, entire, as follows:

Mr. President, 30 years ago I made a business visit to Florence, Ala., which is located on the north bank of the Tennessee River at the Muscle Shoals Dam site. At that time they were expecting a Government appropriation of \$20,000,000 with which to build a dam at Muscle Shoals. In anticipation of that good fortune they had started a town boom, had built foundations of factories that were to be, had several miles of cast-iron pipe strung along the roads to the river, and were showing desirable town and factory sites to northerners. By edict President Wilson made part of their dream come true in 1918, when \$100,000,000 was spilled in there, \$10,000,000 coming from the taxpayers of the South and \$90,000,000 from the taxpayers of the North.

The armistice cruelly stopped the spill. Now it is desired to expend \$68,000,000 additional, to be provided by the taxpayers in the same proportion—10 per cent to the South and 90 per cent to the North, and of which, by the way, Illinois pays 10 per cent, New York 25 per cent, and Indiana about 6 per cent—and with the \$68,000,000 complete the electric development of the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals. Mr. Ford in his offer requires the United States to provide the cash to pay for and install electric machinery and water wheels to develop 850,000 horsepower.

Can you blame the citizens and owners of real estate within 20 miles of Muscle Shoals in every direction for being very

anxious to have the taxpayers of the United States develop their property? I do not blame them.

I do not blame them for going to New York and securing the services and the \$200,000 said to have been expended in promoting the propaganda and fooling the farmers all over the United States.

If one owns a thousand-acre farm worth \$50 per acre and can change that into a thousand acres of manufacturing sites worth \$10,000 per acre, who can blame them? Now that the New York speculators have gotten in there, there are probably many such landowners; but let us take one gentleman down there to illustrate how the farmers in far-off Illinois or Dakota have been worked. Let us just take Mr. Blank, a very fine gentleman, of old family, a man who comes of governor's stock, who stands very high in the State among the farmers, and owns a very large plantation right on the spot where the \$10,000 per acre factory sites will be located if Congress gives this \$168,000,000 investment to Mr. Ford.

Now, it happens that this gentleman owning this 1,000 acres of \$50 land, or 1,000 acres of \$10,000 per acre factory sites, is or was president of the Alabama branch of the American Farm Bureau. He is a bright man, his head works clearly, and when there is money in sight so do the heads of the New York land speculators. They put their heads together and they say: "Here is a chance to build on this spot a great manufacturing city of a million inhabitants right here at this power site. If we can keep this power here, our land for 20 miles either way will become very valuable. We do not want the Government to own this power and distribute it in every direction to the towns and cities within 300 miles of here. We want to hold it all here. Here is the Alabama Power Co., which has water and steam power stations at other points and distributes power all over Alabama. We do not want them to get this power, because they will not build a city here, but they will send the power out to Mobile and Birmingham, Ala.; Memphis, Knoxville, and Chattanooga, Tenn.; Atlanta and Augusta, Ga.; Charlotte and Winston-Salem, N. C.; Huntington, W. Va.; Louisville, Ky.; Evansville and Terre Haute, Ind.; Cairo and East St. Louis, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; Little Rock and Helena, Ark.; and all of Mississippi. All these cities are within a 300-mile circle of Muscle Shoals. They even offer to invest their own cash, instead of having the United States taxpayers provide the \$68,000,000. That will not help us sell our \$50 per acre land at \$10,000 per acre.

Then the happy thought strikes the president of the Alabama American Farm Bureau. "Ha! I have it. We will tell the farmers of the United States that we are going to furnish them fertilizers. Of course, we won't tell the farmers of New York, Illinois, Indiana, and the Dakotas that on account of freight rates we could not ship fertilizers to their States. We will just get them excited and urge them to bear down upon their Members of Congress to vote for Ford."

What is easier than for the president of the Alabama Farm Bureau to pass a resolution through his bureau calling on all members to write their Congressmen and Senators to vote to give Muscle Shoals to Ford. They do not add, "In order that he may build a manufacturing town of a million people at Muscle Shoals." How easy, then, to send this with a specious and taking circular to the farm bureau in every State and ask them to go through the form of passing it and writing to their Congressmen. Well, that has been done, and well done.

When the Muscle Shoals schemers had gotten this all working right, then they began to look around for the angel with sufficient funds who could use their real estate and build a great manufacturing city of a million people. They did not dare organize a hundred-million-dollar corporation to do it, because when the word "corporation" is mentioned some folks raise their heads and their voices and shout "Wall Street." They said, "We must get some very rich man to do this. There are only two now in this country rich enough—Rockefeller and Ford—Rockefeller is too old; is connected with Wall Street, and, besides, he has already given away most of his wealth for public health and improvement. Ford has his; he does not believe in giving it away. He has an income of \$200,000,000 per year that the farmers and workers of the world are giving him. Let us get him." And they did—but at Ford's own terms. He says, in substance, "Yes; I will build at Muscle Shoals a manufacturing town, provided you will give me \$3,500,000 in cash which you received for a power plant sold by the Government, located upon property of Alabama Power Co., 90 miles from Muscle Shoals; that you give me \$500,000 of platinum metal which you have stored in the New York Subtreasury; that you give me a large hotel and 307 residences, with baths, running water, electric lights, and all conveniences; some of the houses costing \$8,000 to \$10,000, and located upon about 4,000 acres of

land, and you must keep these in repair for 100 years; that you give me a steam plant that cost about \$17,000,000, and two nitrate plants that cost about \$35,000,000. But before I will accept this property, which cost the United States over \$100,000,000, you must collect in taxes from the people of the United States about \$68,000,000 more, and complete for me two dams, and equip same with water and electric machinery that will generate 850,000 horsepower. After you have done all this and turned over to me free of taxes that property costing about \$168,000,000, I will pay you one million cash and give you my note for four million additional, due over a period of years. I will also pay 4 per cent interest upon the \$68,000,000, but will pay you no interest upon the \$100,000,000. You must give me all this for 100 years, and when the 100 years is up you must let me continue to use as much power as I am then using—which, of course, would be all of it, making the lease perpetual. I must pay no taxes, and you reserve no right to control my rates should I decide to sell any power to others. You must keep this property in repair—which the Army engineers estimate would cost perhaps \$227,000 per year—and I will pay you \$58,000 per year. Otherwise, I promise nothing for this \$168,000,000, except I will use 100,000 horsepower out of the 850,000 horsepower you give me, to make nitrates to sell to the farmers, provided they will buy it at a price that will pay me 8 per cent profit. If my manufacturing cost is so much that you can buy nitrate from Chile or the by-product from coke ovens at a price lower than that at which I can make it and get a profit of 8 per cent, then I make none and pay nothing for your privilege of giving me all of this property."

That, Mr. President, concisely is Mr. Ford's proposition. Of course, he says the Government can take and use the property in case it is needed in war time, but that right the United States has under war powers, but in that case he provides he must be paid by the Government.

Oh, yes; I forgot; he does give more, for out of the 850,000 horsepower the taxpayers give him he promises to give 300 horsepower, if needed, to move lock machinery. He agrees to make 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen a year and sell it to farmers, if—if they pay him 8 per cent profit. Otherwise there is nothing in the agreement to prevent him selling the nitrogen to foreign governments to make powder.

The bill is very cleverly drawn as to this. In two places, so there can be no misunderstanding, it says he must have 8 per cent profit if he sells to the farmers. All the testimony presented before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and given by the Army engineers stationed at Muscle Shoals, in charge of construction, was that nitrates can be bought from Chile at a cheaper price than that at which the operator of Muscle Shoals can make it—Chile about \$45 and Muscle Shoals \$55 per ton. In other words, the farmers would not pay Ford more for his nitrate than the price they now pay for Chile nitrate, or that they pay for nitrogen made from by-products of coke ovens. Therefore, under practical conditions, he would be required to sell none to the farmers.

Again, the Government now has the machinery to control his 8 per cent profit—the Federal Trade Commission could do it or the Secretary of Agriculture could do it—but to fool the farmers four pages of this bill are used up in provisions of how to appoint a board of seven members, at Government expense, to see that Ford does not make over 8 per cent profit upon this 40,000 tons of nitrogen if sold to farmers. Remember, also, that of the 850,000 horsepower given him he only agrees to use 100,000 to make nitrogen. That will only make enough to fertilize Alabama, or only enough to put on the lands of the territory within 100 miles of Muscle Shoals. What benefit will the farmers of Illinois derive from the \$10,000,000 already paid by Illinois taxpayers, and about \$7,000,000 more which Illinois taxpayers must pay in order to give this property to Mr. Ford? The Department of Agriculture has shown that Alabama, with proper fertilizer, can raise 220 bushels of corn per acre and Illinois and Indiana 150 bushels of corn per acre. In the past the South bought corn from Illinois and Indiana. Now, it will be unnecessary; they will raise their own, and at the expense of the farmers and taxpayers of Illinois, Indiana, and New York.

In the past 20 years it has been impressed upon the people of the United States that they must protect for future generations the natural resources of the United States. For instance, note at this time the pressure to protect the rapidly disappearing coal fields. The public agitation over the Teapot Dome oil-field lease shows how the people feel. After several years of careful consideration and much study Congress enacted a law preserving for the whole people the water-power sites in the United States not yet taken by the private power companies. This law reserves forever to the public these

power sites. It provides that under Government supervision a lease for 50 years may be made of these Government sites to private parties, who at their own expense—at their own expense, please note, while Mr. Ford requires the Government to spend the money at Muscle Shoals—must construct the dams and provide the machinery to develop the power. The Government then retains the right to tell them how much they can charge the people for the electric power, and at the end of 50 years the property is returned to the United States. Fifty years, even, is a long time. Think of the world's discoveries in the past 50 years. Please note the terms of the present power law: First, the time is 50 years; second, the Government controls the rates charged; third, the lessee spends its own money to develop the property; fourth, the property is returned to the Government of the United States at the end of 50 years. This is the present law.

It is now proposed to overturn this law and give to Mr. Ford—the richest man in the world—the greatest natural horsepower in the world, 850,000 horsepower, upon the following terms: He pays a net of \$1,500,000 and gets free deed for property that has cost the Government \$80,000,000; he gets free lease for property that has cost the Government \$20,000,000, and then the Government spends about \$68,000,000 more and he agrees to pay 4 per cent interest on the \$68,000,000; of the 850,000 horsepower, he agrees to use 100,000 horsepower to make nitrogen to be sold to foreign governments to make powder, or to be sold to farmers if they will pay him 8 per cent profit; there is no limit on the price he can charge for the remaining 750,000 horsepower. By taking the property under the form of lease Ford pays no taxes.

While ordinary folks can only get the chance to spend their own money and secure a lease for 50 years and then return the property to the Government, it is different for Mr. Ford, the richest man in the world. He is to have this property, developed at Government expense, for 100 years, and at the end of 100 years is to have the preference right over anyone else of taking it again. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]—and certainly no one would think of accusing Senator NORRIS of being under the control of the money barons or the wolves of Wall Street—is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and has heard all the evidence. Senator NORRIS favors the United States retaining title to the nitrate producing plants that have cost \$65,000,000 and leasing them to companies to make nitrate for farmers, giving them the 100,000 horsepower to do it with, if necessary, or more horsepower if it can be so used, and disposing of the remaining 750,000 horsepower to the city governments of Mobile, Birmingham, Florence, and Sheffield, Ala.; Knoxville, Memphis, and Chattanooga, Tenn.; Atlanta and Augusta, Ga.; Charlotte and Winston-Salem, N. C.; Huntington, W. Va.; Ironton, Ohio; Louisville, Ky.; Evansville and Terre Haute, Ind.; Cairo and East St. Louis, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; Little Rock and Helena, Ark.; all of the cities of Mississippi, and all of the cities and towns within a 300-mile radius of Muscle Shoals to be used by them to the best advantage of their citizens.

Of course, this plan would upset Mr. Ford's plan to build a city of 1,000,000 people at Muscle Shoals and would interfere with the selling of the adjacent lands at \$10,000 per acre, but would be of great value to the people in half a dozen States where the cities are already established and are in great need of cheap power.

A communication, which I received from the Tennessee Manufacturers' Association, of Tennessee, with headquarters at Nashville, would lead me to believe that the "folks back home" in some of the States of the South are beginning to wake up to what is being taken away from them. The demand for electric power is growing by leaps and bounds. I have in mind one little city in Illinois where 25 years ago the total sales of electric power was \$26,000 in a year, and last year one customer paid \$240,000 for power. The town has not doubled in size in that time.

The United States Government, under the present Federal power law, has a commission in control. The secretary of that commission testified that if this proposed Ford bill was passed it would be a gift from the United States to Mr. Ford of \$100,000,000. I have spent 17 years in Congress and in all that time there has been nothing to compare to the lobbying and propaganda to give Muscle Shoals to Ford. Probably the only thing to compare would be the lobbying for the land-grant railroads back in the sixties.

A definite proposal has been made to the Government by a responsible company to spend its own money to complete the dams and power, the Government not to spend the \$68,000,000, and to pay as rental 100,000 horsepower per year. The Government to use that 100,000 horsepower to make nitrate. If

it seems best to let Mr. Ford build a city of 1,000,000 population at Muscle Shoals and keep the power away from the other cities in the South, would it not be better to make a 50-year lease under present law?

Does it not look as if the following would be fair? Let the United States keep the \$1,500,000 of platinum metal now in the subtreasury at New York, even permit, if it be considered desirable, Mr. Ford to keep the \$1,500,000 which he is proposing to pay the United States for the \$100,000,000 investment, less the \$3,500,000 power plant the United States has sold; give him this \$96,000,000 as a free gift, and then let him spend his own \$68,000,000 in completing the dams and the 850,000 horsepower of electric equipment.

That will only take about one-third of the profit he makes each year out of the farmers and workers of the world. If we give him the greatest water power in the world and give him with it a \$96,000,000 investment paid for by the taxpayers, is it unreasonable that he spend his own money to complete it? Other responsible companies have offered to do so. Why take \$17,000,000 from the farmers and taxpayers of New York or \$7,000,000 from the farmers and taxpayers of Illinois to add to the profits of the richest man in the world?

THOMAS NOLAN

MR. STANFIELD. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1219.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1219) for the relief of Margaret Nolan, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Margaret Nolan, the legal guardian of Thomas Nolan, the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement for personal injuries sustained by said Thomas Nolan on the 28th day of April, 1919, when run down by an ambulance belonging to the United States Army.

SEC. 2. The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of all charges and claims for necessary services, resulting from personal injuries sustained by Thomas Nolan: To the Methodist Episcopal Hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y., \$150; to Elliott, Jones & Fanning, 215 Montague Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., \$150; to Margaret Nolan, 309 Hoyt Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., \$350; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Thomas Nolan."

MR. STANFIELD. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### LEASE OF QUARTERMASTER DEPOT AT NEW ORLEANS

MR. RANDELL. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House to Senate Joint Resolution 72.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the New Orleans Association of Commerce New Orleans Quartermaster Intermediate Depot Unit No. 2, which were to strike out the preamble, and on page 3, line 3, after the word "void," to insert:

Provided, That the United States may void the lease any time within the lease period by giving a 30-day notice to the lessees.

MR. RANDELL. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

#### RIGHT OF WAY OVER GOVERNMENT LEVEE AT YUMA, ARIZ.

MR. ASHURST. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 514.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 514) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a right of way over the Government levee at Yuma, Ariz., which were, on page 1, line 6, to strike out the word "permanent"; and on page 2, after line 3, to insert:

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

MR. ASHURST. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on April 3, 1924, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2025) to

detach Jim Hogg County from the Corpus Christi division of the southern judicial district of the State of Texas and attach the same to the Laredo division of the southern judicial district of said State.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 7296. An act for the relief of John W. Dilks; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4122. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to revive, with amendments, an act to incorporate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia," approved July 7, 1838, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 8233. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 5169. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant a patent to certain lands to Johann Jacob Lutsch; and

H. R. 7500. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Adger, Ada County, Idaho, for railroad purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 2875. An act to provide for the addition of the names of certain persons to the final roll of the Indians of the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4461. An act to provide for the payment of certain claims against the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; and

H. R. 6857. An act to provide for the addition of the names of Chester Calf and Crooked Nose Woman to the final roll of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, Seger jurisdiction, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 905. An act for the relief of Gerard E. Bess;

H. R. 1359. An act for the relief of J. W. La Bare;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of the Stone Towing Line;

H. R. 2123. An act for the relief of the Thompson-Vache Boat Co., of Bonnots Mill, Mo.;

H. R. 2126. An act for the relief of C. C. Carson;

H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of J. Jessop & Sons;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Meeks;

H. R. 2647. An act for the relief of Lena Garagnon Owens;

H. R. 2656. An act to permit the correction of the general account of Robert G. Hilton, former Assistant Treasurer of the United States;

H. R. 3453. An act for the relief of the widow of Warren V. Howard;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Cornelia M. A. Tower;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of L. A. Scott;

H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of George A. Nickles;

H. R. 4374. An act for the relief of the American Surety Co. of New York;

H. R. 4432. An act for the relief of Orville Paul;

H. R. 4760. An act for the relief of the estate of C. M. Cole, of Butler County, Ky.;

H. R. 5136. An act for the relief of Eva B. Sharon;

H. R. 5762. An act for the relief of Julius Jonas;

H. R. 5967. An act for the relief of Grace Buxton;

H. R. 6012. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to ascertain the cost to the Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, and the amounts expended by it from December 1, 1906, to November 30, 1907, in closing and controlling the break in the Colorado River, and to render judgment therefor, as herein provided;

H. R. 6049. An act for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of Charles F. Peirce, Frank T. Mana, and Mollie V. Gaither;

H. R. 6384. An act for the relief of the Maryland Casualty Co., the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland, and the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. of Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 6498. An act for the relief of May Adelaide Sharp;

H. R. 8235. An act for the relief of Aktieselskabet Marie di Giorgio, a Norwegian corporation of Christiania, Norway; and

H. R. 8237. An act for the relief of Bruusgaard Klosteruds Dampskibs Aktieselskab, a Norwegian corporation of Drammen, Norway; to the Committee on Claims.

H. J. Res. 222. A joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR MARCUS A. SMITH

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, with deep regret and poignant pain I rise to announce the death in this city to-day of Hon. Marcus A. Smith. Former Senator Smith took his seat

as a Member of the House of Representatives as a Delegate from the Territory of Arizona on the 4th of March, 1887. He served seven terms as Delegate in the House of Representatives. When Arizona was admitted into the Federal Union as a State thereof he was chosen to be one of the first Senators from the new State. He entered the Senate on the 2d of April, 1912. Immediately upon his induction into the Senate he took the highest rank amongst his fellow Senators. At the time of his death he was a member of the International Joint Commission, having been appointed to that position by President Wilson.

His ripe scholarship, his command of forceful and agreeable language, his sterling integrity, and his courage attracted wide and favorable comment throughout the United States. The honor of the State and the Nation was safe in his hands. The peace and tranquillity of his country, its progress along approved and honest lines, and the happiness and prosperity of the people were his only aims in public life. A remarkably able political leader has gone from us in his death, and whilst his many friends mourn his passing, we are consoled with the reflection that a life filled with so many good deeds as was his will serve to cheer and encourage those who are to-day charged with official responsibility.

Excess of emotion prevents my saying anything more.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the former Senator from Arizona, Mr. Smith, whose sudden departure has been brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], was for many years a Member of the body at the other end of the Capitol, and later served with distinction in the Senate of the United States. Marc Smith was a loyal friend, a profound student, a conscientious public officer. All who knew him will feel profound regret at his passing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to join in what has been said by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] with reference to the late Senator Smith. I had the pleasure of serving with him in the House and in the Senate. All who knew him loved him and we all mourn his loss.

#### RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2576) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to offer sundry amendments to the pending bill, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 40 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 8, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7, 1924*

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

##### To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Jack Hayes, Quartermaster Corps, from April 1, 1924.

##### To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Frank Geere, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 1, 1924.

##### To be major

Capt. John Hobert Wallace, Field Artillery, from April 1, 1924.

##### To be captains

First Lieut. Truman Wike Allen, Air Service, from March 28, 1924.

First Lieut. Charles Humphrey Swick, Corps of Engineers, from April 1, 1924.

First Lieut. Victor Leander Oleson, Field Artillery, from April 1, 1924.

##### To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Harold Allen Brown, Infantry, from March 28, 1924.

Second Lieut. Albert Sidney Johnston Stovall, jr., Cavalry, from March 28, 1924.

Second Lieut. Donald Carson Hardin, Infantry, from March 28, 1924.

Second Lieut. Wayne Clifton Zimmerman, Infantry, from April 1, 1924.

Second Lieut. John Thomas Keeley, Infantry, from April 1, 1924.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY  
CAVALRY

Second Lieut. Richard Briggs Evans, Air Service, with rank from June 12, 1923.

AIR SERVICE

Second Lieut. Cornellus Emmett O'Connor, Infantry (detached in Air Service), with rank as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1922.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Curtis C. Maltman to be postmaster at El Monte, Calif., in place of C. J. Towson, deceased.

COLORADO

William L. Butler to be postmaster at Vona, Colo., in place of L. A. Haynes. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1924.

FLORIDA

James A. Zipperer to be postmaster at Madison, Fla., in place of C. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1924.

IDAHO

William L. Killpack to be postmaster at Driggs, Idaho, in place of E. M. Fourt, resigned.

INDIANA

Clara I. Boesen to be postmaster at Griffith, Ind., in place of B. A. Schofield. Office became third class January 1, 1924.

IOWA

Marvin K. Moore to be postmaster at Pacific Junction, Iowa, in place of E. M. Olson. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1924.

KENTUCKY

Clyde Burton to be postmaster at Stone, Ky., in place of J. W. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired August 20, 1923.

LOUISIANA

Harry Preaus to be postmaster at Farmerville, La., in place of Harry Preaus. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1923.

MICHIGAN

Ralph S. Wiggins to be postmaster at Sunfield, Mich., in place of P. D. Palmer, resigned.

MONTANA

George W. Shearer to be postmaster at Warland, Mont., in place of J. R. Wotring. Office became third class October 1, 1923.

NEW MEXICO

Earl McMinimy to be postmaster at Roy, N. Mex., in place of W. G. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

NEW YORK

Celia M. Arnold to be postmaster at Chautauqua, N. Y., in place of G. A. Ross. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1924.

Clarence R. Chismore to be postmaster at Ilion, N. Y., in place of David Dunham. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1924.

Charles H. Griffin to be postmaster at Oakfield, N. Y., in place of R. A. Heckroth. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1924.

NORTH DAKOTA

James G. Acheson to be postmaster at Souris, N. Dak., in place of J. P. Shahane. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1923.

Oliver Lundquist to be postmaster at Bismarck, N. Dak., in place of Frank Reed. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

OREGON

George W. Epley to be postmaster at Sheridan, Oreg., in place of A. J. Flynn. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mary G. Smith to be postmaster at East Waterford, Pa., in place of M. G. Smith. Office became third class October 1, 1923.

Frank P. Lightner to be postmaster at Loysville, Pa., in place of C. C. Nickel. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Hellen S. Angus to be postmaster at Humboldt, S. Dak., in place of H. S. Angus. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1924.

Beatrice M. Dobson to be postmaster at Winfred, S. Dak., in place of B. M. Dobson. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1924.

UTAH

Edward J. Young, jr., to be postmaster at Vernal, Utah, in place of E. J. Young, jr. Incumbent's commission expires April 9, 1924.

CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 7, 1924.*

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Harlan F. Stone to be Attorney General.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

*To be lieutenant*

Francis E. Matthews.

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Charles A. Whiteford.

Delamer L. Jones.

*To be chief gunners*

Casper H. Husted.

Merle E. Rothenburg.

Bruce M. Parmenter.

Carlton A. McKelvey.

Felix A. Geissert.

William J. Murphy.

Daniel H. Love.

John E. Fredericks.

*To be chief machinist*

Thomas F. Morris.

*To be chief pharmacist*

Emil E. Heun.

*To be ensigns*

George W. Allen.

Steve V. Edwards.

Frank S. Miller.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Harry D. Steele, Holly.

Maude E. Klingensmith, Hotchkiss.

Martha H. Foster, Olathe.

INDIANA

William H. Williams, jr., Muncie.

Harold P. Willoughby, Spencer.

KANSAS

Henry B. Gibbens, Cunningham.

Josie B. Stewart, Sylvan Grove.

LOUISIANA

Minnie M. Baldwin, Bernice.

MASSACHUSETTS

Wilhelm O. Johnson, Woronoco.

MICHIGAN

C. Clyde Beach, Deerfield.

NEBRASKA

George W. Bennett, jr., Arnold.

William L. Tripp, Belvidere.

Elizabeth McGuire, Hampton.

Ernest G. Miller, Lynch.

Robert G. Walsh, Morrill.

Wesley E. Snider, Osceola.

Perry E. Chase, Page.

Horton W. Bedell, Peru.

Thomas W. Cook, Scotia.

NORTH CAROLINA

George W. Stanton, Wilson.

OHIO

Harry R. Hebblethwaite, Berlin Heights.

John E. McClure, East Liverpool.

Rollo J. Hopkins, Edgerton.

Clayton O. Judd, Garrettsville.

Edward C. Bunder, Lewisburg.

John F. Adams, Lisbon.

William A. Campbell, Oakharbor.

Austin H. Bash, Strasburg.

Oliver C. Robart, Wellington.

Asher O. Earley, Woodsfield.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Ambrose S. Plummer, Elizabethtown.

## TENNESSEE

John M. Whiteside, Bellbuckle.  
Lula C. Beasley, Centerville.  
Rennie G. Connelly, Lyles.

## WYOMING

Flora Thomas, Grass Creek.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, April 7, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our blessed Heavenly Father, the light of another day has broken in upon us to reveal incomplete tasks. May we discover Thee in common day and in common duty. Then we shall know that they are sacred and divine. Bless us with Thy wisdom and make us conscious of Thy presence. Inspire us with a faith that never wavers and with a hope that never grows dim. O Lord, keep us wise and prudent, that we may enjoy the world without injury and life without wrong. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journals of the proceedings of Saturday, April 5, 1924, and Sunday, April 6, 1924, were read and severally approved.

## MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file views of the minority on H. R. 7962.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to file the views of the minority on the bill referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I have before me page 5646 of the RECORD. In reply to that I ask unanimous consent to insert some pictures by McManus, Sidney Smith, and Goldberg.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a matter which ought to be done by the consent of the Printing Committee.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The order of business to-day is the Consent Calendar. The Chair, for the information of the House, will say that the only suspension which the Chair has in mind as to any bill not on the Consent Calendar is the one to fix the compensation of the officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government. The Chair expects to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to move to suspend the rules very early.

The Clerk will report the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

## BRIDGE ACROSS ST. MARYS RIVER NEAR WILDS LANDING, FLA.

The first bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6725) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Georgia and Florida, through their respective highway departments, to construct a bridge across the St. Marys River at or near Wilds Landing, Fla.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, since that matter was up for consideration before I have conferred with the Representatives of the two States concerned and with Senator FLETCHER, who has a similar bill pending in the Senate. As I understand, there is no objection to the bill being passed for the present; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed but retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 6725 be passed but retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 8262, a bill to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

SECTION 1. The following positions and annual (except where specified otherwise) rates of compensation are hereby established:

## SENATE

## OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Secretary to the Vice President, \$4,200; clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$2,080; messenger, \$1,310.

## CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the Senate, \$1,520.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; Assistant Secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,500; reading clerk, \$4,500; financial clerk, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$3,420; assistant financial clerk, \$3,600; minute and Journal clerk, \$3,600; principal clerk, \$3,150; librarian, \$3,000; enrolling clerk, \$3,150; printing clerk, \$3,000; executive clerk, \$2,890; file clerk, chief bookkeeper, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,880 each; first assistant librarian and keeper of stationery, \$2,780 each; assistant librarian, \$2,150; skilled laborer, \$1,520; clerks—3 at \$2,880 each, 2 at \$2,590 each, 1 \$2,460, 1 \$2,100, 1 \$1,770; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,360; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; messenger in library, \$1,310; special officer, \$2,150; assistant messenger, \$1,520; laborers—3 at \$1,140 each, 3 at \$1,010 each, 1 in stationery room, \$1,440.

## DOCUMENT ROOM

Superintendent, \$3,500; first assistant, \$2,880; 2 clerks, at \$1,770 each; skilled laborer, \$1,520.

## COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Clerks and messengers to the following committees: Agriculture and Forestry—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Appropriations—clerk, \$6,000; assistant clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$3,000; three assistant clerks, at \$2,700 each; two assistant clerks, at \$2,100 each; messenger, \$1,440. To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Civil Service—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Claims—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,570; assistant clerk, \$2,360; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Commerce—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Conference Minority of the Senate—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. District of Columbia—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,480; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Education and Labor—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Expenditures in the Executive Departments—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Finance—clerk, \$3,600; special assistant to the committee, \$3,150; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,460; assistant clerk, \$1,940; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each; two experts (one for the majority and one for the minority), at \$2,360 each; messenger, \$1,520. Foreign Relations—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Immigration—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,570; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Inter-oceanic Canals—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Interstate Commerce—clerk, \$3,300; two assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Judiciary—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; two assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Library—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Manufactures—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Military Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; additional clerk, \$1,940; three assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Patents—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Pensions—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; four assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; three assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Printing—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Privileges and Elections—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,840; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Public Lands and Surveys—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$2,150; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Revision of the Laws—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Rules—clerk, \$3,300, to

include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual under the direction of the Committee on Rules; two assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Territories and Insular Possessions—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520.

#### CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS

Clerical assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of the committees specifically provided for herein, as follows: Seventy clerks at \$3,300 each, 70 assistant clerks at \$1,940 each, and 70 assistant clerks at \$1,830 each. Such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

Seventy-one additional clerks at \$1,520 each, 1 for each Senator having no more than 1 clerk and 2 assistant clerks for himself or for the committee of which he is chairman.

#### OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; 2 floor assistants, at \$3,600 each; messengers—5 (acting as assistant doorkeepers, including 1 for minority), at \$2,150 each; 38 (including 1 for minority), at \$1,770 each; 1, \$1,310; 1 at card door, \$1,940; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the Official Reporters, \$2,800; storekeeper, \$2,740; stenographer in charge of furniture accounts and records, \$1,520; upholsterers and locksmith, \$1,770; cabinetmaker, \$1,520; 3 carpenters, at \$1,390 each; janitor, \$1,520; 5 skilled laborers, at \$1,310 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,340; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,240 each; 3 attendants to women's toilet rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,010 each; telephone operators—chief, \$2,040; 4, at \$1,200 each; night operator, \$1,010; telephone page, \$1,010; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in old library space, \$950; press gallery—superintendent, \$2,740; assistant superintendent, \$1,840; messenger for service to press correspondents, \$1,240; laborers—3, at \$1,100 each; 34 at \$1,010 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$3.30 per day each, during the session.

Police force for Senate Office Building under the Sergeant at Arms: Sixteen privates at \$1,360 each; special officer, \$1,520.

#### POST OFFICE

Postmaster, \$2,740; chief clerk, \$2,150; 8 mail carriers and 1 wagon master, at \$1,520 each; 3 riding pages, at \$1,220 each.

#### FOLDING ROOM

Superintendent, \$1,940; foreman, \$1,940; assistant, \$1,730; clerk, \$1,520; folders—7 at \$1,310 each; 7 at \$1,140 each.

#### CAPITOL POLICE

Captain, \$2,150; 3 lieutenants, at \$1,520 each; 2 special officers, at \$1,520 each; 3 sergeants, at \$1,410 each; 44 privates, at \$1,360 each.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Clerk, \$4,000; inspector, \$2,490; stenographer, \$1,740.

#### OFFICE OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Architect of the Capitol, \$6,000; chief clerk and accountant, \$3,150; civil engineer, \$2,770; construction draftsman, \$2,360; 2 clerks, at \$1,520 each; laborers—2 at \$1,010 each, 2 at \$950 each; forewoman of charwomen, \$760; 21 charwomen, at \$410 each; 48 elevator conductors, at \$1,520 each.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

##### OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER

Secretary to the Speaker, \$4,200; clerk to the Speaker's table, \$3,600, and for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$1,000 per annum; clerk to the Speaker, \$1,940; messenger to the Speaker's table, \$1,520; messenger to the Speaker, \$1,440.

##### CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the House of Representatives, \$1,520.

##### OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$6,500; Journal clerk, and 2 reading clerks, at \$4,200 each; disbursing clerk, \$3,570; tally clerk, \$3,470; file clerk, \$3,420; enrolling clerk, \$3,200 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, \$3,600; 2 assistant custodians at \$3,000 each; chief bill clerk, \$3,150; assistant enrolling clerk, \$2,880; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$2,780; stationery clerk, \$2,570; librarian, \$2,460; assistant librarian, \$2,240; assistant file clerk, \$2,250; assistant librarian, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,150 each; clerks—1 \$2,150, 3 at \$2,020 each; bookkeeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,940 each; 4 assistants to chief bill clerk, at \$1,830 each; stenographer to the Clerk, \$1,730; locksmith and typewriter repairer, \$1,620; messenger and clock repairer, \$1,520; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; 3 messengers,

at \$1,410 each; stenographer to Journal clerk, \$1,310; 9 telephone operators, at \$1,200 each; 3 session telephone operators, at \$100 per month each; substitute telephone operator, when required, at \$3.30 per day; laborers—3 at \$1,200 each, 9 at \$1,010 each.

#### COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Clerks, messengers, and janitors to the following committees: Accounts—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310. Agriculture—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310. Appropriations—clerk, \$5,000, and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk, \$4,000; six assistant clerks, at \$3,000 each; assistant clerk, \$2,440; janitor, \$1,440. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Census—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Claims—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Coinage, Weights, and Measures—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Disposition of Useless Executive Papers—clerk, \$2,360. District of Columbia—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Education—clerk, \$2,360. Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress—clerk, \$2,360. Elections No. 1—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Elections No. 2—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Elections No. 3—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Flood Control—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Foreign Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Immigration and Naturalization—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Industrial Arts and Expositions—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Insular Affairs—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Interstate and Foreign Commerce—clerk, \$2,880; additional clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Invalid Pensions—clerk, \$2,880; stenographer, \$2,560; assistant clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,240. Judiciary—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,940; janitor, \$1,240. Labor—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Library—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Merchant Marine and Fisheries—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Military Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310. Patents—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Pensions—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,940; janitor, \$1,010. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,730; janitor, \$1,310. Printing—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,310. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Public Lands—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Civil Service—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Revision of the Laws—clerk, \$3,000; janitor, \$1,010. Rivers and Harbors—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310. Roads—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Rules—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,010. Territories—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. War Claims—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Ways and Means—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$2,250; janitors—one \$1,310, one \$1,010. World War Veterans' Legislation—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150.

#### OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Sergeant at Arms, \$6,500; Deputy Sergeant at Arms, \$2,880; cashier, \$4,000; two bookkeepers, at \$2,640 each; Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs, \$2,150; pair clerk and messenger, \$2,150; messenger, \$1,730; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200; skilled laborer, \$1,140. Police force, House Office Building, under the Sergeant at Arms: Lieutenant, \$1,520; 19 privates, at \$1,360 each.

#### OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Doorkeeper, \$5,000; special employee, \$2,040; superintendent of House press gallery, \$2,240; assistant to the superintendent of the House press gallery, \$1,520; janitor, \$2,040; messengers—17 at \$1,500 each, 14 on soldiers' roll at \$1,520 each; laborers—17 at \$1,010 each, 2 known as cloakroom men at \$1,140 each, 8 known as cloakroom men, 1 at \$1,010, and 7 at \$890 each; 2 female attendants in ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,440 each; superintendent of folding room, \$2,880; foreman of folding room, \$2,340; chief clerk to superintendent of folding room, \$2,150; 3 clerks at \$1,940 each; janitor, \$1,010; laborer, \$1,010; 31 folders, at \$1,200 each; shipping clerk, \$1,520; 2 drivers, at \$1,140 each; 2 chief pages at \$1,740 each; 2 telephone pages, at \$1,440 each; 2 floor managers of telephones (1 for the minority), at \$2,400 each; assistant messenger in charge of telephones, \$1,830; 42 pages during the session at \$3.30 per day each; laborer, \$1,100; superintendent of document room, \$3,050; assistant superintendent of document room, \$2,460; clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,940; 8 assistants, at \$1,600 each; janitor, \$1,220; messenger to pressroom, \$1,310.

#### SPECIAL AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Special employee (Joel Grayson) in the document room, \$2,740. Six minority employees, at \$2,150 each, authorized and named in the resolution of December 5, 1923.



Assistant foreman of the folding room, authorized in the resolution of September 30, 1913, at \$4.76 per day.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of April 23, 1914, \$1,140.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of December 10, 1901, \$1,140.

Clerk, under the direction of the Clerk of the House, named in the resolution of February 13, 1923, \$2,740.

Successors to any of the employees provided for in the five preceding paragraphs may be named by the House of Representatives at any time.

Office of Majority Floor Leader: Legislative clerk, \$3,600; clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310.

Conference Minority: Clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,310. The foregoing employees to be appointed by the minority leader.

Two messengers, one in the majority caucus room, and one in the minority caucus room, to be appointed by the majority and minority whips, respectively, at \$1,520 each.

#### POST OFFICE

Postmaster, \$4,200; assistant postmaster, \$2,570; registry and money-order clerk, \$1,830; 34 messengers (including one to superintend transportation of mails), at \$1,520 each; substitute messengers and extra services of regular employees, when required, at the rate of not to exceed \$105 per month each; laborer, \$1,010.

#### OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Six official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House, at \$6,000 each; assistant, \$3,000; 6 expert transcribers, at \$1,520 each; janitor, \$1,220.

#### COMMITTEE STENOGRAPHERS

Four stenographers to committees, at \$6,000 each; janitor, \$1,220.

#### CLERK HIRE, MEMBERS, DELEGATES, AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS

The clerk hire for each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be at the rate of \$4,000 per annum and shall be paid in accordance with the act of January 25, 1923 (42 Stat., chap. 43, p. 1217): *Provided*, That no person shall receive a salary from such clerk hire at a rate in excess of \$3,300 per annum.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1924.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is a matter in which every Member is interested, I make the point of no quorum. I withdraw it for the present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the bill before us is based upon the recommendations contained in the report of the joint committee for the readjustment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress, submitted on December 3, 1923, and printed as House Document No. 131 of the present session.

The necessity for action at this time in connection with the employees of Congress is due to the fact that the classification act of 1923, which makes provision for the classification of employees in the executive departments, does not extend to the employees of Congress.

The following specific recommendations of the joint committee are the basis for the rates of compensation incorporated in the bill:

The annual compensation of clerks to Senate committees, the clerk to the conference minority, and chief clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees is fixed at \$3,300 each per annum, except the clerk of the Committee on Finance, which is recommended at \$3,600, and one assistant clerk of the Committee on Appropriations at \$3,300.

The allowance for clerk hire for each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner is fixed at not exceeding \$4,000 per annum, with the limitation that the maximum salary of any person should not exceed \$3,300.

That is to say, if there is only one clerk employed, \$3,300 will be the most that can be paid, whereas if two or more clerks are employed by any Member of the House they may receive an aggregate of \$4,000, to be divided in such proportions as the Member may suggest when he files the names of those who are to be employed by him with the Clerk of the House.

The salary of the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House is fixed at \$3,600 per annum.

All specific salaries of \$4,500 per annum or more remain at present rates.

All specific salaries less than \$4,500 per annum, not included in the foregoing recommendations, are increased 5 per cent per

annum on the total rate of basic salary plus additional compensation in cases where the additional compensation applies, and 5 per cent per annum on the basic rate where the additional compensation does not apply. In instances where substantial increases in basic pay have been granted comparatively recently the present basic salary, plus the additional compensation, is recommended without the 5 per cent increase.

Mr. FREE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FREE. I notice that the name of Henry M. Rose is inserted, and it is the only name I see that is inserted in the bill. That is on page 2, line 4, and I would like to ask the gentleman why that is done.

Mr. MADDEN. That is under a special act.

In cases of employees paid from lump-sum appropriations it is recommended that the proper administrative officers submit estimates for the fiscal year 1925, in the manner prescribed by law, for such amounts as will be necessary to enable them to apply the \$240 bonus and the 5 per cent increase to employees carried on lump-sum rolls under the same restrictions as the committee has herein recommended for the specific employments.

In connection with the appropriation for clerk hire for Representatives, Delegates, and Commissioners, it should be remembered that the additional compensation (\$240 per annum) for the fiscal year 1924 is applicable in all cases where the salary fixed by the Member brings the employee within the proper range. The clerk-hire allowance of approximately 90 per cent of the House membership is now at the rate of \$3,680 per annum. This rate consists of a basic rate of \$3,200 (from which the Member employs two clerks at basic rates which do not exceed the total of \$3,200 for the two persons), plus the \$240 additional compensation which is added to the basic rate of each clerk. The average salary of the persons paid from the clerk-hire appropriation and the supplemental allotment from the additional compensation appropriation is approximately \$1,900. The average salary under the rate recommended in this report (\$4,000 where two clerks are employed and \$3,300 where only one is employed) would be approximately \$2,100.

On pages 5 to 14, inclusive, of the report of the joint committee will be found a detailed tabulation giving each specific employment covered by the bill, showing the present basic pay, the \$240 bonus, and the total present rate, compared with the rate recommended in the bill. The bill is identical with the terms of the report of the joint committee with a few exceptions. The number of pages for the Senate has been increased to 21 and that number is included in the bill in lieu of the 16 included in the report. The House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was created subsequently to the making of the report and by resolution of the House has been granted a clerk and assistant clerk, both of which are incorporated in the bill. The position of Chief Clerk of the House, \$4,500, and the allowance of \$1,000 for stenographic services for that office, the assistant chief clerk at \$2,740, and the position of superintendent of furniture repair shop, \$3,000 (carried on a lump-sum roll), have been eliminated. In their places the bill includes a property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, at \$3,600, and two assistant custodians, at \$3,000 each. The net reduction in annual expense due to these changes is \$1,640.

On the basis of the recommendations contained in the joint committee's report and included in the accompanying bill, the following tabulation shows the approximate total number of persons, the present rate of \$240 bonus; the total present rate, and the recommended rate:

#### Recapitulation

Offices and designations of positions	Number	Basic rate	Additional compensation	Total rate	Suggested rate
Senate	660	\$1,097,387.50	\$151,230.00	\$1,248,617.50	\$1,351,960.00
House of Representatives	1,242	2,071,919.10	280,230.00	2,352,149.10	2,546,180.00
Capitol police	53	57,300.00	12,720.00	70,020.00	73,820.00
Joint Committee on Printing	3	7,750.00	480.00	8,230.00	8,230.00
Legislative drafting service	9	27,500.00	—	27,500.00	28,375.00
Architect of the Capitol	394	379,446.97	86,263.10	465,710.07	489,275.00
Grand total	12,361	13,641,303.57	1,530,903.10	14,172,206.67	14,497,846.00

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of the number and pay of pages and session telephone operators.

The foregoing table shows an increase of the recommended salaries over the present salaries (including \$240 additional compensation) of \$325,633.33, to which must be added an indefinite sum sufficient to apply the 5 per cent to the compensation of the pages and session telephone operators. The present average salary is \$1,767. The recommended average salary is \$1,905—an increase of \$138.

The increased annual cost of \$325,633.33 does not include the increase on account of pages and other session employees or employees whose services are of a temporary character. The amounts to be added on this account will vary according to the length of the sessions of Congress, but should not make the aggregate increased cost in any year in excess of \$360,000.

The recommendations made in the bill are believed by the committee to be as uniform as possible, considering the class of service that is involved, and to be in proportion to the general results arrived at in the classification of the employees in the executive departments in the District of Columbia.

The estimates submitted to Congress to carry out the classification act in the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1925 result in the addition of \$3,200,000, or approximately 4 per cent, to the total pay roll of the personnel involved. The amount recommended to be added through the enactment of this bill represents an increase of approximately 8 per cent in the total present pay roll.

I wish to say, gentlemen, that in considering the problems involved in the adjustment of the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government, under the direction which you were pleased to give the joint committee, we considered what additional compensation was being paid under the classification act to those who are engaged in the administrative side of the Government, and we endeavored, in reaching our conclusions in connection with the legislative branch of the service, to come as near fixing the compensation of those employed under the legislative branch of the Government as we could to those fixed by the Classification Board in connection with the administrative employees.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman explain the very last clause of the bill? It seems to me entirely unreasonable.

Mr. MADDEN. The last clause of the bill provides that the clerk hire of a Member, where he employs two people, shall be \$4,000. If he only employs one person, it means he can not draw more than \$3,300. The reason for that is that in the Senate no Senator has a secretary as such, and the clerks to the committees of the Senate act not only as clerks to committees but also as secretaries to the Senators.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. How many employees do they have?

Mr. MADDEN. Let me make this explanation first and then I will answer the other question. It was provided that Senators who were not chairmen of committees should be allowed \$3,300. It is true that Senators have more than one clerk, but the chief clerk to the Senator is not only the clerk to the committee but also a clerk to the Senator, and in addition to the chief clerk each Senator has three additional clerks, if I recall correctly; and it is very proper that he should have because the work of a Senator covers a whole State, and he has very much more to do than a Member of the House, and could not under any circumstances do the work he is called upon to do unless he had these additional employees.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The 70 Senators who are not chairmen of committees each has a clerk at \$3,300, one at \$1,940, one at \$1,830, and one at \$1,520.

Mr. MADDEN. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. And they are not chairmen of committees.

Mr. MADDEN. That is true. I said where the Senator was not a chairman of a committee he had the same rate as the Senator who is a chairman of a committee.

Mr. BLANTON. And, as a matter of fact, they do not have a bit more work to do than a Congressman.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, they say they have, and, of course, we can not deny that.

Mr. BLANTON. I can.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RUBEY. In talking about clerks to Senators is it not a fact there are clerks to Senators who come only half a day, some working in the morning until noon and others coming at half past 1 and working the rest of the day; and is it

not also a fact they have so many clerks over there that they fall over one another trying to get into the offices?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not answer that question; I do not know.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But the particular question I was asking my friend was this: If there is provided \$4,000 for clerk hire for a Representative, why should not the Representative be allowed to expend the money as he thinks proper?

Mr. MADDEN. The law provides how the Representative shall make the appointments and how he shall file the names.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is true, but this is the difficulty. I take a case now that is probably illustrative of a great many cases. Suppose there is a Member who employs a high-class man and pays him all that is allowed at the present time, which, I believe, is \$3,200 a year. He may desire to pay \$4,000, but this provision would forbid him doing that.

Mr. MADDEN. It would.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Therefore, he can not get along without paying his clerk \$3,200, and then the six or seven hundred dollars additional will count for nothing. That is the situation to be created.

Mr. MADDEN. I am frank to say that this is done so that no Member employing a single individual will be able to pay more than a Senator pays a single individual.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But a Senator now gets something like \$7,500 as a total allowance for clerk hire.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to use but a few moments of the time at my disposal. I want to make a very brief statement of my position upon this bill and then yield such time as I may have left to other gentlemen who wish to speak upon it.

In March, 1923, Congress provided for a joint committee to take into consideration the adjustment of salaries of House and Senate employees, including clerical forces of the Senators and of the Representatives. This committee was composed in the Senate of Senator WARREN, Senator SMOOT, and Senator OVERMAN and in the House of Congressman MADDEN, Congressman ANDERSON, and Congressman BYRNES of South Carolina. The committee has submitted a majority report, which is signed by the entire committee of the Senate and by two of the House members. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] filed a minority report. I am very sorry the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is not here to-day. He told me the latter part of the week that he understood this bill was coming up under a suspension of the rules and that he was absolutely compelled to be away from the House to-day and to-morrow, but he wished his minority report called to the attention of the House, and I am going to read it to you. It is short and is as follows:

I am not in favor of either increasing or reducing the compensation of the employees of the legislative branch of the Government. I think these employees should receive the compensation they are now receiving, including the basic salary and the bonus.

JAMES F. BYRNES.

I concur with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] in the position he has taken. So far as I know, there was never any particular desire—there may have been a desire, but there was never any expectation—on the part of the employees of the Senate and the House that they should receive anything more than their basic salary plus the bonus which they have been receiving during the last few years.

It is not proposed to reenact the bonus feature for the next fiscal year. Therefore this committee was appointed to take into consideration the question of adjustment of salaries and to make a report such as they have done; but there were many of us who, like the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], felt that while we were not in favor of reducing any of the employees of the Senate or of the House, on the other hand, we were not in favor of increasing their salaries above what they are now drawing as a basic salary plus the bonus.

The proposition that is submitted here means just this in expenditure: It means that the expenditures of the Government during the next fiscal year will be increased in the sum of \$325,633.33 per annum, plus 5 per cent, which is to be added to the salaries of telephone operators and pages, and which is not included in this report.

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry my colleague makes that statement, because this \$325,000 includes the 5 per cent.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. I will read what the report says. I think I am accurate in the statement. The report says:

The foregoing table shows an increase of the recommended salaries over the present salaries (including \$240 additional compensation) of \$325,633.33, to which must be added an indefinite sum sufficient to apply the 5 per cent to the compensation of the pages and session telephone operators.

Mr. MADDEN. That is very small, however.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not doubt that, but that is the statement I made and I intended to be accurate. It is not a pleasant thing to oppose an increase of salaries for employees, particularly so when it applies to those close to you, in your office, with whom you come in contact every day, whose efficiency you are familiar with, but I can not support this bill and be consistent and true to my convictions and my belief as to what Congress should do in this day when the taxpayers are demanding relief, when the expenditures of the Government have increased to a point beyond that anybody ever dreamed of in times of peace, and when every effort is being made or ought to be made to reduce expenditures of the Government. I am unwilling, no matter who may be involved, by my vote to increase the burdens of the taxpayers of this Government.

For that reason I wish to repeat that I can not vote for this bill. As was said a while ago the Senators have four clerks now. Those Senators who are not chairmen of committees have under this bill a secretary at \$3,300, a clerk at \$1,940, another at \$1,830, and another at \$1,520. I do not know whether they need them or not. Some have told me, and on the best of authority, that many of the clerks in the Senate are not worked so hard as the clerks in the House Office Building. This bill makes too great a distinction in the allowance made for the Senate and that made for the House. Everyone knows that clerks to Representatives are worked much harder than the four clerks of Senators. Their own clerks will not deny that. If they would consent to eliminate one of their clerks, it would enable increase of the others without additional expenditure. But whether that be true or not, the Senate under this bill will be given over \$8,500 for clerk hire, and the House \$4,000. At the present time it is \$7,760 and \$3,680. I do not believe in view of the situation of the Treasury that Congress ought to put itself in the attitude of making this increase for its own force. I would not vote to increase my own salary, and I am not willing to vote to increase the salaries of the House and Senate employees under present circumstances.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. This bill would give the Senators \$8,500 for clerk hire, and what are they getting now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. \$7,760.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. We have no demonstration that they are in any need of this increase on the Senate side?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. None at all, as far as I know.

Mr. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. On page 6 of the bill is this language, lines 6, 7, and 8:

Such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex-officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

As I understand, that provision does not displace committee clerks but simply provides that these clerks of Senators shall also do committee work if they are needed in order to expedite the committee's business.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH. Why did not the gentleman insert a similar provision with reference to House clerks?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Because I was not on the committee. It was the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENGLE. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. STENGLE. The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, which committee has approved a large increase in the salary of bureau chiefs. Will the gentleman explain for my benefit by what process of reasoning he could favor that and not favor an increase of the poor pay of some of the employees of the House?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Committee on Appropriations did not make any increases. They were made under the reclassification law, over which the committee had no control.

I have stated my personal views relative to this bill. If there was opportunity to amend some of its provisions, I might vote for it, but under the motion made we are called upon to vote for it, without opportunity for consideration and without opportunity to amend. It ought not to be passed under a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a crime upon the country and upon this House to call a bill up like this under suspension of the rules. You can not argue it, you can not debate it except for the measly little 20 minutes to the side that is allowed for debate, and you can not debate a bill of this character in that time. You can not change an item in it. You have got to take it exactly as it is written without a change. I say such a bill as this under suspension of the rules is a crime against the membership of this House.

This bill (H. R. 8262) was introduced in this House by the gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] on March 27, 1924, and was then referred to the Special Committee on Adjustment of Legislative Salaries, and by such committee was favorably reported to this House only on last Thursday, April 3, 1924. And, so far as I know, there was not a single Democrat on this side of the aisle who knew until just a few minutes ago that this bill would be called up to-day. And I do not believe that there were 15 Republicans who knew it. The majority leader should have given us some notice of it. He made no mention of it in his legislative program.

For the benefit of some of the new Members here who probably may not be familiar with the rules, that by calling this bill up now under suspension, as it has been called up, the debate is limited to 20 minutes to the side, controlled by two men; not a single Member has the right to offer any amendment whatever; we are compelled to vote for every item in it, just as it has been written, or to vote against the whole bill. Not even a motion to recommit is permissible. We have to swallow it like a bunch of helpless, open-mouthed mocking birds. I am not going to do it. I am surprised that our good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] should be a party to it.

Mr. MADDEN. I am entirely responsible for it, and I assume that responsibility.

Mr. BLANTON. Such a very important bill as this ought to be brought regularly before the House under the rules and not under suspension, so that we could debate it, so that the membership could be heard, and the sentiment of the House pass upon it and amend it in many particulars that are outrageous as they now stand in the bill. Not half of the membership of the House is present. We have just a few minutes of debate, and it will be over in a very short time. Then the bells will ring and the membership will come over here, if we are able to force a roll call, and they will ask what is up and will be told at the door that it is the committee's bill; that it is a bill from the Committee on Appropriations, and 9 out of 10 of our colleagues will vote for it without knowing what is in it. I say, that is not right and just to the membership of this House.

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

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment.

Mr. MADDEN. Just for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I can not yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, as I desire to use the little time I have. The chairman of our great Committee on Appropriations may answer me in his own time. Of all the salary-raising bills that this Congress has been passing continually since we met, this one takes the prize. It is entitled to the blue ribbon. It stands in a class to itself. It exemplifies the innate modesty concerning money spending of our economical brothers in the far end of the Capitol.

I deny that Senators work harder than Congressmen. I deny that more work is done in the offices of Senators than in the offices of Congressmen. I deny that either of the Senators from Texas do any more work than I do each day of the year. I deny that the office of either of the distinguished Senators from Texas does more work than my office does each day in the year. No secretary of any Senator in Washington does more work than my secretary. You may say that they represent a whole State. That is true, but only a comparatively few people from each district in the State write to them, while every person in our respective districts having business here writes to us, and our work in connection with all pending legislation is just as arduous as that of any Senator. Yet each Senator who is not a chairman of a committee is allowed one clerk at \$3,300, another clerk at \$1,940, another clerk at \$1,830, and another clerk at \$1,520, aggregating \$8,500 for clerk hire, while we are given only \$4,000 for clerk hire. And \$4,000 is every cent that Senators need, for their work is practically the same as ours. And I will not vote to give them \$8,500 for clerk hire, and I want a chance to properly amend this bill when it passes, and not have to vote for every item in it just as it has been written. Let me put in parallel columns the salaries paid to certain of the Senate employees as compared with the salaries paid to certain of the House employees, and let you contrast them, to wit:

## SENATE

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators, and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,500; reading clerk, \$4,500; financial clerk, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$3,420; assistant financial clerk, \$3,600; minute and Journal clerk, \$3,600; principal clerk, \$3,150; librarian, \$3,000; enrolling clerk, \$3,150; printing clerk, \$3,000; executive clerk, \$2,890; file clerk, chief bookkeeper, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,880 each; first assistant librarian, and keeper of stationery, \$2,780 each; assistant librarian, \$2,150; skilled laborer, \$1,520; clerks—three at \$2,880 each, two at \$2,590 each, one \$2,400, one \$2,100, one \$1,770; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,300; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; messenger in library, \$1,310; special officer, \$2,150; assistant messenger, \$1,520; laborers—three at \$1,140 each; three at \$1,010 each, one in stationery room, \$1,440.

## HOUSE

## OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$6,500; Journal clerk, and two reading clerks, at \$4,200 each; disbursing clerk, \$3,570; tally clerk, \$3,470; file clerk, \$3,420; enrolling clerk, \$3,200 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, \$3,600; two assistant custodians at \$3,000 each; chief bill clerk, \$3,150; assistant enrolling clerk, \$2,880; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$2,780; stationery clerk, \$2,570; librarian, \$2,460; assistant librarian, \$2,240; assistant file clerk, \$2,250; assistant librarian, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,150 each; clerks—one \$2,150, three at \$2,020 each; bookkeeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,940 each; four assistants to chief bill clerk, at \$1,880 each; stenographer to the Clerk, \$1,730; locksmith and typewriter repairer, \$1,620; messenger and clock repairer, \$1,520; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; three messengers, at \$1,410 each; stenographer to Journal clerk, \$1,310; nine telephone operators, at \$1,200 each; three session telephone operators, at \$100 per month each; substitute telephone operator, when required, at \$3.30 per day; laborers—three at \$1,200 each; nine at \$1,010 each.

old library space, \$950; press gallery—superintendent, \$2,740; assistant superintendent, \$1,840; messenger for service to press correspondents, \$1,240; laborers—3, at \$1,100 each; 34, at \$1,010 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$3.30 per day each, during the session.

\$1,520; 2 drivers, at \$1,140 each; 2 chief pages, at \$1,740 each; 2 telephone pages, at \$1,440 each; 2 floor managers of telephones (1 for the minority), at \$2,400 each; assistant messenger in charge of telephones, \$1,830; 42 pages during the session, at \$3.30 per day each; laborer, \$1,100; superintendent of document room, \$3,050; assistant superintendent of document room, \$2,460; clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,940; 8 assistants at \$1,600 each; janitor, \$1,220; messenger to pressroom, \$1,310.

Illustrating the employees provided for committees, let me call attention to the fact that for the Senate Committee on Appropriations there is one clerk at \$6,000, two assistant clerks at \$3,300 each, three assistant clerks at \$2,700 each, and two assistant clerks at \$2,100 each, and a messenger at \$1,440. For the House Committee on Appropriations there is one clerk at \$5,000, with the provision that the present incumbent shall draw \$1,000 extra, an assistant clerk at \$4,000, six assistant clerks at \$3,000 each, an assistant clerk at \$2,440, and a janitor at \$1,440; and it will be remembered that all appropriation bills originate in the House and are prepared and framed by the employees of the House Appropriations Committee.

For the Senate Committee on Claims this bill allows one clerk at \$3,300, one assistant clerk at \$2,570, one assistant clerk at \$2,360, and two assistant clerks at \$1,830 each, while for the House Committee on Claims this bill allows one clerk at \$2,880, an assistant clerk at \$1,520, and a janitor at \$1,010. The foregoing fairly illustrates the employees on the various and sundry big and little committees of the House and Senate. And these are all patronage jobs, and when the Congress adjourns for nine months, like it did from March 4 to December, 1923, all of these employees are drawing salaries with nothing to do, and there are entirely too many of them, and their salaries are far beyond the clerical fees paid by the industrial world. I can not vote for this bill when it can not be amended. What we ought to do is to defeat it under suspension and then properly debate and amend it under the rules of the House.

On January 27, 1924, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW], who is a member of the Republican steering committee of this House, arose and said that he "had been requested to present to the House of Representatives a petition signed by 345,516 actual and real farmers in this country." Let me show you what then occurred:

Mr. DARROW. These names have been voluntarily obtained after a thorough explanation of the purposes. The petition itself simply asks for a reduction in the expenditures of the Government—a cut in Government costs for the purpose, of course, of reducing taxes and the heavy burden that is placed upon all classes of people by war taxes. Some one has asked me where these names come from. They came chiefly from the great Middle West. Speaking in round numbers, from Indiana there are 30,000 names, from Iowa 29,000, from Kansas 22,000, from Kentucky 14,000, from Michigan 17,000, from Minnesota 20,000, from Missouri 11,000, from Nebraska 16,000, from Ohio 68,000, from Pennsylvania 23,000. Sometimes my friends here forget that Pennsylvania is one of the great agricultural States of this Union. All of the other States of the Union are represented with one exception, and that is Nevada. The total of the other States is 61,528.

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

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the steering committee of the dominant party of this House. I take it that this box car of petitions is a protest against present conditions?

Mr. DARROW. It is asking for a cut in governmental expenditures.

Mr. BLANTON. And is a protest against present conditions. The farmers want the present conditions changed; they want taxes reduced; they want extravagance of government stopped, and they have grounds for all of that.

Mr. DARROW. This petition was started before—

Mr. BLANTON. I take it that it is an indictment against the present management of the Government's business.

And upon insistence by the gentleman from Maryland, the gentleman from Pennsylvania finally read the petition:

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman omitted to read the petition. Will he kindly do so?

Mr. DARROW. I will be very much pleased to read it, although the gentleman will not expect me to read all of the names.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska, I would like to have the names of those from Nebraska,

Now, in parallel columns let us compare the salaries paid to other Senate employees with those paid to House employees, and again contrast the difference:

## SENATE

## OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; 2 floor assistants, at \$3,600 each; messengers—5 (acting as assistant doorkeepers, including 1 for minority), at \$2,150 each; 38 (including 1 for minority), at \$1,770 each; 1, \$1,310; 1 at card door, \$1,940; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the official reporters, \$2,800; storekeeper, \$2,740; stenographer in charge of furniture accounts and records, \$1,520; upholsterer and locksmith, \$1,770; cabinetmaker, \$1,520; 3 carpenters, at \$1,390 each; janitor, \$1,520; 5 skilled laborers, at \$1,310 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,340; 2 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,240 each; 3 attendants to women's toilet rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,010 each; telephone operators—chief \$2,040, 4 at \$1,200 each; night operator, \$1,010; telephone page, \$1,010; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in

## HOUSE

## OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Sergeant at Arms, \$6,500; Deputy Sergeant at Arms, \$2,880; cashier, \$4,000; 2 bookkeepers, at \$2,640 each; Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs, \$2,150; pair clerk and messenger, \$2,150; messenger, \$1,730; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200; skilled laborer, \$1,140.

## OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Doorkeeper, \$5,000; special employee, \$2,040; superintendent of House press gallery, \$2,240; assistant to the superintendent of the House press gallery, \$1,520; janitor, \$2,040; messengers—17 at \$1,500 each, 14 on soldiers' roll at \$1,520 each; laborers—17 at \$1,010 each, 2 known as cloakroom men at \$1,140 each, 8 known as cloakroom men, 1 at \$1,010, and 7 at \$890 each; 2 female attendants in ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,440 each; superintendent of folding room, \$2,880; foreman of folding room, \$2,340; chief clerk to superintendent of folding room, \$2,150; 3 clerks at \$1,940 each; janitor, \$1,010; laborer, \$1,010; 31 folders, at \$1,200 each; shipping clerk,

Mr. DARROW. The petition reads as follows:

"We the undersigned, who are directly interested in farming and the welfare of the people, do hereby respectfully petition or request Congress through the Farm Journal to pass legislation which will cut the cost of running the Government by reducing all nonessential expenses, eliminating all unnecessary employees, and voting against all increases in salaries."

In the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker, I ask to have read from the desk, if I may, a letter from Mr. Jenkins, which will probably more clearly express the purpose of this petition than anything that I could say.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the reading of the letter, though I shall not object, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether the steering committee is going to carry out the requests made by these farmers in this petition. I am going to help them do it as one Member of Congress, and I will say that I hope that the steering committee is going to do that.

And although I have almost daily called attention to it, that petition from 345,516 actual and real farmers of this country has been buried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and has been daily ignored here ever since, for this administration has continued to raise salaries in practically every bill that has been passed so far.

The clerk to an ordinary committee of the Senate gets \$3,300 a year. The clerk of a House committee gets only \$2,880. Why should a clerk of the Senate committee who does the same character of work that a House clerk does get that much more salary per year? It is not right. His principal does not get any more salary. Should the subordinate clerk in the office get more?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. How can we expect the country to have any respect for the House if every time we have a chance as a body to take legislative action we permit this sort of discrimination against ourselves?

Mr. BLANTON. Why certainly! But who is permitting it? It is our Appropriations Committee who are bringing the bill like this in here before the House under suspension and not permitting the membership to open their mouths against it. We have only 20 minutes of debate, and we can not properly discuss it, and we can not change it if we wanted to in any particular. If 90 per cent of this House wanted to change this bill they could not do it. We have to take it just as the committee has framed it and vote for it from the first syllable to the last. That is the reason I said it is a crime upon the membership of this House. Oh, you new Members who call yourselves progressives, when you first came here you said you were not going to stand for this sort of thing and yet you are.

Mr. KVALE. We are not.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why don't you get up and denounce it?

Mr. KVALE. Because we haven't the time, and we can not get the time.

Mr. BLANTON. I just wanted you to think about it.

Mr. KVALE. We are thinking.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I presume that I am somewhat of a progressive new Member—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I admit that.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield me some of his time?

Mr. BLANTON. I would yield the gentleman the balance of my time if I could, but the rules do not permit it.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, when I came into the House this morning this proposition was being taken up for consideration, and that was the first notice that we had that legislation of this character was sought to be enacted. I am opposed to this bill; this is no time to increase the salaries of our own clerks and the employees of this House. This bill is to be passed without opportunity of amendment. We have only to vote it up or vote it down, and so far as I am concerned, I am going to vote it down. I agree with what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] has said. We are discriminating against ourselves and in favor of another body. If we pass this bill we are going to give to each Senator for the increased pay of his clerks twice or three times as much as we give to each Member of the House. The Senators have so many clerks now that if you go into a Senator's office you will find it full of clerks. We do just as much work in our offices, many of us, as the individual Senators do. There is no question about

that. They have each four or five clerks and we have one or two. If we pass this bill we shall be giving them over \$800 each for additional clerk hire and giving to each member of the House for that purpose only \$320. The responsibility is upon us if we vote through this sort of legislation. So far as I am concerned I am opposed to it. I am in favor of voting it down and letting it come up in the House at some other time when we will have an opportunity to amend it. I realize that this is an unpopular position to take because many of the Members are interested in this legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that this is a very good illustration of the need of having some rule under which Members could be informed in advance of the business that is to be brought up in the House from day to day?

Mr. RUBEY. There is no question about that. As I said in the beginning, when we came here we did not know that this bill was to be before the House. This is unanimous-consent day and we had a right to believe that that calendar would be taken up in regular order.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the gentleman yield for a short statement?

Mr. RUBEY. I will gladly reserve the balance of my time and it can be yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. BOYCE. I desire to make the statement in the gentleman's time. I want to enter my solemn protest against action on this bill, of such public importance, in the manner that has been provided. There are features in the bill which I would vote for, but I am utterly opposed to being compelled to vote for it in blanket without an opportunity for amendment. I shall vote against the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill as written. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEY. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, in reply to the gentlemen who have criticized the comparative allowance of the Senate and House, that under existing conditions the Senate has 47.4 per cent of the allowance paid for clerk hire to Senators and Members.

Mr. RUBEY. How many clerks are there?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield. Under the recommendation made in this bill the Senate will have only 45.4. The relationship between the Senate's expenses for clerk hire and the House for clerk hire is better under this bill than it has ever been before. It does not matter to me whether anybody votes for this or not. You charged us with the responsibility of adjusting the compensation. We are recommending an adjustment of the compensation. Now, the gentleman from Missouri who just took his seat says nobody knows what is in this bill. That is not our fault. This bill and report, giving every detail of what is in it, has been on file here since last December, and if nobody read what was reported the committee is not to blame for it.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

Mr. RUBEY. We are not supposed to read all bills and reports—

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman tried to convey the idea we were bringing in something here surreptitiously. We are not. You have had every detail of this before you since December; and if we are ready to go on now and nobody wants to vote for it, it does not make a particle of difference to me. I do not care how you vote. I am presenting legislation proposed under your orders, and you can vote as you like.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The proposition that the gentleman brings forth here, it is true, has been before the House and there has been opportunity for Members to inform themselves upon it. It gives the Members of the House something like \$320 more than what we have to-day for clerk hire, and to that extent the gentleman's course is commended, but—

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield for a speech. I do not yield any further. What I want understood is that we are reporting here an adjusted compensation measure under the orders of the House; and if you do not like it, vote it down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. RUBEY. I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. Thirty gentlemen have arisen. The Chair will count the House. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-three Members; not a sufficient number.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It is clear there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 106, answered "present" 1, not voting 118, as follows:

YEAS—207

Abernethy	Freeman	McDuffie	Sears, Nebr.
Ackerman	French	McKenzie	Seger
Aldrich	Frothingham	McKeown	Shreve
Andrew	Fuller	McLeod	Simmons
Anthony	Gallivan	McSweeney	Sinnott
Ayres	Gasque	MacGregor	Sites
Bacon	Gifford	Madden	Smith
Barbour	Glatfelter	Magee, N. Y.	Smithwick
Beck	Green, Iowa	Major, Mo.	Snell
Beeby	Greene, Mass.	Manlove	Snyder
Begg	Griest	Martin	Speaks
Bixler	Hadley	Merritt	Stedman
Boies	Hardy	Michener	Stengle
Bowling	Hastings	Miller, Wash.	Stephens
Browne, Wis.	Haugen	Mills	Stevenson
Brumm	Hawley	Minahan	Strong, Kans.
Buckley	Hayden	Mooney	Strong, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Hersey	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Burton	Hickey	Morris	Swing
Butler	Hill, Md.	Murphy	Swoope
Cable	Howard, Okla.	Nelson, Me.	Tague
Campbell	Hull, Iowa	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Tenn.
Carter	Hull, William E.	Newton, Minn.	Temple
Casey	Humpbrys	Newton, Mo.	Thompson
Chindblom	Jacobstein	Nolan	Timberlake
Clague	James	O'Connell, R. I.	Tincher
Clarke, N. Y.	Jeffers	O'Connor, La.	Tinkham
Cole, Iowa	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Sullivan	Treadway
Cole, Ohio	Johnson, Wash.	Oliver, N. Y.	Tydings
Colton	Kearns	Peavey	Underhill
Connery	Keller	Perkins	Upshaw
Cooper, Ohio	Kelly	Porter	Valle
Cummings	Kendall	Prall	Vestal
Dallinger	Kerr	Ragon	Vincent, Mich.
Darrow	Ketcham	Raker	Vinson, Ky.
Davis, Minn.	King	Reece	Voigt
Deal	Kopp	Reid, Ill.	Wainwright
Dickinson, Iowa	LaGuardia	Richards	Ward, N. Y.
Dowell	Lampert	Roach	Watson
Dyer	Lankford	Robinson, Iowa	Weaver
Elliott	Lazaro	Robson, Ky.	White, Kans.
Evans, Mont.	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.	White, Me.
Fairchild	Leatherwood	Rogers, N. H.	Williams, Mich.
Faust	Leavitt	Rosenbloom	Williamson
Fayrot	Lehbach	Rouse	Winter
Fenn	Lineberger	Sabath	Wood
Fish	Linthicum	Sanders, N. Y.	Woodruff
Fisher	Little	Schafer	Wright
Fitzgerald	Logan	Schall	Yates
Fleetwood	Longworth	Schneider	Zihlman
Fredericks	Luce	Scott	
Free	Lyon		

NAYS—106

Allen	Crosser	Kunz	Rayburn
Allgood	Davis, Tenn.	Kvale	Reed, Ark.
Almon	Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Ronjue
Arnold	Doughton	Larsen, Ga.	Ruby
Aswell	Drewry	Lilly	Sanders, Tex.
Bankhead	Driver	Lowrey	Sandlin
Barkley	Evans, Iowa	Lozier	Shallenberger
Bell	Fulbright	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stalker
Black, Tex.	Fulmer	McReynolds	Stegall
Bland	Garber	McSwain	Summers, Tex.
Blanton	Gardner, Ind.	Major, Ill.	Swank
Box	Garner, Tex.	Mansfield	Taylor, W. Va.
Boyce	Garrett, Tenn.	Mapes	Thatcher
Brand, Ohio	Garrett, Tex.	Milligan	Thomas, Okla.
Briggs	Gilbert	Montague	Tillman
Browne, N. J.	Greenwood	Moore, Ga.	Tucker
Browning	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Underwood
Buchanan	Hill, Ala.	Morehead	Vinson, Ga.
Burness	Hill, Wash.	Morrow	Ward, N. C.
Busby	Howard, Nebr.	Oldfield	Watkins
Byrnes, Tenn.	Huddleston	Oliver, Ala.	Wefald
Cannon	Hudspeth	Park, Ga.	Williams, Tex.
Collins	Johnson, Ky.	Peery	Wilson, Miss.
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Tex.	Quin	Wilson, Ind.
Cook	Johnson, W. Va.	Ralney	Wingo
Cooper, Wis.	Jones	Ramseyer	
Crisp	Kincheloe	Rankin	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Pou

NOT VOTING—118.

Anderson	Celler	Davey	Geran
Bacharach	Christopherson	Dempsey	Gibson
Beers	Clancy	Denison	Goldsborough
Berger	Clark, Fla.	Dickstein	Graham, Ill.
Black, N. Y.	Cleary	Dominick	Graham, Pa.
Bloom	Collier	Drane	Griffin
Boylan	Connolly, Pa.	Eagan	Harrison
Brand, Ga.	Corning	Edmonds	Hawes
Britten	Cramton	Fairfield	Hoch
Burdick	Croll	Foster	Holiday
Byrnes, S. C.	Crowther	Frear	Hooker
Canfield	Cullen	Funk	Hudson
Carew	Curry		Hull, Morton D.

Hull, Tenn.	Magee, Pa.	Purnell	Thomas, Ky.
Jost	Michaelson	Quayle	Tilson
Kahn	Miller, Ill.	Ransley	Vare
Kent	Moore, Ill.	Rathbone	Wason
Kless	Moore, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.	Watres
Klhred	Morgan	Reed, W. Va.	Weller
Knutson	Morin	Salmon	Welsh
Kurtz	Mudd	Sanders, Ind.	Wertz
Langley	O'Brien	Sears, Fla.	Williams, Ill.
Larson, Minn.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Sherwood	Wilson, La.
Lee, Ga.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Sinclair	Winslow
Lindsay	Palge	Sproul, Ill.	Woodrum
McClintic	Parker	Sproul, Kans.	Wurzbach
McFadden	Parks, Ark.	Sullivan	Wyant
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Patterson	Sweet	Young
McNulty	Perlman	Taber	
MacLafferty	Phillips	Taylor, Colo.	

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
On this vote:

Mr. Mudd and Mr. Young' (for) with Mr. Thomas of Kentucky (against).

- General pairs:
- Mr. Patterson with Mr. Drane.
  - Mr. Graham of Illinois with Mr. Jost.
  - Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
  - Mr. Rathbone with Mr. McClintic.
  - Mr. Denison with Mr. Klhred.
  - Mr. Cramton with Mr. Sullivan.
  - Mr. Britten with Mr. Lindsay.
  - Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Woodrum.
  - Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Hawes.
  - Mr. Winslow with Mr. Canfield.
  - Mr. Vare with Mr. Weller.
  - Mr. Sweet with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
  - Mr. McFadden with Mr. Boylan.
  - Mr. Frear with Mr. Wilson of Louisiana.
  - Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'Brien.
  - Mr. Beers with Mr. Goldsborough.
  - Mr. Purnell with Mr. Croll.
  - Mr. Sinclair with Mr. Quayle.
  - Mr. Ransley with Mr. Celler.
  - Mr. Welsh with Mr. Hooker.
  - Mr. Morin with Mr. Black of New York.
  - Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Geran.
  - Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Pou.
  - Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Corning.
  - Mr. Tilsen with Mr. Sherwood.
  - Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Dominick.
  - Mr. Crowther with Mr. O'Connell of New York.
  - Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Harrison.
  - Mr. Watres with Mr. Bloom.
  - Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Collier.
  - Mr. Kiess with Mr. Carew.
  - Mr. Wyant with Mr. Parks of Arkansas.
  - Mr. Foster with Mr. McNulty.
  - Mr. Wertz with Mr. Kent.
  - Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Griffin.
  - Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Salmon.
  - Mr. Holaday with Mr. Doyle.
  - Mr. Kahn with Mr. Davey.
  - Mr. Paige with Mr. Cullen.
  - Mr. Miller of Illinois with Mr. Sears of Florida.
  - Mr. MacLafferty with Mr. Eagan.
  - Mr. Wason with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
  - Mr. Burdick with Mr. Clancy.
  - Mr. Funk with Mr. Brand of Georgia.
  - Mr. Sanders of Indiana with Mr. Cleary.
  - Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina.
  - Mr. Perlman with Mr. Dickstein.
  - Mr. Parker with Mr. Berger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, the Doorkeeper will reopen the doors. The Clerk will call the next bill on the Consent Calendar.

DIVISION OF LANDS AND FUNDS, OSAGE INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA, ETC.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend the act of Congress of March 3, 1921, entitled "An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled 'An act of Congress for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.'"

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

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma and Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.  
The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be paid at the end of each fiscal quarter to each adult member of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma having a certificate of competency his or her pro rata share, either as a member of the tribe or heir of a deceased member, of the interest on trust funds, the bonus received from the sale of oil or gas leases, the royalties therefrom, and any other moneys due such Indian received during each fiscal quarter, including all moneys received prior to the passage of this act and

remaining unpaid; and so long as the accumulated income is sufficient the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be paid to the adult members of said tribe not having a certificate of competency \$1,000 quarterly, except where such adult members have legal guardians, in which case the amounts provided for herein may be paid to the legal guardian or direct to such Indian in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior; the total amounts of such payments, however, shall not exceed \$1,000 quarterly, except as hereinafter provided; and shall cause to be paid for the maintenance and education, to either one of the parents or legal guardians actually having personally in charge, enrolled or unenrolled, minor member under 21 years of age, \$1,000 quarterly out of the income of each of said minors, and so long as the accumulated income of the parent or parents of a minor who has no income or whose income is less than \$500 per quarter is sufficient, shall cause to be paid to either of said parents having the care and custody of such minor \$500 quarterly, or such proportion thereof as the income of such minor may be less than \$500, in addition to the allowances above provided for such parents. Rentals due such adult members from their lands and their minor children's lands and all income from such adults' investments not exceeding \$500 a quarter shall be paid to them in addition to the allowance above provided. All payments to legal guardians of Osage Indians shall be expended subject to the joint approval in writing of the court and the superintendent of the Osage Agency. All payments to adults not having certificates of competency, including amounts paid for each minor, shall be subject to the supervision of the superintendent of the Osage Agency. The Secretary of the Interior shall invest or deposit the remainder, after paying all of the taxes of those members whose funds are subject to his supervision, as provided by existing law: *Provided*, That any part of such remainder, including minor's funds, not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the benefit of such member of the tribe for the specific purpose of purchasing or improving a home, and any additional amount may be expended in the prevention of or cure of any member or minor afflicted with tuberculosis or by any lingering or dangerous disease, when authorized by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and expended under his direction and supervision: *Provided further*, That at the beginning of each fiscal year there shall first be reserved and set aside, out of Osage tribal funds available for that purpose, a sufficient amount of money for the expenditures authorized by Congress out of Osage funds for that fiscal year. No guardian shall be appointed except on the written application of the Secretary of the Interior for the estate of a member of the Osage Tribe of Indians who does not have a certificate of competency or who is of one-half or more Indian blood. All funds and other property heretofore or hereafter received by a guardian of a member of the Osage Tribe of Indians, which was theretofore under the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Interior or the title to which was held in trust for such Indian by the United States, shall not thereby become divested of the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Interior or the United States be relieved of its trust; and such guardian shall not sell, dispose of, or otherwise encumber such fund or property without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with orders of the county court of Osage County, Okla. In case of the death, resignation, or removal from office of such a guardian the funds and property in his possession subject to supervision and control of the Secretary of the Interior or to which the United States held the title in trust shall be immediately delivered to the superintendent of the Osage Agency to be held by him and supervised or invested as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 2. All funds of Osage Indians accruing to their credit and which are subject to supervision as above provided may, when deemed to be for the best interest of such Indians, be paid to the administrators of the estates of deceased Osage Indians or direct to their heirs, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, under regulations to be promulgated by him.

SEC. 3. Lands devised to members of the Osage Tribe of one-half or more Indian blood or who do not have certificates of competency under wills approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and lands inherited by such Indians, shall be inalienable unless such lands be conveyed with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Property of Osage Indians not having certificates of competency purchased as hereinbefore set forth shall not be subject to the lien of any debt, claim, or judgment except taxes, or be subject to alienation, without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. Whenever the Secretary of the Interior shall find that any member of the Osage Tribe of more than one-half Indian blood to whom has been granted a certificate of competency is squandering or misusing his or her funds, he may revoke such certificate of competency after notice and hearing in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and thereafter the income of such member shall be subject to supervision and investment as herein provided for members not having certificates of competency to the same extent as if a certificate of competency had never been granted.

SEC. 5. No person convicted of having taken or who causes or procures another to take, the life of an Osage Indian shall inherit from or receive any interest in the estate of the decedent, regardless of where the crime was committed and the conviction obtained.

SEC. 6. No contract for debt hereafter made with a member of the Osage Tribe of Indians not having a certificate of competency shall have any validity unless approved by the Secretary of the Interior. In addition to the funds heretofore authorized, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to pay, out of the funds of a member of the Osage Tribe not having a certificate of competency, any indebtedness heretofore or hereafter incurred by such member by reason of his unlawful acts of carelessness or negligence.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I demand a second.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I give myself five minutes.

Gentlemen of the House, after about six weeks of intensive investigation, both in hearings on the bill and in executive session, we bring here to-day by unanimous consent of the committee a bill with more than a majority present, and concurred in by all the committee, with the exception of one who voted against reporting the same.

This bill is a modification of an act passed March 3, 1921, which modified the law then in existence to the extent of prescribing the amounts of money which should be paid to this tribe of Osage Indians and imposing certain other restrictions with reference to guardians. The bill has worked splendidly, except with one or two exceptions. We attempted to provide in the bill of 1921 that the same amount of money which we allowed quarterly to the Indians should be paid to the guardian of the incompetent Indian who desired a guardian; but the courts of Oklahoma have interpreted the law so that now, when an Indian desires to have a guardian, the courts have held that his entire estate, including his entire income quarterly, shall be paid to him. The result is that while in 1921 we started out with about 700 incompetent Indians under the jurisdiction of the bureau, we now find that over 400 of them have released themselves from the jurisdiction of that bureau and have become wards of individual guardians. The result of that has been that those who stayed within the bureau have accumulated, by reason of the law setting aside about \$1,000 each quarterly, over \$17,000,000.

As to the 400 who left the jurisdiction of the bureau and took on individual guardians, by reason of the way in which their affairs have been handled, it is impossible for this committee to feel otherwise than that their estates have been badly managed. So we propose to limit the amount of money that the restricted Indian shall receive quarterly.

We propose to restrict the bill with reference to guardians so that in the future an incompetent Indian who has a guardian will receive only the same amount quarterly as the incompetent Indian who stays within the jurisdiction of the bureau. We keep in this bill a supervision of the impounding of their resources.

The reason the act was passed, in the first place, was that we found the 2,200 Osage Indians enrolled had dwindled to about 1,600, and they were receiving average amounts of \$10,000 or \$12,000 annually, all of which was being squandered. In addition to that we found, in our investigation of 1920, that they had gone \$1,300,000 in debt. Now, that debt has been cleaned up.

We have set aside, as I said before, for those who stayed under the jurisdiction of the bureau about \$17,000,000, and if all of them had remained under that same jurisdiction there would be at least \$40,000,000 now on deposit for the Osage Indians.

The Osage Reservation contains approximately 1,465,000 acres. The surface of the land is allotted to 2,229 enrolled Indians, about 650 acres each. The oil and gas thereunder is reserved to tribe until 1946, leased at public auction under department. The entire reservation is leased for gas in large tracts at 3 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. The annual gas royalties are about \$900,000. Approximately 510,000 acres are leased for oil in 160-acre tracts, all royalties fixed by President at one-sixth and one-fifth where oil wells on each tract average 100 barrels in 30 days.

From April, 1916, to April, 1924, there was sold at 20 auction sales 528,383 acres for bonus aggregating \$90,438,856. Oil produced from 1901 to July 1, 1923, aggregated 223,022,666 barrels. The total revenues such period from oil and gas aggregated approximately \$142,240,000, of which 151,215,000 barrels was produced from 1916, and revenues therefrom aggregated \$136,366,388, part of which bonus was not yet due.

In the Osage Reservation there are now 8,755 producing oil wells and 749 gas wells operated under close supervision of the department. The Burbank oil field, covering about 16,000 acres in the Osage, has produced from May, 1920, when first well drilled, to March 1, 1924, approximately 62,000,000 barrels of oil. The total present Osage production is about 100,000 barrels.

From March 18 and 19, 1924, there was sold 51,142 acres for oil leases in 160-acre tracts for \$14,193,800. Six tracts in Burbank fields selling for over \$1,500,000 each, the highest tract bringing \$1,990,000, the largest bonus known to have been paid for the privilege of securing oil lease on 160-acre nonproducing lands.

Receipts for the year ended June 30, 1923, were \$31,417,628; disbursements, \$28,829,747; total, \$60,247,375. Receipts from July 1, 1915, to June 30, 1923, \$124,585,388; disbursements, \$108,030,904. Receipts for month of March, 1924, from various sources aggregated \$10,753,916, of which \$7,475,000 was revenue from oil and gas.

Per capita payments were made to Indians from oil and gas revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, \$12,400 to those having certificates. Restricted adults were paid \$4,000, and parents of minors \$2,000 of minors' shares, the balance retained to their credit. At present they have a credit of \$17,500,000, \$10,000,000 being in banks at 4 and 4½ per cent interest, and \$7,500,000 in Liberty bonds.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield. I yield five minutes more to myself.

Mr. BLANTON. I notice that the committee has recommended the bill. If these Indians who have guardians have had their estates squandered, why not limit their control to the bureau?

Mr. SNYDER. It has been limited to the bureau. You will find that when the guardian is limited to each quarter that will not be the case.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not opposed to legislation which has for its purpose the conservation of the property of incompetent Indians. I never have taken that position. I will not take that position on this floor. But I do take the position here, gentlemen, that you are passing a bill under suspension of the rules which does not permit an amendment to be made, and which is so far-reaching that I appeal to your fairness to decide whether or not you believe that a measure of this kind should be enacted to affect people in your State.

I have no fault to find with a policy that limits the amount per quarter to be paid to the incompetent Indian, but I do object to a proposition that gives dual government and which necessarily results in conflict in carrying on and carrying out of the administration of these estates.

What does this bill do? This bill provides that all payments to the legal guardians of the Osage Indians shall be made subject to the joint control and approval in writing of the courts and of the superintendent of the agency. What do you have under that provision? You have the guardian in a State court, who submits his accounts to the probate judge for his approval and the probate judge approves the account; and then you have it submitted to the Osage Indian Agency, and forsooth, if the agency should not approve the account, then you have a guardian under the court with an account approved and the department disapproving, and the result is that a man who deals with an Indian does not know what he is doing or what to expect.

Why, gentlemen, experience in Oklahoma has shown that the delay in the settlement of Indian affairs, so far as the settlement of Indian estates is concerned, is due entirely to the fact that the department has delayed until the condition is this—and I make the statement without fear of successful contradiction—that under this bill a full-blood Osage Indian, with \$10,000 cash in the Treasury of the United States, could not contract for a doctor to wait upon him; he could not contract for a hospital bill; and he could not make a lawful contract to have himself laid away decently after his death.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The Osage Council has indorsed this bill, has it not?

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand it has.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. But it has also indorsed the compromise bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. I say that whenever the department has the control of an Indian's money, or anybody else has control of it, they can make him do any kind of indorsing they please, because he wants to get as much money as he can and spend it as freely as he can.

I have no fault to find with the Indian Committee when they attempt to conserve the estates of these Indians. But look where this bill goes. All I ask you to do is to vote this bill down under suspension of the rule and give us an opportunity to amend it so as to make it a workable bill in Oklahoma.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. If the gentleman from Oklahoma had not objected to its consideration, it could have been amended, could it not?

Mr. McKEOWN. We would not have had any chance to amend it; it would have gone through right off the reel by a majority vote. I do not discount the ability of the gentleman from New York to pass bills of this House. I have been here before and I know his ability to pass these Indian bills.

I want to show you what they can not do under this bill:

No guardian shall be appointed except on the written application of the Secretary of the Interior for the estate of a member of the Osage Tribe of Indians.

Nobody may be appointed unless the department shall approve the application. Are you going to do away with the wholesome laws of the State of Oklahoma, which provide that the parents of a child shall have priority in the right to nominate the guardian of their child. The State of Oklahoma has extended to these Indians every right of a citizen of Oklahoma. They have the right to vote, and we have thrown around them by law every possible protection. The last legislature passed a law to protect their estates. Now, gentlemen, with all of this protection thrown around them you are going to deny them the privileges extended to them by the laws of the State of Oklahoma. I say the bill ought to be amended.

Let me show you something else in the bill. Here is something else that ought to be amended:

All funds of Osage Indians accruing to their credit and which are subject to supervision as above provided may, when deemed to be for the best interest of such Indians, be paid to the administrators of the estates of deceased Osage Indians or direct to their heirs, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, under regulations to be promulgated by him.

Why, gentlemen, that language permits the Secretary of the Interior to pass on the question of heirship of deceased Osage Indians, and although the courts of Oklahoma may determine who the lawful heirs of an Indian are, the Secretary of the Interior can disregard it, and will disregard it in some instances, and pay it out, and there is no recourse to the heir who is entitled to the money. I have seen cases where it has already been done in other tribes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman of the Indian Committee said in one breath that the several guardians were dissipating the estates and then in the next breath he says that the committee has stopped that by giving them only \$1,000 a quarter. That would be \$4,000 a year, and it occurs to me that a civil guardian who was inclined to dissipate an estate could dissipate a pretty good sum out of \$4,000 a year.

Mr. SNYDER. But these Indians get \$12,000 a year.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas—and I know he wants to be fair—that we have laws in the State of Oklahoma which are ample to require guardians to account; we require them to be placed under bond; but I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that this bill is so far-reaching that it simply wipes out the probate courts of Oklahoma so far as Osage County is concerned. And it does more. It goes further than any bill I have ever seen with respect to the probate courts of Oklahoma.

Mr. SNYDER. But the gentleman will admit it only refers to Osage Indians and Osage County. And, if the gentleman will permit, I will state this: That there is a bill now on the calendar asking for an investigation on account of the very bad practices of your guardians out there.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for two additional minutes.



Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman from New York that when the investigation is made and the record is printed it will show that if there have been any outrages permitted in the probate courts of Oklahoma they have been permitted with full knowledge and under the supervision of the representatives of the department. The truth is that these so-called exaggerated cases will fall flat whenever they are brought into this House, and the Members of this House shall know all the circumstances.

I am asking the House not to vote this bill through under suspension of the rules, because we have no opportunity to amend this bill, and I contend it ought to be amended so that we can pass it correctly.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Do not the courts of Oklahoma now have jurisdiction of the probate cases of Indians?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; they have jurisdiction, and we have a statute which is as strong as the statute of any State in the Union, and that statute properly protects these people. I claim that the supervision provided in this bill will be a greater detriment to the Indians themselves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, four years ago I went with the Committee on Indian Affairs to Oklahoma, where we very carefully examined into the condition of the Osage Tribe of Indians. We found the Osages to be the richest group of people in the world, with the largest individual income, and yet that money was not giving many of them the comforts of life which they ought to have, because much of it was being dissipated. Congress subsequently passed an act which we thought would properly conserve their property, but in order to avoid the law many of the Osage Indians had guardians appointed in the courts of Oklahoma. Through these guardianships they have been able to obtain more money than they ought to have, and their money is still being dissipated.

The time will come when the oil resources of the Osage Reservation will be gone, and unless we conserve the money that now comes from the oil and create a fund that can care for these Indians, there will be many paupers among them to be cared for ultimately by the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. My time is so limited that I am sorry I can not yield.

Under this bill we have liberalized the sums of money that can be paid to each member of the tribe. We have made it unlimited with respect to Indians who are sick or who need urgent and immediate help, and have made \$10,000 available to build each or any of them homes, and yet under the terms of the bill their property will be conserved for them. For these reasons, without discussing its terms, I want to urge the Members of the House to vote for the bill, and I hope it will be adopted to-day.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret finding myself in disagreement with some of my colleagues from my home State, for I have learned to have a very high regard for each of them, and it is unfortunate that we have not been able to bring our views in harmony; but I can not agree with those opposing this legislation. The Osages are the wealthiest people in the world. They draw from \$10,000 to \$12,000 per annum, man, woman, and child, every year. For that reason the most careful restrictions should be placed around these funds. Under the provisions of this bill each man, woman, and child will get \$1,000 of this \$12,000 per quarter. This would mean \$3,000 per quarter for a family of three. In addition to that, they are allowed \$10,000 to be expended for building homes, and the allowance with reference to sickness is unlimited; any available amount can be used for that purpose. The only place in which this bill touches the court jurisdiction of the State of Oklahoma is on page 5, wherein it is provided that money may be paid to the legal guardian or direct to such Indian in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. Under the present law the Secretary must pay the money to the guardian. Under this bill he can pay it direct to the Indian if he thinks that is the best procedure. It does not materially interfere with the jurisdiction of the courts. It simply makes that change and applies the same procedure to the Osages that is now applied to the Five Civilized Tribes who, while far greater in numbers and somewhat more advanced in what we call civilization, have a great deal less money. I sincerely hope the House will adopt the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma has eight minutes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the same privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SNYDER. I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. And I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to any of these requests? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on this measure I occupy a rather unique position. I am the only Representative in this House who represents these Indians in Congress or any of the property affected, and yet I know that through the great power of the Indian Bureau, the prejudice that they have built up against the courts of Oklahoma and the citizens of Oklahoma who oppose this measure, that it is going to be passed this afternoon. I also recognize that under the parliamentary situation where a measure of great importance like this is rushed through with only 20 minutes of debate that myself and those who are opposed to this measure can not with any degree of satisfaction discuss it and give to you the information you should have before you vote. But I come to you appealing and asking as the Representative from the district most vitally affected by this legislation that you do not do this great injustice to these Indians and this community simply because the Bureau of Indian Affairs is seeking to gather greater power through the passage of this bill. There is no demand for this legislation; no necessity for it, except the demand of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and a few of its employees, and in the consideration of this measure I want to sound a warning to the Congress and to the people of the country. Too much legislation like this reaching into the powers of the States and interfering with the inherent rights of the citizens and the States is being introduced by these bureaucratic bureaus and passed by the Congress. Already we have gone so far in this class of legislation that the washerwoman can not ply her trade, the mechanic can not carry on in his trade, and the shepherd can not herd his sheep in peace on the hillside without having some representative of the Federal Government there to dictate to him and make reports on him to the Federal Government later. This bureaucratic practice in Federal Government, such as is attempted by the Indian Bureau in this bill, has reached such a point in this Nation that the citizen of the United States can not longer sing the songs of liberty until he has obtained a clearance card from some Federal bureau or department in Washington.

This bill has not been demanded by anybody except the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They come to you with their sob stories about how the courts of Oklahoma have mistreated the Indians, but they only tell you half of the story. They do not give you an opportunity to know of the waste and dissipation, through favoritism and negligence at least, that has been brought about by the miserable handling of the Indian affairs by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and through their autocratic power they will not give the Congress an opportunity to investigate—this being evidenced by the fact of the impossibility of passing through this Congress a resolution now pending providing for a thorough investigation. They tell you about how much of the money of the Indian has been spent through the courts and guardians in Oklahoma, but make to you no report of their handling of the Indian's financial affairs. They do not tell you that the Osage Indian, who since March 3, 1921, has been entirely under the jurisdiction of the bureau, has created debts amounting to \$260,000, which, in the bureaucratic manner of the Indian Bureau, they refuse to recognize or to pay. They do not give us an opportunity to, by comparison, judge whether or not if the just debts of these Indians were paid that their estates would have been just as much depleted as have those under guardianships they are referring to. They do not tell you that not a man has appeared at the hearing before the committee in behalf of this bill except those who are interested, directly or indirectly, in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman tell the membership of the House who are opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The citizenship of Osage County and all other Oklahomans who know the real facts and conditions.

Mr. SNYDER. No one is opposed to it, so far as I have been able to discover, except the bar association, which constitutes 90 per cent of the guardians and their counsel.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I want to say to you that I have just returned from Oklahoma, and only last Friday and Saturday I saw telegrams sent from Washington to banks that have Osage money on deposit saying in substance, "If you do not quit protesting against the Snyder bill, we will withdraw this money out of your bank." There has not been any opportunity for the citizens of Oklahoma interested in this bill to get a hearing on this matter.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman put one of these telegrams in the Record?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I have not them with me, but I have seen them, and they will be, I understand, put in the Record in the Senate.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield? Did I understand the gentleman to say that those telegrams were sent from Washington?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes; and also to citizens, threatening legislation in this body if these protests were not withdrawn.

Mr. HUDSPETH. From officials of the Government?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Oh, of course not. We know how these autocratic bureaus do these things. They would not dare send these telegrams themselves, but every man on this floor knows how through their influence they can be sent, and they were sent from people from Oklahoma in Washington close to and working with the Indian Bureau in favor of this legislation. Everybody understands a situation like this and can read between the lines.

Mr. SNYDER. That is a very different statement; the gentleman started out with the statement that the telegrams were from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I did not so state.

Mr. SNYDER. That is what I understood.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I never said anything that would give the gentleman any such understanding, but am trying to impress upon the Congress the power that the bureau has and is exercising in this matter. There is not a man who is in trade or in business in Osage County or who is connected with any financial institution in which Osage moneys are deposited who dares to raise his voice in protest. If the Congress will send a committee out there empowered to question and protect the citizens from the autocracy of this department, you will find a very different situation to that presented to the committee by the friends of this measure.

What is the demand for this legislation? The Osage Indian you have been told approves of this bill. The chief of the Osage Tribe and other members have told me that they do not approve of it. They did approve of and give me a compromise bill, which the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee refused to take into consideration. They were told that if they came to Washington legislation would be passed that would give them more of their own money, but in this measure they are worse hampered and placed more at the mercy of an autocratic bureau 1,500 miles away from them than they are under present conditions. It is the Osage Indian that is going to suffer most in the end from this legislation. He owns most of the land in Osage County. This land is taxable. From much of it is being taken this great natural resource. There is a probability that this land will ultimately yield \$100,000,000. This money could be used so as to build up the community in which the Osage Indian's land is located and thereby increase the value of his land and assist in holding the taxes on it to the minimum. Under this measure this will not be done. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs has testified that the money should be invested in Government bonds. What will be the result? The natural resources will be taken out of the country and put into Government bonds; they will not be used to build up the community, with the result that when the oil is gone, when the great income from it has ceased, the community will not have been built up by reason of this great natural resource; the community will have been depleted without the benefit of the revenues that come from that depletion; consequently the Indian will find himself with his income stopped, the value of his property less, and the taxes upon it higher. Under present conditions the guardians, which they are expecting in this bill to do away with, are investing the money in building and loan stock, in first mortgage and real estate loans, where not only the community is benefited but agriculture assisted, and on these funds the Indian through these guardianship loans is earning from 6 to 7 and 8 per cent net on his investment, while if his money is invested by the department, as is contemplated, it will bring not over 3½ to 4 per cent, thus entailing an annual loss to the Osage Indians. I know of some investments in

building and loan stock by guardians that are drawing the Indian from 6 to 10 per cent, and where already these investments have increased in value from 15 to 20 per cent. The passage of this measure will exclude the Indians from receiving benefits such as this, take the money from their own community, and put them back where they were 25 years ago. Under the present system their money is being invested where it is building up their own community and helping to pay the taxes of that community. There is where it should be invested and where you would want it invested if this was in your district instead of mine.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I crave your indulgence a few minutes while I talk upon this bill. I ask not to be interrupted, for I have only a few minutes. I hope to make a comprehensive statement, and I have every confidence that if I could have the attention of all the Members of this House and sufficient time to explain the provisions of this bill there would not be a vote against it.

This bill should receive the unanimous support of this House. The Indian Committee gave a great deal of consideration to Osage affairs four years ago when it visited Pawhuska, Okla., and took testimony there on the ground. We began the consideration of the pending bill on the 25th day of January, 1924, and the hearings are in two volumes comprising 389 printed pages of testimony and argument. After six weeks of consideration by the entire membership of the Committee on Indian Affairs, after we had heard those in favor of it, after we had heard the Indian Bureau and the Indians themselves and those who were opposed to the bill, there was no minority report filed and none requested to be filed. I violate no secret of the Committee on Indian Affairs when I say that every man around the table on both sides except my colleague [Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma] voted to favorably report this bill.

Gentlemen of the House, do you think this is a very bad bill, after six weeks' careful investigation, going over it line by line and section by section, after having heard everybody for and against it? Do you believe it is a bad bill when every member of the committee except one voted to favorably report it, and there was no minority report? Surely if there was any objection to the bill on principle or to any of the phraseology in the bill, those who were heard to object to it would have been able to have pointed it out to the members of the committee and should have been able to have induced some one to make a minority report. The truth is no legitimate argument can be made against this bill, as none was advanced before the committee.

I have not the time to discuss the bill as I would like, but let me say that the Osage Indians occupy Osage County in Oklahoma, just south of the Kansas line. They purchased their reservation, consisting of approximately 1,500,000 acres, from the Cherokees in 1870 and have occupied it continuously since that date. In 1906 they made an agreement with the Government of the United States for the survey and allotment of their land, reserving the oil and gas rights to the tribe. The rolls were made as of July 1, 1907, and there were 2,229 enrolled members of the Osage Tribe. Their lands were allotted, and each enrolled member was permitted to take four allotment selections, aggregating 657½ acres of land. Great lakes of oil have been discovered underneath this land, and the same is being developed. Last year each Osage Indian received as his share from the sale of oil and oil leases \$11,800. These people are being seriously menaced by their own wealth. After an exhaustive investigation we tried to protect them by the act of March 3, 1921, known as the Osage extension act, when the mineral period, including oil and gas, was extended for 25 years, expiring in 1946. We endeavored then in that act to limit the amount of money to be paid each adult Osage Indian to \$1,000 a quarter and \$500 for each of the enrolled minor children. We also provided for the payment of their accumulated debts. You will doubtless be amazed when I tell you that it subsequently developed that the restricted Osage Indians were found to be indebted more than \$1,300,000. This amount was paid out of the funds of these Indians by the superintendent for the Osage Agency. Since then they have contracted debts to the amount of \$260,000.

The act of 1921 provided that all moneys due to Indians having certificates of competency—in other words, unrestricted—should be paid over to them direct. This was done. Unfortunately there was a provision in the act of 1921 directing that the department should pay to all Indians having guardians their share through their guardians. At that time it was not

known to Congress that guardians were being appointed for adult full-blood Indians. As a mere subterfuge and in order that they might get additional allowances over and above the \$1,000 per quarter, these poor unfortunate, improvident, adult Indians, induced and assisted by white people, permitted applications to be made to the county court to have guardians appointed for them, in order, as above stated, that they might have all of their money in the hands of the Indian Bureau turned over to their guardians and squandered. That is exactly what was done. I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment this is the blackest chapter that has ever been written in the history of these Indians.

I do not have time to go into all the details. These Indians were not adjudged non compos mentis. They are restricted full-blood Osage Indians. Of the 2,229 originally enrolled there are approximately 1,600 living, and of these some 600 are restricted Indians. Four hundred and thirty-five of these adult restricted Indians had guardians appointed. These guardians received all of their money—not only the annual share of approximately \$10,000 each, but all of the accumulated moneys in the hands of the Government officials, which in many cases amounted to a vast sum. While it may be an extravagant statement to say that these guardians have dissipated it all, in effect they have dissipated most or approximately all of this money, some ten or twelve thousand dollars a year.

The share of each Osage amounts to some ten or twelve thousand dollars a year. You can readily see the interest of these professional guardians. They do not want to be interfered with, nor do their attorneys who represent them. They do not want to be relieved of their business. They regard it as perfectly legitimate. They do not perform any beneficial services whatsoever. There can be no excuse for their appointments in the first place nor for their continuance. The county seat is at Pawhuska, Okla., and the disbursing office is within sight and a stone's throw. Why should this money be paid first to the guardian who in turn pays it to the adult Indian, not however, before taking a heavy toll of approximately \$1,100 per year, in addition to attorney's fees of \$250 basic fee with additional allowance in almost every case aggregating five or six hundred dollars? Why not permit the disbursing officer to pay it direct to the Indian and let the Indian have some experience in spending it? It is argued that the guardians could invest this money at a larger rate than Government or State bonds pay or than is paid on time certificates of deposit. The answer to that is that in not a single case submitted to the committee has the amount received by a guardian increased, but approximately all, regardless of the amount, dissipated. Suppose the guardian received 8, 10, or 20 per cent, what benefit would it be to the Indian if it were all squandered? Of course these guardians and their attorneys do not want this legislation enacted.

The hearings show a few more than 600 living full-blood restricted adult Osage Indians, 435 of whom have guardians and approximately 200 do not have guardians, but their allowances of \$1,000 per quarter were paid direct by the disbursing officer for the Osage Agency. These 200 Indians have now to their credit in money and bonds \$12,000,000, an average of \$6,000 each. If no guardians had been appointed for the other 435 but their allowances had been paid to them direct they should have to their credit the same proportion or \$26,100,000. While the exact amount is not known because current reports in all cases were not made, the amount to their credit is small in comparison. Practically all has been improvidently expended.

Oil leases on only approximately one-third of their lands have been sold. On March 18 and 19, 1924, leases on about 100,000 acres additional were sold for more than \$14,000,000, which will increase the shares of each enrolled Osage approximately \$7,000. After the leases on the remaining land are sold and the oil developed the shares of each Osage should be greatly increased, which emphasizes the necessity for protective legislation.

What does the bill provide? As you noticed, my colleague, Mr. HOWARD, did not debate the details of the pending bill at all. He talked about the Indian Bureau and tried to arouse your prejudice against the action of the bureau in Oklahoma. He talked very little about the Osages. I believe we should stick to our text. Let us examine the details of this bill, and see if there could be any legitimate objections. But before doing this let me say neither can opposition to this bill be justified on the ground that it was brought up under a motion to suspend the rules, for the reason that the bill was placed upon the Consent Calendar and called up for consideration on Monday, March 17, when objection was made, and it was called

up again for consideration to-day, when, if three objections had not been made, time would have been given for amendment and debate, but inasmuch as objections were made to the consideration of the bill, the chairman was forced, in order to get consideration, to appeal to the Chair to be recognized to move to suspend the rules and to pass the bill because there is urgent need for the enactment of this legislation.

Nor should we be diverted to a comparison with the Five Civilized Tribes. Conditions are entirely different. The Osages occupy one county, their money is disbursed at the county seat, Pawhuska, their affairs are paid out of their own funds, they have an entirely different business experience, whereas the Five Civilized Tribes are scattered over 40 counties, many of them remote from the office of the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes, they do not have guardians for adult restricted Indians, their funds are now being paid direct to them, they have managed their own affairs for a century, they occupy an entirely different status, and are governed by different laws. In this discussion let us confine ourselves to the Osage Indian.

This bill provides liberally for the Osages. It goes further than I wanted it to go. It is no secret that I wanted to eliminate every one of those guardians of restricted adult Indians not adjudged non compos mentis. They do not have them personally in charge. It should be enacted, however, as it was the best bill that all of the members of the committee could unite upon and report.

In the first place, let us eliminate from consideration the Osage Indians to whom certificates of competency have been issued. They are turned loose from all supervision whatsoever. All of their money, much or little, is turned over to them quarterly. This bill directs to be paid to every restricted adult Osage Indian \$1,000 quarterly. If the man's wife is enrolled, she also gets \$1,000 quarterly, and each enrolled child or one having an inherited interest gets \$1,000 per quarter. To a family of three that amounts to \$3,000 a quarter. The bill also provides that there may be paid to each, in addition to the above allowance, \$500 a quarter from their agricultural rents and interest from their investments, and that would amount to \$1,500 additional per quarter—in all, \$18,000 per annum for a family of three. In addition allowances may be made of \$500 per quarter for the keeping of unenrolled minor members of the family.

Surely the bill can not be criticized as not being liberal enough in the allowance of money. It is urged, however, by the unthinking and by the more improvident Indians themselves that this is their money and that, therefore, they should be allowed to do as they please with it, and that it is no concern of the Government nor of Congress if they spend it in dissipation and riotous living. When we consider that these Indians are the wards of the Government and that we as Members of Congress in the consideration of this legislation are the guardians of these primitive people, surely this argument does not need an answer. The truth is, not much can be done for the old adult Osage Indian, who has passed the meridian of life and who faces the setting sun. The current of his life can not be greatly changed. Doubtless he will be permitted to drift down the stream of life supervised and protected as best we can until he reaches the great sea beyond and is finally received into the happy hunting ground.

Our greatest concern, however, should be for the young Indians. What is our duty toward them? Shall we permit them to grow up in ease and thriftless luxury and be despoiled in their own excesses and vices, or shall we regard them as human beings and attempt to restrict them in the too liberal use of money and endeavor to direct their lives into the paths of honorable and productive citizenship? The situation in Osage County is not pleasant to contemplate. These Osages have a splendid school—beautifully located in their capital of Pawhuska, on a high elevation overlooking the city. Congress appropriates from Osage funds annually for its upkeep and maintenance. It has been discontinued for the past two years. These children remain with their parents and spend their time where the discipline is lax and where attendance upon the day schools is admittedly very irregular. The testimony shows that not one single young full-blood Osage Indian is pursuing a gainful occupation. Not one can be pointed to as a productive citizen. The thought that has always burned my brain has been that the thing that was uppermost to consider with reference to all Indians of all tribes was the conservation of the Indian, his development into a productive, patriotic citizen, rather than the conservation of his money. With the Osages, the continued extravagant expenditure of their money so as to permit them to live as they have lived the past few years means the destruction of every young boy and girl born to the full-blood members

of the tribe. What a pity it is that some of the full-blood members of the tribe may not be developed, so that they will be pointed to with pride as members of a dying race in the years to come! Knowing this to be true, I insisted in 1921 upon restricting them in the too liberal expenditure of their money. It is the history of every child—Indian or white—in the land. If they are permitted to grow up without discipline and with an unlimited allowance of money, none of them make the men and women of whom our Nation is proud.

In addition, the bill provides that under the supervision of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, or the Secretary of the Interior, \$10,000 may be spent for the purchase or improvement of a home. It also provides that an unlimited amount may be expended for those suffering with tuberculosis or any lingering disease.

As above stated, the truth is these people are despoiling themselves with their own money. Conditions at Pawhuska are similar to those of western mining towns. All sorts of people—good and bad, reputable and disreputable, moral and immoral—are attracted there by the advertised wealth of these Osage Indians. Of course, there are many splendid men and women there. There are also many who go there to prey upon these helpless, improvident Indians.

Mr. CARTER. And what happens when this \$12,000 is all turned over to these primitive, incompetent people?

Mr. HASTINGS. It is in a very large measure squandered.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. No; I can not yield.

There is no necessity for a guardian for these adult Osage Indians. As previously stated, they live in Osage County, near Pawhuska, Okla. That is the county seat. The Osage Agency is located there and their money is disbursed there by a Federal official. All of the expenses of supervising these Indians and of managing their affairs—every penny of it is appropriated by Congress out of the Osage tribal funds. Not a dollar is appropriated from the Federal Treasury. What is the necessity of paying this money through a guardian to one of these adult Osage Indians? The testimony before the committee showed that the fees of these guardians on an average were \$1,100 a year. Some 25 or more typical cases were presented. They spend as much as \$10,000 in burying one of these Indians. All sorts of extravagances are indulged in.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. No; I can not yield. The young Indians are being despoiled by conditions that prevail there. Some of them have more than one share. Some have five or six inherited shares. I hesitate to make public and to invite to your attention some of the outrages that are being perpetrated, but publicity will arouse the conscience of the Members of this House and of the country. Many of the good people do not know what is going on. The people of my State do not indorse or approve it. Very few in my own State really know the facts. To show you how these people are being despoiled, let me cite you one, perhaps an extreme case. It illustrates conditions.

One Indian girl has  $8\frac{1}{2}$  shares. If she had been paid all the money due her for the  $8\frac{1}{2}$  shares last year, \$11,800 for each share, and agricultural rents in addition, that Indian girl would have received approximately \$100,000. Can you imagine what an outrage was perpetrated upon her? Supposed to be suffering from tuberculosis, her guardian sent her to Kansas City under the protection of a matron, when some of those people of Osage County who wanted to get her money conspired with a prize fighter, or boxer, in Osage County, took him to Kansas City, and getting this unfortunate woman under the influence of liquor, induced her to marry him. He had never seen the girl before. In fairness I will say that the marriage was subsequently annulled. Gentlemen of the House, that is the kind of testimony that was presented to the committee and compelled us to bring out this legislation for the further protection of the Osage Indians for your consideration.

This bill does not entirely ignore the guardian, as I would like, but it does permit the department to supervise these guardians, restricts payment to them in the sums mentioned in the bill, and authorizes the department to pay the money for the use of these Indians either to the guardians or direct to the Indians themselves. This does not change the probate law. It simply requires an honest administration of probate proceedings and a rigid accounting by guardians or else the guardians will be ignored.

The county court should welcome this assistance. It is their duty to protect these wards. Why should an honest guardian object? And if the guardian is not too scrupulous in the handling of the Indian's estate the more is the neces-

sity for the legislation. The bill does not take a cent from the Indians. It provides for the investment of all surplus moneys in Government bonds, State or school bonds, or placed at interest on time deposit in banks in accordance with existing law. It tries to preserve some of the vast wealth of the members for the benefit of future generations. Nor can it be urged that these Indians do not pay their taxes. That is not correct. They pay taxes upon all of their surplus lands, and in addition to the gross production tax required to be paid by other citizens they pay 1 per cent additional to be used for road building in Osage County. They are, therefore, helping develop the county and State by the use of their money.

It has been asserted that the enactment of this bill will not be to the best interest of the business interests or assist in the development of Osage County. Its passage should be welcomed for that very reason. It is, of course, to the advantage of the business interests in Osage County to have Osage money paid out properly and in an orderly way and expended for food, clothing, the necessaries of life for adult Indians, and for the education and maintenance of the minor Indians, and for the purchase and improvement of homes for all than to have the money improvidently spent and wasted through sewers of vice. The money conserved will be, in a large measure, placed in banks on time deposits available to be loaned for legitimate purposes in the development of the surrounding country.

This bill also prevents these improvident Indians from running all sorts of extravagant accounts. Immediately after the act of 1921 was passed \$1,300,000 of their accounts were paid. Guardians for these adult restricted Indians have subsequently paid immense sums on accounts not recognized by the department. That is another excuse for the appointment of these guardians. It is said that there are 210 of these guardians and in all 435 guardianships. Some of them have four or five guardianship cases. In some cases the wife is the guardian and the husband is the attorney. These facts are a matter of common knowledge in Oklahoma, and the testimony taken before the committee sustains it, and it is in fact not denied.

Surely no one who knows the facts can withhold his assent in behalf of legislation that has for its purpose the further protection of these Indians. This bill prevents the restricted Indians from selling or encumbering their lands without consent of the department. Wills are invalid unless so approved. What sections or provisions of the bill have been invited to our attention which should be amended or which is not to the best interest of these improvident Indians? Many of them know nothing of the value of money or property. To state these things to the membership of this House compels an affirmative response.

I have endeavored to indicate my objections to this bill: (1) The recognition of any guardians of adult Indians not of unsound mind; and (2) the allowances are too liberal. I yielded in part to the judgment of the other members of the committee. In the event this bill is enacted into law, I warn the administrative officers against these defects in order that in future years no one can point an accusing finger to my record upon this question and charge that, knowing conditions, I did not invite attention to them.

I appeal to the House, if you want to protect these Indians, if you want to deal fairly with them, if the Government is to be the guardian of these Indians, to pass this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will this bill protect them?

Mr. HASTINGS. It will if the Government officials charged with the administration of it will do their duty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 64, answered "present" 2, not voting 140, as follows:

YEAS—226

Abernethy	Bacon	Boles	Bulwinkle
Ackerman	Barbour	Box	Burtness
Aldrich	Beck	Brand, Ohio	Busby
Allen	Beedy	Briggs	Butler
Andrew	Begg	Browne, N. J.	Cable
Anthony	Bixler	Browne, Wis.	Campbell
Arnold	Black, Tex.	Buchanan	Carter
Aswell	Blanton	Buckley	Casey

Chindblom	Hadley	Major, Mo.	Sites
Clarke, N. Y.	Hardy	Mapes	Smith
Cole, Iowa	Hastings	Martin	Smithwick
Cole, Ohio	Hawley	Merritt	Snell
Collins	Hayden	Michener	Snyder
Colton	Hersey	Miller, Wash.	Speaks
Cook	Hickey	Mills	Stalker
Cooper, Ohio	Hill, Md.	Moore, Ohio	Stedman
Crisp	Hill, Wash.	Moore, Ind.	Stephens
Crowther	Hooker	Morehead	Stevenson
Cummings	Huddleston	Morgan	Strong, Kans.
Dallinger	Hudspeth	Morrow	Strong, Pa.
Darrow	Hull, Iowa	Murphy	Sumners, Tex.
Davis, Minn.	Hull, William E.	Nelson, Me.	Swing
Deal	Jacobstein	Newton, Minn.	Swoope
Dickinson, Iowa	James	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Doughton	Jeffers	O'Connell, R. I.	Temple
Dowell	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver, Ala.	Thatcher
Drewry	Johnson, Tex.	Park, Ga.	Thompson
Driver	Johnson, Wash.	Peavey	Timberlake
Dyer	Johnson, W. Va.	Peery	Tincher
Elliott	Keller	Perkins	Tinkham
Evans, Iowa	Kendall	Phillips	Treadway
Evans, Mont.	Kerr	Porter	Tucker
Fairchild	Ketcham	Prall	Tydings
Fairfield	Kincheloe	Purnell	Underwood
Faust	King	Rainey	Upshaw
Favrot	Kopp	Raker	Vaile
Fenn	Kvale	Ramseyer	Vincent, Mich.
Fish	LaGuardia	Rayburn	Vinson, Ga.
Fisher	Lampert	Reece	Vinson, Ky.
Fitzgerald	Lanham	Reid, Ill.	Wainwright
Fleetwood	Lea, Calif.	Richards	Ward, N. Y.
Foster	Leatherwood	Roach	Ward, N. C.
Fredericks	Leavitt	Robinson, Iowa	Watkins
Freeman	Linthicum	Robson, Ky.	Watson
French	Longworth	Rogers, Mass.	Weaver
Frothingham	Lowrey	Rogers, N. H.	White, Kans.
Fuller	Luce	Sanders, N. Y.	Williams, Mich.
Garber	McKenzie	Sandlin	Williamson
Gardner, Ind.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Schneider	Wilson, Ind.
Garner, Tex.	McLeod	Sears, Nebr.	Wilson, La.
Garrett, Tenn.	McReynolds	Seger	Winter
Gifford	McSweeney	Shallenberger	Woodruff
Glatfelter	MacGregor	Sherwood	Wright
Green, Iowa	Madden	Shreve	Yates
Greene, Mass.	Magee, N. Y.	Simmons	Young
Greenwood	Major, Ill.	Sinnott	

NAYS—64

Allgood	Gallivan	Lyon	Rankin
Almon	Garrett, Tex.	McKeown	Romjue
Barkley	Gasque	McSwain	Rubey
Bell	Hammer	Mansfield	Sabath
Bowling	Harrison	Mead	Sanders, Tex.
Boyce	Hill, Ala.	Milligan	Stegall
Browning	Howard, Nebr.	Minahan	Stengle
Burton	Howard, Okla.	Mooney	Swank
Byrns, Tenn.	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Ga.	Tague
Cannon	Jones	Moore, Va.	Thomas, Ky.
Concny	Kelly	O'Sullivan	Thomas, Okla.
Crosser	Kunz	Oldfield	Tillman
Dickinson, Mo.	Lankford	Oliver, N. Y.	Williams, Tex.
Free	Larsen, Ga.	Parks, Ark.	Wilson, Miss.
Fulbright	Lee, Ga.	Quin	Wingo
Fulmer	Lozier	Ragon	Wolf

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Pou

NOT VOTING—140

Anderson	Denison	Lehlbach	Rosenbloom
Ayres	Dickstein	Lilly	Salmon
Bacharach	Dominick	Lindsay	Sanders, Ind.
Bankhead	Doyle	Lineberger	Schafer
Beers	Drane	Little	Schall
Berger	Eagan	McClintic	Scott
Black, N. Y.	Edmonds	McDuffie	Sears, Fla.
Bland	Frear	McFadden	Sinclair
Bloom	Funk	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sproul, Ill.
Boylan	Geran	McNulty	Sproul, Kans.
Brand, Ga.	Gibson	MacLafferty	Sullivan
Britten	Gilbert	Magee, Pa.	Summers, Wash.
Brumm	Goldsbrough	Manlove	Sweet
Burdick	Graham, Ill.	Michaelson	Taber
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.
Canfield	Griffin	Montague	Taylor, W. Va.
Carew	Haugen	Moore, Ill.	Tilson
Celler	Hawes	Morin	Underhill
Christopherson	Hoch	Morris	Vare
Clague	Holiday	Mudd	Vestal
Clancy	Hudson	Nelson, Wis.	Voigt
Clark, Fla.	Hull, Morton D.	O'Brien	Wason
Cleary	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Watres
Collier	Humphreys	O'Connor, La.	Wefald
Connally, Tex.	Jost	O'Connor, N. Y.	Weller
Connolly, Pa.	Kahn	Paige	Welsh
Cooper, Wis.	Kearns	Parker	Wertz
Corning	Kent	Patterson	White, Me.
Cramton	Kiess	Perlman	Williams, Ill.
Croll	Kindred	Quayle	Winslow
Cullen	Knutson	Ransley	Wood
Curry	Kurtz	Rathbone	Woodrum
Davey	Langley	Reed, Ark.	Wurzbach
Davis, Tenn.	Larson, Minn.	Reed, N. Y.	Wyant
Dempsey	Lazaro	Reed, W. Va.	Zihlman

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Pou.  
 Mr. Wyant with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Cooper of Wisconsin with Mr. Lazaro.

Mr. Brumm with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Vestal with Mr. Bankhead.  
 Mr. Welsh with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Frear with Mr. Ayres.  
 Mr. Manlove with Mr. Croll.  
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Gilbert.  
 Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Bland.  
 Mr. Mudd with Mr. Humphreys.  
 Mr. Hoch with Mr. Montague.  
 Mr. Tilson with Mr. Taylor of West Virginia.  
 Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. McNulty.  
 Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin with Mr. Connally of Texas.  
 Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Lilly.  
 Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Morris.  
 Mr. Curry with Mr. McDuffie.  
 Mr. Anderson with Mr. Reed of Arkansas.  
 Mr. Sproul of Kansas and Mr. O'Connell of New York.  
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Wefald.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will reopen the doors.

THE LATE HON. J. M. C. SMITH, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, April 27, be set aside for memorial addresses on the life, character, and public services of our late colleague, Hon. J. M. C. SMITH, of Michigan, and that the House meet at 11 o'clock on that day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that Sunday, April 27, be set aside for memorial exercises on the late Mr. SMITH, of Michigan, and that the House meet at 11 o'clock on that day. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 646. An act for the relief of Ethel Williams; and  
 S. 1861. An act authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Elwood Grissinger.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 655) to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A SUPERINTENDENT AND TWO ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS OF DELIVERY IN CERTAIN POST OFFICES

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 579) providing for the appointment of a superintendent and two assistant superintendents of delivery in certain post offices of the first class.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PAYMENT OF PURCHASE MONEY, FORT BERTHOLD INDIAN RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4494) authorizing the extension of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government land purchases within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is interested in this bill?

Mr. WINTER. The bill is a bill of Mr. SINCLAIR, of North Dakota.

Mr. BEGG. Has this privilege been heretofore granted these same people prior to this time?

Mr. WINTER. As a class or individually?

Mr. BEGG. To these same individuals?

Mr. WINTER. I can not say whether it has affected the identical individuals or not.

Mr. BEGG. The bill is to extend the time for payment of their entry fees for improvements and also upon the land. Now, if the time be extended for a year, will that satisfy them and will they be able to get out of their present financial difficulties, or come back another year and want the same thing done over?

Mr. WINTER. It is believed very easily, and the belief of the committee is that a year will probably suffice, but the bill provides that in case that time is not sufficient that upon a proper showing it may be extended for a final limit of three years.

Mr. BEGG. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That any homestead entryman or purchaser of Government lands within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota who is unable to make payment of purchase money due under his entry or contract of purchase as required by existing law or regulations, on application duly verified showing that he is unable to make payment as required, shall be granted an extension to the 1925 anniversary of the date of his entry or contract of purchase upon payment of interest in advance at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the amounts due from the maturity thereof to the said anniversary; and if at the expiration of the extended period the entryman or purchaser is still unable to make the payment he may, upon the same terms and conditions, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be granted such further extensions of time, not exceeding a period of three years, as the facts warrant.

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

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

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

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN TWO INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES FOR CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 195) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in two international conferences for the control of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This resolution embraces about three times as much money as should be spent on this trip. I am just as much in favor of the principle that is involved in this proposition as the gentleman or any other gentleman in this House, but in the name of these conferences we are going to waste a great deal of money. Is not the gentleman willing to cut it down by half, at least?

Mr. PORTER. Decidedly no.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it requires two objections.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I will object unless somebody explains it.

Mr. PORTER. I will say to the gentleman I intend to make a statement and explain the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 195) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in two international conferences for the control of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

Whereas President Roosevelt on October 14, 1907, called an international commission, which met in Shanghai, China, in 1909, to make an investigation of the abuses growing out of the opium traffic and to suggest a means for their prevention, and thus the United States, as pointed out by President Wilson in his message to Congress on April 21, 1913, "initiated the world-wide movement toward" the abolition of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs; and

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

Whereas the original convention delegated certain administrative functions to the Netherlands Government (thereby constituting the said Government an agent for the execution of the treaty), and said Government called two conferences in 1913 and 1914 to consider problems growing out of the execution of the convention; and

Whereas certain of the powers parties thereto have vested in the League of Nations the agency or duty of executing the convention by treaty dated June 28, 1923, article 23 of which provides as follows: "Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the league \* \* \* will intrust the league with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to \* \* \* the traffic in opiums and other dangerous drugs \* \* \*;" and

Whereas the United States, for the reasons that it is only by international cooperation that the suppression of the world-wide traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs can be accomplished, and that this Government is bound by The Hague opium convention equally with other governments to work toward this end, accepted an invitation from said agency to cooperate with it in the execution of said treaty; and

Whereas as the result of conferences in January, May, and September of 1923, between the representatives of the United States and governments represented by the League of Nations, the latter govern-

ments agreed that the United States construction of The Hague opium convention, as provided in Public Resolution No. 96, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved March 2, 1923, represented the objects which the treaty was intended to accomplish, and that any other construction would render the treaty ineffective and of no practical value, and accordingly it was decided:

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

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

Whereas it was further decided at said conferences that two international conferences should be called in the latter part of the year 1924 to agree upon a plan to enforce said treaty in accordance with said construction and interpretation, bearing in mind that the gradual suppression of the traffic in and use of prepared opium as provided in Chapter II of the convention is not yet accomplished, reservations to that effect having been noted by certain powers (Great Britain, France, Germany, Netherlands, Japan, British India, and Siam, in regard to prepared opium): Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the appropriation of such sum as may be necessary, not to exceed \$40,000, for the participation of the United States in one or both of these conferences, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: On page 3, line 1, of the resolving clause, after the word "Resolved," insert "by the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: On page 3, line 1, after the word "Resolved," insert "by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled."

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the letter of the Secretary of State be read in my time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letter will be read. There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, February 9, 1924.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 31, 1924, inclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution 162, authorizing the appropriation of the necessary funds for the participation of the United States in one or both of the international conferences for the control of the traffic in habit-forming narcotics.

This resolution has my full and unqualified approval, and I feel sure that its prompt passage is necessary to enable this Government to continue its efforts to obtain a complete international understanding in regard to the limitations which must be placed upon the production and dissemination of opium and coca leaves and their derivatives. The preamble to your resolution shows so fully the background of the narcotic situation that it is hardly necessary for me in this letter to state any further reasons for American participation in this work.

I may add, however, that for nearly 20 years the United States has occupied a prominent position in urging international action in this regard and in carrying out the international obligations it has assumed for the control of the traffic, and I trust that Congress will authorize an appropriation that will permit the Government to continue in the future as it has in the past.

I thank you for your letter and for this opportunity to express my views as to the need for further international activity in the work of suppressing the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs.

I am, my dear Mr. Porter,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the pending resolution authorizes an appropriation of \$40,000 to defray the expenses of the United States participation in the forthcoming conference to be held the latter part of this year. The conference will be called for the purpose of putting into practical effect the American construction of The Hague opium convention. That construction was placed on the convention by the last Congress. It is a construction that this Government has always advocated, and for the purpose of the Record I shall make a very brief statement.

I think it should be a source of gratification that in the Philippine Islands we very rarely, if ever, see the sunken eye, the emaciation, the pallor, and the nervousness, and in many instances the abscesses on the body from the use of the hypodermic syringe that are so common in certain oriental coun-

tries. We have proven by our action in the Philippines that the traffic in opium can be effectively suppressed and its use limited to strictly medicinal purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I notice that on page 2 of the resolution it says:

Whereas as the result of conferences in January, May, and September of 1923 between the representatives of the United States and governments represented by the League of Nations—

Mr. PORTER. Would the gentleman kindly defer his question until I am through? Then I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Very well.

Mr. PORTER. The act of March 4, 1909, prohibited any citizen of the United States from—

giving, selling, or otherwise supplying \* \* \* any opium to any aboriginal native of any of the Pacific islands lying within the twentieth parallel of north latitude and the fortieth parallel of south latitude and the one hundred and twentieth meridian of longitude east of Greenwich and not being in possession of the protection of any civilized power. \* \* \*

On July 24, 1906, Right Rev. Charles H. Brent, Bishop of the Philippines, wrote President Roosevelt suggesting that in view of the fact that from the earliest days of our diplomatic relations with the East the course of the United States of America has been so manifestly high in relation to the traffic in opium that it seemed to him almost our duty, now that we have the responsibility of actually handling the matter in our own possessions, to promote some movement that would gather in its embrace representatives from all countries, for the traffic in and use of opium is a matter of moment.

The preamble to the resolution, as stated by the Secretary of State, "shows so fully the background of the narcotic situation" that I shall content myself with a brief history of the attitude of the United States toward the illicit traffic in opium and its derivatives—morphia, heroin, and codeine; and the coca leaf and its derivative—cocaine; and the efforts made by our Government to suppress the abusive use of these habit-forming drugs.

The record shows that it has been the unbroken policy of the United States to insist on the limitation of the production of these drugs to the quantity required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes. The treaties of 1844, 1858, 1880, and 1903 with China, the treaty of 1882 with Korea, and the treaty of 1858 with Japan prohibit American citizens from trafficking in opium or its derivatives with the citizens of those countries and fixed severe penalties for the violation of the treaties by any citizen of the United States, and provided further that—

the benefits of the most favored nation clause in existing treaties shall not be claimed by the subjects of either power as against the provisions of this article.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to continue for seven minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not, the gentleman has kindly promised me five minutes. Is he going to give me that five minutes?

Mr. PORTER. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall expect to speak as much as five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, with the same understanding, the gentleman said he would yield me ten minutes.

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

Mr. PORTER. By the act of Congress of March 3, 1905, it was provided that after March 1, 1908, it shall be unlawful to import into the Philippines opium in whatever form except by the Government and for strictly medicinal purposes only. The act of Congress of August 5, 1909, provided as follows:

Importation or shipment into the Philippines of the following articles is prohibited: \* \* \* (g) Opium in whatever form except by the Government of the Philippines and pharmacists duly licensed and registered as such under the laws in force in said islands, and for strictly medicinal purposes only.

This legislation completely suppressed the traffic in opium and exploded the ages-old argument that the abusive use of

opium in the Orient was a necessary evil. I have here the figures of the imports of opium by the Philippine Islands from 1900 to 1903, prior to the passage of the acts of Congress:

	Pounds
In 1900 there were imported	224, 115
In 1901 there were imported	369, 037
In 1902 there were imported	137, 583
In 1903 there were imported	254, 547

and the figures showing imports of opium from 1918 to 1921 subsequent to the passage of the acts of Congress:

	Pounds
In 1918 the import was approximately	235
In 1919 the import was approximately	237
In 1920 the import was approximately	1, 550
In 1921 the import was approximately	192
Total	2, 214

In compliance with the request of Bishop Brent, President Roosevelt called a conference of the interested nations at Shanghai, China, which adopted certain resolutions looking toward the limitation of production of these drugs to the quantities needed for strictly medicinal purposes. In 1909 President Taft called a conference at The Hague for the purpose of conventionalizing the resolutions adopted at the Shanghai conference. The conference at The Hague met in the year 1912 and resulted in the existing Hague opium convention, which has been ratified by the overwhelming majority of all the nations of the world.

Two subsequent conferences were held at The Hague where much effective work was done but the war broke out and at its close the treaty of Versailles delegated to the League of Nations the duty or agency of executing The Hague opium convention on the part of the States signatory to the treaty of Versailles. On February 28 the Congress of the United States passed a resolution declaring in substance as follows:

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

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes more.

Mr. TILLMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, a great many of us are interested here in other matters on this long docket. There is no objection to this bill. It will be passed unanimously, as I understand. I do not like to object, but—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought the gentleman could restrict his request.

Mr. PORTER. I will ask for three minutes more.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. PORTER. In January, May, and September representatives of the United States attended conferences with the agency created by the other signatories to The Hague opium convention, and it was finally decided that the construction placed on the convention by the assembly of the league, namely, that production should be limited to the quantity required for legitimate purposes, was erroneous and that the American construction of said treaty, subject to a reservation, represented its true intent and purpose.

It was further decided that two international conferences should be called to meet in the latter part of the year 1924 to agree upon a plan to enforce the convention in accordance with the American construction and interpretation.

In view of the fact that the United States has succeeded in securing the acceptance of its construction of The Hague opium convention, subject to a reservation, and that a conference has been called to put into practical operation the American principles, it would, indeed, be most embarrassing if we failed to appropriate the funds necessary for such purpose.

The contest which the United States has waged against the abusive use of these drugs is one of which every American citizen has a right to feel proud, and I am firmly convinced that

we are on the last lap of a long journey toward the suppression of this great international sin.

It is hardly conceivable that civilized nations will longer allow the element of revenue to interfere with the suppression of this degrading traffic, which is a greater evil than human slavery. [Applause.]

Now I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. On page 2 of the resolution I notice that there is this language:

Whereas as the result of conferences in January, May, and September of 1923, between the representatives of the United States and governments represented by the League of Nations, the latter governments agreed that the United States construction of The Hague opium convention, as provided in Public Resolution No. 96, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved March 2, 1923, represented the object which the treaty was intended to accomplish.

I want to ask the gentleman what was his position before the League of Nations, and what was the nature of the conference with the League of Nations?

Mr. BLANTON. That is a hard question.

Mr. PORTER. No; it is not a hard question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute, so as to allow him to answer the question.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is indelicate to object, but on a calendar day like this it is equally indelicate to make the request. This calendar is composed of bills unobjected to, which are supposed to pass without debate. I hope the gentleman will be willing to conclude at the end of a minute.

Mr. PORTER. I could not answer that question in a minute. Two minutes would be the limit. I am very anxious to answer the question.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. There is an amendment already pending. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment on page 3, line 2. I move to strike out "\$40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 2 of the resolution, strike out "\$40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] is going, with four others, to Europe on this mission. I go with him in spirit, and I am for the things he stands for on this mission. But why on earth these five people should spend \$8,000 apiece is beyond my comprehension. I am willing to cut this \$40,000 down to \$10,000, and I hope my colleagues who are in favor of economy will support me. These four other individuals, led by our colleague here in the House, can easily make that trip on \$2,000 apiece, which would total \$10,000, and if they can not do it, they ought to stay at home. Conditions now are such that \$2,000 of American money in Europe will buy a whole lot of things, wet and dry, and I am sure these five excursionists can get along on \$10,000 in all.

That is my only purpose in now taking up the time of the House, and I hope that every man in the House who believes in economy will vote for my amendment. How on earth can these five individuals spend \$8,000 apiece—four men and one good woman?

The length of this resolution made me rather suspicious of it. It goes on to tell us that President Roosevelt did in 1907, and then what President Taft did in 1909, and then what President Wilson did in 1913, and then what the League of Nations has done. Why, the gentleman ought not to mention the League of Nations, because he and his Republican Party have not only ignored and disregarded it but turned it down. Now, he sets up in a resolution that it is the League of Nations that expects to carry out his Hague narcotic convention of

1912. If he is depending on the League of Nations he ought to cooperate with it a little more, instead of disregarding it and turning it down all the time.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the gentleman think it is worth \$40,000 to us to recognize the League of Nations?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it is such a small recognition after all that I doubt if it is worth it. We are only recognizing it on narcotics.

Mr. KING. It is recognized four times in the resolutions.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. That is a kind of camouflage. It is going in by the back door. When I go into a place I do not go in by the back door. I go in openly by the front door.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MOREHEAD. This trip is what we call in the West a junketing trip?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I am willing to pay for the gentleman's trip. He accomplishes something every time he goes over there. I am behind him in what he is doing. This is his annual trip to Europe. He accomplishes something every time he goes; but I want to say this to him—and I am his friend—that he has got his kite up too high.

Forty thousand dollars is too much for five people to spend on this junketing trip that has much junketing in it. I hope the gentleman will agree to cut it down to \$10,000, because unless he does I am going to vote against so much waste.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this resolution, having for its purpose the suppression of opium traffic and other narcotic drugs. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and his associates, Bishop Brent, Doctor Blue, and Mr. Neville, of the State Department, as a committee, accomplished a great work in their conference with the League of Nations.

It is wonderful indeed how we are gradually slipping into the League of Nations, and the conference of this committee with the league is but one of a number of steps which we have taken in that direction. I regret, however, that they could not have taken a part in the discussion like representatives from member nations before that great international body.

Mr. Fosdick, in speaking of my colleague, Mr. PORTER, said in the American Review of Reviews for April:

Our official representatives—that is, those appointed by Government agencies—are present only as "observers"—a shadowy term which in some cases has been conscientiously interpreted to debar them from speaking and voting. Mr. PORTER would not even stay in the room to hear the discussion of the measures for opium control; but, having presented his own ideas, solemnly led his delegation outside to avoid international entanglements.

[Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. For a question.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. If the gentleman please, I never heard of this bill and I would like to have some information. I understand the gentleman to say that if we shall vote in favor of this bill it will be an expression on the part of the American Congress in behalf of the League of Nations.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly it will. The gentleman's conference was with the League of Nations and the agreement was with the League of Nations.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. That is enough for me. Then I do not want to vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Well, if the gentleman is not in favor of the League of Nations and its operations he ought not to vote for this resolution. I notice that some dozen different representatives of the United States have gone to the League of Nations and placed their matters before it, and I think that if we propose to take part in the affairs of the world we ought to do it like other nations as a part of the League of Nations and not as a looker-on or as an observer, and that our representatives should not have to take the position which the gentleman from Pennsylvania was compelled to take.

I congratulate him on his work; he did splendid work, and \$40,000 is not too much to allow them to go back and to do more work. It is for two committees and may last several months.

One does not realize to what extent the United States has embarked upon consultations, conferences, and participations with the League of Nations without a thorough examination into the subject.



For a list of recent participations, I would call the attention of the House to the appointment by the Department of Agriculture of an official to the league's commission on anthrax. The appointment of General Blue, our then Surgeon General, to the opium committee, which was followed by the conference of the committee headed by Chairman PORTER, of which I have spoken; then later of Surgeon General Cummings, who represented America on the health committee of the league; and then of Assistant Surgeon General Blue, who represented the United States at the league's conference in London to consider antitoxic serum. In 1923, when Secretary Hughes informed the powers that the American relief organization would retire from Greece, he sent a representative to the financial committee of the league, then to a special subcommittee of the council, where a plan for relief was consummated. In the same year our consul at Geneva, Mr. Haskell, and a special agent of the United States customs service, Mr. Van Dorem, represented the United States at the league's conference on customs formalities; and then we have the direct participation of Mr. Grew, the American minister to Switzerland, at the Geneva conference on the suppression of traffic in arms; and then there is the acceptance by John Bassett Moore of the league's court of international justice, and I might mention numerous other occasions where to all intents and purposes the United States participated in matters under discussion by the League of Nations without, however, any influence which membership therein might have brought us.

I am indebted to the Baltimore Sun for the following editorial of to-day:

IS THIS ISOLATION?

To this country the most striking feature of the experts' report on reparations is not the carefully drawn clauses designed to enable Germany to resume payments. It is the very great extent to which active American participation is relied upon in order to make the plan workable.

It is useless to suppose that a huge block of German bonds can be sold in this country unless purchasers are assured that Germany will have a fair chance to recover economic security. That assurance is impossible unless our Government participates much more directly in the reparations settlement than has hitherto been the case. Nothing has been said in Washington to indicate a change from the policy of isolation. Yet the American chairman of the experts' commission is going ahead with plans for the German loan as though it is a matter of course that this country will take up a share of it.

But the share which is being allotted to America in clearing up the reparations problems only begins with the loan. An American, appointed as an American, is to be on the governing board of the proposed German bank of issue, sharing equal responsibility with the official representatives of allied and neutral nations.

An American is to be a member of the transfer committee of this bank, the duties of which will include not only handling the reparations account but also supervision of funds which the German Government might possibly use to finance measures of resistance. And while it is not specifically stated, it is broadly hinted that other Americans, acting as official appointees of the reparations commission, will be expected to serve as members of the commission to be appointed to supervise the imposition of taxation in Germany and to regulate inner financial reforms in that country.

Many in this country will feel that this proposed participation in the settlement of Europe's greatest problem is essential to our own welfare. Others will oppose it. But all will agree that the calm way in which American supervision of the reparations settlement is being worked out in Paris while the administration at Washington maintains its stand of rigid nonintervention is highly remarkable, to say the least.

It is incredible to suppose that General Dawes has written this report, involving this country in European affairs as deeply as if we were a full-fledged member of the League of Nations, without having first submitted his plans to Washington and received tacit approval thereof.

It is equally incredible to suppose that President Coolidge, who even side-steps American membership in the World Court, should have let General Dawes understand that he is at liberty to suggest our joining with Great Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium in a supervision of Germany to the extent proposed.

Yet the inference is inescapable that one of these incredible things has happened.

But meantime, while these steps toward the recovery of Europe are developing, no inkling comes from Washington that we have any but the most indirect interest in the work of the Dawes committee, regardless of the direct participation in European affairs it is evidently preparing to recommend for us.

Why should we continue to operate as an observer? If the United States intends to recognize the league, should we not

have courage and conviction sufficient to become a party to this great world league and enter by the front door, pay our just proportion of the expenses, and have a vote, as other nations now have? It is not correct when the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that only matters which were prescribed by treaty prior to the formation of the League of Nations have been considered by the United States with the league. Many of the matters which I have enumerated, and for which I am indebted not alone to the Baltimore Sun but to Mr. Fosdick, are new subjects which have originated long since the formation of the league.

I contend that the United States should have the position in world affairs to which we as a nation are entitled. I believe membership in the league would give us this position. If there are certain features of the league with which we are not pleased or which might be inimicable to our democratic form of government or to the liberties of the people, then let us eliminate those features and become a participant in world affairs. Through such participation we can help lead nations and the world back to normal conditions, and with our great resources not alone help to reestablish nations, but to secure world markets for our goods both from the farm and the factory.

We can not hope for that complete prosperity until our world customers are likewise prosperous. We can not hope for that influence in world affairs until we have established ourselves in that position which affords us world prominence. We can not hope for that great humanitarian idea for which America stands until we assume our responsibilities along with other nations. I sincerely will hail the day when America takes the position to which she is entitled before the world and assumes those responsibilities which come with those opportunities, to which this great Nation and people are entitled. [Applause.]

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the amount of this appropriation, as I have said, we are on the last lap of a long journey with reference to the narcotic drug problem.

Two conferences are to be called. We are not certain whether we shall attend one or both of them. The matter is to be determined later. For instance, an emergency arose about a month ago and it was necessary to send two men to Paris to arrange for our part in the conferences. So far as salaries are concerned, there is no intention of paying salaries to the commissioners except in one instance, and it is not fair to talk about junketing. Bishop Brent, in 1902, led the warfare against opium in the Philippines. He represented our Government at Shanghai; he represented our Government three times at The Hague opium conventions, presiding over one of them, and he went across the Atlantic with me last summer twice and he never received a dollar of compensation, and he does not expect any. Mrs. Hamilton Wright is the widow of the man who represented us at Shanghai and again at The Hague. Mr. Neville is connected with our Consular Service.

You must remember this: This conference may last two or three months. Traveling expenses are high, subsistence is high, and, after all, the disbursement of this fund is left to the sound discretion of the Secretary of State under the terms of the resolution.

This is the crisis in the matter, and if it becomes necessary for the Secretary of State to hire an international lawyer of outstanding prominence or other assistants he ought to have the money with which to do it. In all probability the \$40,000 will not be expended.

Now, just a word in reply to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM]. The gentleman seems to forget that the United States has treaties with the countries now members of the League of Nations and that those treaties were made long before the League of Nations was ever thought of. That these nations had the right to form that association no one will question, but the fact they did form it does not deny us the right to assert our rights or discharge our obligations under the terms of these treaties. In every instance where the United States representatives have negotiated with the league it has been to assert a right or perform a duty under an existing treaty, and I confess frankly I can not see any distinction between negotiating with these nations en bloc and negotiating with them individually.

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

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I dislike at this time—

The SPEAKER. The Chair promised to recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, because I have great respect for anything he wants to submit to the House.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I was going to move to close debate. I entirely agree with my friend from Tennessee that days like this should not be taken up in debate. When unanimous consent has been given for the consideration of a bill, it is to be assumed that if unanimous consent is granted a long argument is not necessary. I speak only in the interests of protecting this calendar. I think the gentleman from Tennessee is absolutely right.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I hope, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] has talked for 20 minutes, he will at least let the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER] talk five minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I shall not submit the motion now, but I shall move to close debate after this.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not intend to prolong the debate unnecessarily. I was interested in objecting to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to reduce this appropriation to \$10,000. I have seen men ruined by opium, and if this committee that goes to Europe can save the life and career of but one person such as I have seen it will have justified the expenditure of the \$40,000. I think that the opium traffic is one of the most dangerous to the life and happiness of the American people. A great judge in New York, the chief city magistrate, Judge McAdoo, an ex-Member of Congress from New Jersey, one of the wisest advisers in our complex city life, wrote a marvelous article in World's Work in which he said that if the poppy fields of Turkey could be plowed up there would be thousands of lives and careers saved in the city of New York. He proved it in this remarkable article which he wrote. He has performed a great service to America.

I am interested in any mission that will break down the opium traffic of the world. I believe it is more vital to have this commission go unimpaired, fully equipped, and fully paid for than to have any other kind of expedition sent over to Europe. I believe the underworld is backed up by the dope peddler and that every criminal in this country is a part of the opium traffic of this country. I believe there is a direct connection between opium and crime. Crime causes this country the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and if we can spend \$40,000 to clip off but one criminal in his infancy, I tell you we will have justified the expense a thousandfold.

On behalf of humanity I ask that every dollar that this committee asks be appropriated, because it ought to carry with it the prayers of America and the prayers of all humankind, because if we can wipe out the opium traffic we can wipe out the most sinful, the most baneful, and the most malignant influence that is now wrecking and ruining the prospects of mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman have any idea that this committee can stop it?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I certainly have, and I certainly hope they will stop it, and I will back it up with my vote and my voice anywhere any time. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that no quorum is present. It is clear no quorum is present. The doorkeeper will close the doors, the sergeant at arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 13, nays 279, not voting 140, as follows:

NAYS—279

- |                 |                  |                   |                 |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Abernethy       | Faust            | Leatherwood       | Rogers, N. H.   |
| Ackerman        | Favrot           | Leavitt           | Ronjue          |
| Aldrich         | Fenn             | Lee, Ga.          | Rouse           |
| Allen           | Fish             | Linthicum         | Rubey           |
| Allgood         | Fisher           | Lozier            | Sanders, N. Y.  |
| Almon           | Fitzgerald       | Luce              | Sandlin         |
| Andrew          | Fleetwood        | Lyon              | Schafer         |
| Arnold          | Foster           | McDuffie          | Schall          |
| Aswell          | Free             | McKeown           | Schneider       |
| Ayres           | Freeman          | McLaughlin, Mich. | Sears, Nebr.    |
| Bacon           | French           | McLeod            | Seger           |
| Barbour         | Frothingham      | McReynolds        | Shallenberger   |
| Barkley         | Fulbright        | McSwain           | Shreve          |
| Beck            | Fuller           | McSweeney         | Simmons         |
| Beedy           | Fulmer           | MacGregor         | Sinnott         |
| Begg            | Gallivan         | MacLafferty       | Sites           |
| Bell            | Gardner, Ind.    | Madden            | Smith           |
| Bixler          | Garner, Tex.     | Magee, N. Y.      | Smithwick       |
| Black, Tex.     | Garrett, Tenn.   | Major, Ill.       | Snell           |
| Bland           | Garrett, Tex.    | Major, Mo.        | Snyder          |
| Bloom           | Gasque           | Manlove           | Speaks          |
| Boies           | Gifford          | Mansfield         | Stalker         |
| Bowling         | Glatfelter       | Mapes             | Stedman         |
| Box             | Greene, Mass.    | Mead              | Stengle         |
| Boyce           | Greenwood        | Merritt           | Stephens        |
| Brand, Ohio     | Griest           | Michener          | Stevenson       |
| Briggs          | Hadley           | Miller, Wash.     | Strong, Kans.   |
| Browne, N. J.   | Hammer           | Milligan          | Strong, Pa.     |
| Browne, Wis.    | Hardy            | Mills             | Summers, Wash.  |
| Browning        | Harrison         | Minahan           | Summers, Tex.   |
| Buchanan        | Hastings         | Mooney            | Swank           |
| Buckley         | Hawley           | Moore, Ga.        | Swing           |
| Bulwinkle       | Hayden           | Moore, Ohio       | Tague           |
| Burtness        | Hersey           | Moore, Va.        | Temple          |
| Burton          | Hickey           | Moore, Ind.       | Thatcher        |
| Busby           | Hill, Ala.       | Morgan            | Thomas, Ky.     |
| Byrns, Tenn.    | Hill, Md.        | Morrow            | Thomas, Okla.   |
| Campbell        | Hill, Wash.      | Murphy            | Thompson        |
| Cannon          | Hoch             | Nelson, Me.       | Timberlake      |
| Carter          | Howard, Nebr.    | Newton, Mo.       | Tincher         |
| Casey           | Howard, Okla.    | Newton, Minn.     | Tinkham         |
| Chindblom       | Huddleston       | Nolan             | Treadway        |
| Clancy          | Hudspeth         | O'Connell, R. I.  | Tucker          |
| Clarke, N. Y.   | Hull, Iowa       | O'Connor, La.     | Underhill       |
| Cole, Iowa      | Hull, William E. | O'Sullivan        | Underwood       |
| Cole, Ohio      | Jacobstein       | Oldfield          | Upshaw          |
| Collins         | James            | Oliver, Ala.      | Vaile           |
| Colton          | Jeffers          | Oliver, N. Y.     | Vestal          |
| Connery         | Johnson, Ky.     | Park, Ga.         | Vincent, Mich.  |
| Cook            | Johnson, S. Dak. | Peavey            | Vinson, Ga.     |
| Cooper, Ohio    | Johnson, Tex.    | Ptery             | Vinson, Ky.     |
| Cooper, Wis.    | Johnson, Wash.   | Perkins           | Wainwright      |
| Crisp           | Johnson, W. Va.  | Phillips          | Watkins         |
| Crosser         | Jones            | Porter            | Watson          |
| Crowther        | Kelly            | Pou               | Weaver          |
| Cummings        | Kendall          | Prall             | White, Kans.    |
| Dallinger       | Ketcham          | Purnell           | Williams, Mich. |
| Darrow          | Kincheloe        | Quin              | Williams, Tex.  |
| Davey           | King             | Ragon             | Williamson      |
| Deal            | Kopp             | Rainey            | Wilson, Ind.    |
| Dickinson, Iowa | Kunz             | Raker             | Wilson, La.     |
| Dickinson, Mo.  | Kurtz            | Ramseyer          | Wilson, Miss.   |
| Doughton        | Kvale            | Rankin            | Winslow         |
| Dowell          | LaGuardia        | Rayburn           | Winter          |
| Driver          | Lampert          | Reed, N. Y.       | Wolff           |
| Dyer            | Lanham           | Reid, Ill.        | Wright          |
| Evans, Iowa     | Lankford         | Richards          | Wurzbach        |
| Evans, Mont.    | Larsen, Ga.      | Roach             | Yates           |
| Fairchild       | Larson, Minn.    | Robinson, Iowa    | Young           |
| Fairfield       | Lea, Calif.      | Rogers, Mass.     |                 |

NOT VOTING—140

- |                |                 |                   |                |
|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Anderson       | Dominick        | Langley           | Rosenbloom     |
| Anthony        | Doyle           | Lazaro            | Sabath         |
| Bacharach      | Drane           | Lehbach           | Salmon         |
| Bankhead       | Drewry          | Lindsay           | Sanders, Ind.  |
| Beers          | Eagan           | Lineberger        | Scott          |
| Berger         | Edmonds         | Little            | Scars, Fla.    |
| Black, N. Y.   | Elliott         | Longworth         | Sherwood       |
| Boylan         | Frear           | McClintic         | Sinclair       |
| Brand, Ga.     | Fredericks      | McFadden          | Sproul, Ill.   |
| Britten        | Funk            | McKenzie          | Sproul, Kans.  |
| Brumm          | Garber          | McLaughlin, Nebr. | Sullivan       |
| Burdick        | Geran           | McNulty           | Sweet          |
| Butler         | Gibson          | Magee, Pa.        | Swoope         |
| Byrnes, S. C.  | Gilbert         | Martin            | Taber          |
| Cable          | Goldsborough    | Michaelson        | Taylor, Colo.  |
| Canfield       | Graham, Ill.    | Miller, Ill.      | Tilson         |
| Carew          | Graham, Pa.     | Montague          | Tydings        |
| Celler         | Green, Iowa     | Moore, Ill.       | Vare           |
| Christopherson | Griffin         | Morin             | Voigt          |
| Clague         | Haugen          | Morris            | Ward, N. C.    |
| Clark, Fla.    | Hawes           | Mudd              | Ward, N. Y.    |
| Cleary         | Holaday         | Nelson, Wis.      | Wason          |
| Collier        | Hudson          | O'Brien           | Watres         |
| Connally, Tex. | Hull, Tenn.     | O'Connell, N. Y.  | Wefald         |
| Connolly, Pa.  | Hull, Morton D. | O'Connor, N. Y.   | Weller         |
| Corning        | Humphreys       | Paige             | Welsh          |
| Cramton        | Jost            | Parker            | Wertz          |
| Croll          | Kahn            | Patterson         | White, Me.     |
| Cullen         | Kearns          | Periman           | Williams, Ill. |
| Curry          | Keller          | Quayle            | Wingo          |
| Davis, Minn.   | Kent            | Ransley           | Wood           |
| Davis, Tenn.   | Kerr            | Rathbone          | Woodruff       |
| Dempsey        | Kiess           | Reece             | Woodrum        |
| Denison        | Kindred         | Reed, W. Va.      | Wyant          |
| Dickstein      | Knutson         | Robison, Ky.      | Zihlman        |

So the amendment was rejected. The following additional pairs were announced: Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Montague. Mr. Frear with Mr. Bankhead.

YEAS—13

- |         |             |                |         |
|---------|-------------|----------------|---------|
| Blanton | Lowrey      | Sanders, Tex.  | Tillman |
| Hooker  | Morehead    | Stegall        |         |
| Lilly   | Parks, Ark. | Taylor, Tenn.  |         |
| Logan   | Reed, Ark.  | Taylor, W. Va. |         |

Mr. Brumm with Mr. Drewry.  
 Mr. Reece with Mr. Lazaro.  
 Mr. Swoope with Mr. Tydings.  
 Mr. Ward of New York with Mr. Wingo.  
 Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Martin.  
 Mr. Keller with Mr. Eagan.  
 Mr. Lehibach with Mr. Canfield.  
 Mr. Elliott with Mr. Geran.  
 Mr. Cable with Mr. Collier.  
 Mr. Butler with Mr. Sabath.  
 Mr. White of Maine with Mr. McNulty.  
 Mr. Curry with Mr. Kerr.  
 Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Sherwood.  
 Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LILLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.  
 The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed," strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$20,000."

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 20 ayes and 167 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

#### DEFERRING PAYMENT OF RECLAMATION CHARGES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1631) to authorize the deferring of payments of reclamation charges.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that it be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to defer the dates of payments of any charges, rentals, and penalties which have heretofore accrued, or may hereafter accrue, prior to the 1st day of January, 1925, under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388), and amendatory and supplemental acts, and upon irrigation projects on Indian reservations, as may, in his judgment, be necessary to the making of rearrangements and readjustments in or concerning any irrigation project now existing under said act: *Provided, however,* That interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum on the amount of each payment so deferred shall be collected in lieu of any penalties that may now be provided by law in case of delinquencies in such payments: *Provided further,* That no payment shall be deferred in any particular case beyond the date on which the last payment of construction charges shall be required by law to be made in that case, thereby permitting the distribution of the deferred payments over the life of existing contracts.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to defer the dates of payments of any charges, rentals, and penalties which have heretofore accrued, or may hereafter accrue, prior to the 1st day of January, 1925, under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388), and amendatory and supplemental acts, as may, in his judgment, be necessary in or concerning any irrigation project now existing under said act: *Provided,* That no payment shall be deferred in any particular case beyond the date on which the last payment of construction charges shall be required by law to be made in that case, thereby permitting the distribution of the deferred payments over the life of existing contracts."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Idaho if an amendment has been agreed upon that will lengthen the time of this extension?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I intend to offer it as a committee amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman be good enough to have it read now?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I will offer it now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SMITH: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to defer the dates of payments of any charges, rentals, and penalties which have accrued prior to the 1st day of March, 1924, under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388), and amendatory and supplemental acts, as may, in his judgment, be necessary in or concerning any irrigation project now existing under

said act: *Provided,* That no payment shall be deferred under this section in any particular case beyond March 1, 1927: *Provided,* That upon such adjustment being made, any penalties or interest which may have accrued in connection with such unpaid construction and operation and maintenance charges shall be canceled, and in lieu thereof the amount so due, and the payment of which is hereby extended, shall draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, paid annually from the time said amount became due to date of payment: *And provided further,* That in case the principal and interest herein provided for are not paid in the manner and at the time provided by this section, any penalty now provided by law shall thereupon attach from the date of such default.

"Sec. 2. That where an individual water user or individual applicant for a water right under a Federal irrigation project constructed or being constructed under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388) or any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto makes application prior to January 1, 1925, alleging that he will be unable to make the payments as required in section 1 hereof, excepting operation and maintenance charges for drainage on the Boise, Idaho, project for the year 1922, or prior thereto, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion prior to March 1, 1925, to add such accrued and unpaid charges to the construction charge of the land of such water user or applicant, and to distribute such accumulated charges equally over each of the subsequent years, beginning with the year 1925, or, in the discretion of the Secretary, distribute a total of one-fourth over the first half of the remaining years of the 20-year period beginning with the year 1925, and three-fourths over the second half of such period, so as to complete the payment during the remaining years of the 20-year period of payment of the original construction charge: *Provided,* That upon such adjustment being made any penalties or interest which may have accrued in connection with such unpaid construction and operation and maintenance charges shall be canceled, and in lieu thereof the amount so due, and the payment of which is hereby extended, shall draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, paid annually from the time said amount became due to date of payment: *Provided further,* That the applicant for the extension shall first show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior detailed statement of his assets and liabilities and probable inability to make payment at the time required in section 1: *And provided further,* That in case the principal and interest herein provided for are not paid in the manner and at the time provided by this act any penalty now provided by law shall thereupon attach from the date of such default: *And provided further,* That similar relief in whole or in part may be extended by the Secretary of the Interior to a legally organized group of water users of a project upon presentation of a sufficient number of individual showings made in accordance with the foregoing proviso to satisfy the Secretary of the Interior that such extension is necessary."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the right to object until the gentleman can explain the amendment. I followed the reading as closely as I could, but the confusion was such that I do not fully understand it. I reserve the right to object and ask the gentleman to explain the effect of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, the amendment agreed upon by the committee at the last meeting provides—

Mr. BEGG. Before the gentleman begins will he permit a suggestion?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. This is the third time this extension has been made. If permitted this time, will the gentleman in his statement give us some assurance that this will be the last?

Mr. SMITH. If the gentleman can assure us that the farmers will be able to sell their crops at a profit next year I can, otherwise not.

Mr. BEGG. That is no answer at all. Not all the farmers in the United States are asking for the Government to give extension on their obligations, and very few get it.

Mr. SMITH. I am talking about the farmers on the reclamation projects where they have high overhead expenses of \$10 to \$20 an acre, which does not apply to other agricultural sections.

Mr. SINNOTT. If the gentleman will yield; this will be the last extension on these particular charges.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; because they are expected to be paid in three years.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH. I will.

Mr. RAKER. The House did not get the statement that the gentleman made—that this amendment was presented to the committee having charge of the matter, and they heard from the department and offered this amendment to meet the situation, which conforms to the desire of the department and the Reclamation Service.

Mr. SMITH. That is true. The committee carefully considered the amendment, the enactment of which is urged by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation to save delay. The bill as passed the Senate provided an interest charge of 6 per cent. As the committee first reported it we thought no interest should be charged on the deferred payments. On further consideration of the matter, and taking the advice of some older members who objected to this feature of the bill, we agreed to the amendment which has been read at the desk, which provides for interest at 5 per cent. It also provided that the charges that have accrued during the last year may be paid within three years, and prior to the 1st of next January if the farmer concludes that he can not pay these back charges within three years, then under section 2 they are to be scattered out over the balance of the contract term, one quarter of which may be paid in the first half and three quarters in the second half. The bill is similar to the existing law and is intended to meet the necessities confronting water users who are delinquent—the farmers who are unable to pay the water charges due the 1st of last December—and in order to give the Secretary of the Interior legal authority to turn on the water for the opening of the irrigation season we have presented the pending bill.

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

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. There seems to be a misunderstanding or not a full understanding about this bill. Some Members seem to think that it does not provide for interest. I understand that the amendment does provide interest.

Mr. SMITH. It provides interest on delinquent construction charges and maintenance and operation charges.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Carried over a certain period. The charges are not canceled.

Mr. SMITH. No; they are not canceled.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which has been reported by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent, House Resolution 223, a resolution providing for the consideration of this bill, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS PEARL RIVER, MISS.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6903) 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.

The title of the bill was read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2436, a bill of identical language already passed by the Senate, be substituted for the House bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Pearl River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Grigsby's Ferry, Leake County, State of Mississippi, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

By unanimous consent, the similar House bill, H. R. 6903, was ordered to lie on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS PEARL RIVER, MISS.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6902) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is not an error by any chance granting an authorization for the construction of the same bridge?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2437, passed by the Senate, in identical language, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Pearl River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Battle Bluff Crossing, Leake County, State of Mississippi, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

By unanimous consent a similar House bill, H. R. 6902, was laid on the table.

#### FEES FOR REGISTERED-MAIL MATTER

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6352) to authorize the Postmaster General to fix the fees chargeable for registration of mail matter, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time this bill has been up, and as I understand it three objectors are required.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LILLY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Three gentlemen have objected, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PA.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6810) granting the consent of Congress to the Millersburg & Liverpool Bridge Corporation, and its successors, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Millersburg, Pa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Millersburg & Liverpool Bridge Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Millersburg, Pa., in the county of Dauphin, in the State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

#### COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INDIAN AFFAIRS, OKLAHOMA

The next business was House Joint Resolution 181, creating a joint committee of three Members of the Senate and three

Members of the House to investigate the administration of Indian affairs in the State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Three gentlemen have objected.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the objection which the gentleman from Ohio made to this resolution when it was up last can be cured.

Mr. BEGG. Oh, we have wasted a lot of time this afternoon, and we have already passed a bill that I think makes the passage of this resolution unnecessary. I do not see any reason to waste any more time. I shall object.

Mr. CARTER. The bill about which the gentleman talks which we passed does not apply to these matters. It applies only to the Osage Nation. The gentleman's objection was that this was a joint resolution. He would not object, as I understand it, to a House resolution authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs—

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will have the committee bring in such a resolution, we will consider that.

#### USE OF LANDS IN QUINAIELT INDIAN RESERVATION FOR LIGHTHOUSE PURPOSES

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5416) to authorize setting aside of certain tribal lands within the Quinaielt Indian Reservation, in Washington, for lighthouse purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to set aside for lighthouse purposes lot 5 in section 13 and lot 1 section 24, township 21 north, range 13 west of Willamette meridian, within the Quinaielt Indian Reservation, in Washington, containing a total of 43.20 acres: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce shall pay the Indians therefor, from the appropriation for the general expenses of the Lighthouse Service for the fiscal year in which this reservation is made, such price for the lands set aside hereunder as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided further,* That the funds thus derived shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of the Quinaielt Reservation and shall be subject to expenditure for their benefit in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may deem for their best interests.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby reserved for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Quinaielt Reservation in common all oil, gas, coal, or other minerals in the lands set aside hereunder for lighthouse purposes and the right to prospect for and mine these commodities under such rules and regulations as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER. The next on the Consent Calendar is S. J. Res. 96, which has been provided for in the appropriation bill and without objection will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

#### TUITION OF INDIAN CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4835) to pay tuition of Indian children in public schools.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an agreement made with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] the last time the bill was under consideration, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is the amendment in place of the whole bill?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be reported instead of the bill. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay any claims which are ascertained to be proper and just, whether covered by contracts or not, for tuition of Indian pupils in State public schools during the fiscal years 1922 and 1923, and to expend for such purpose out of balances remaining from the appropriations for support of Indian day and industrial schools for such fiscal years not to exceed a total of \$30,000, without regard to the limitations heretofore placed by law upon the use of such appropriations for tuition of Indian pupils in public schools."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### AUTHORIZING THE COURT OF CLAIMS TO ADJUDICATE CLAIMS OF CREEK INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7913) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Creek Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statutes of limitation, to hear, examine, and adjudicate and render judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims arising under or growing out of any treaty or agreement between the United States and the Creek Indian Nation or Tribe, or arising under or growing out of any act of Congress in relation to Indian affairs, which said Creek Nation or Tribe may have against the United States, which claims have not heretofore been determined and adjudicated on their merits by the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to confer jurisdiction upon the court to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any balance claimed to be due on the so-called loyal Creek claim, or any amount claimed to be due to equalize allotments among members of the Creek Tribe.

SEC. 2. Any and all claims against the United States within the purview of this act shall be forever barred unless suit be instituted or petition filed as herein provided in the Court of Claims within five years from the date of approval of this act, and such suit shall make the Creek Nation party plaintiff and the United States party defendant. The petition shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed to prosecute such claim or claims under contract with the Creeks approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior; and said contract shall be executed in their behalf by a committee chosen by them under the direction and approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior. Official letters, papers, documents, and records, or certified copies thereof may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of said Indian nation to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys of said Indian nation.

SEC. 3. In said suit the court shall also hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any claims which the United States may have against said Indian nation, but any payment which may have been made by the United States upon any claim against the United States shall not operate as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suit.

SEC. 4. That from the decision of the Court of Claims in any suit prosecuted under the authority of this act, an appeal may be taken by either party as in other cases to the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 5. That upon the final determination of any suit instituted under this act, the Court of Claims shall decree such amount or amounts as it may find reasonable to be paid the attorney or attorneys so employed by said Indian nation for the services and expenses of said attorneys rendered or incurred prior or subsequent to the date of approval of this act: *Provided,* That in no case shall the aggregate amounts decreed by said Court of Claims for fees be in excess of the amount or amounts stipulated in the contract of employment, or in excess of a sum equal to 10 per cent of the amount of recovery against the United States.

SEC. 6. The Court of Claims shall have full authority by proper orders and process to bring in and make parties to such suit any or all persons deemed by it necessary or proper to the final determination of the matters in controversy.

SEC. 7. A copy of this petition shall, in such case, be served upon the Attorney General of the United States, and he, or some attorney from the Department of Justice to be designated by him, is hereby directed to appear and defend the interests of the United States in such case.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, on page 2, line 13, I offer an amendment. Strike out the word "five" and insert "three."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, all I want to say in reference to this is very brief. If you leave that five years, you will continue the employment of attorneys perhaps unnecessarily long. Now, I should think—and perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma can correct my impression—but I should think that all the claims that could be filed, or are likely to be filed, might be done within a period of three years. In other words, I should think nobody will be jeopardized by making it three years, and these Indians' money will certainly be saved from the employment of unnecessary attorneys.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will yield, the only objection to that is that there are five of these civilized tribes. This is the last one in this bill. The others have been passed, and we followed exactly the language, in so far as the limitation is concerned, of the other four bills. We passed one for the Cherokees which was signed by the President, which was five years; we passed one for the Seminoles, one for the Choctaws and Chickasaws, and this is the last of these five tribes.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman really think—

Mr. HASTINGS. They will be emancipated, their affairs are now being wound up, and will be wound up within five years, so that no jurisdictional act should ever be passed for either of these Five Civilized Tribes after this is over. This winds it up completely, and—

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman thinks three years would not be long enough?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is my judgment, and that is the reason we put in five years.

Mr. CARTER. There is no reason why this tribe should be dealt with differently from the other Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. BEGG. I will say I will withdraw the amendment in order to gain time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the amendment.

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

#### TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS FROM ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK TO COLORADO NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2713) to transfer certain lands of the United States from the Rocky Mountain National Park to the Colorado National Forest, Colo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a national park, my attention was distracted at the moment. I think we should have some one explain especially the necessity of taking this amount out of a national park and putting it in this reserve. I will just reserve the right to object if any gentleman wants to make a statement.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, replying to the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that there should be shown the necessity for this legislation, I desire to say that a farmers' irrigation company desires a portion of land which is partially in the national park and partially in the national forest, in order to construct a reservoir for irrigation purposes.

Now, to show the membership of the House just how little the park is affected by this proposed legislation, here on this map before you [indicating] is the Colorado National Forest, and here is the Colorado National Park. This [indicating] is the dividing line between them; and having been the author of the bill for the extension of this park, I know just exactly how this line was formed.

The park service desired for purposes of administration that it be on the peak of the mountain, dividing the slopes of the mountain, so that the administration of it could be easily looked after, and they changed the description I had used for metes and bounds and made the boundary line along the crest of this mountain range, and in the survey for the location of the reservoir, which the Geological Survey has shown in the hearings to be the only available place for the reservoir, they say there are 345 acres within the national park. This bill only provides for the elimination of that many acres out of the national park and transfer into the forest reservation, which department is permitted under the law to grant permits for this and other purposes, which is not the case with the Interior Department or the park service. This bill has the approval of both the Department of Agriculture and the In-

terior Department, and as you will observe by the hearings is favored by the park service as evidenced by the statement made by Mr. Cameron before the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation.

The SPEAKER. The reservation is withdrawn. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That those portions of the following-described tracts now within the Rocky Mountain National Park be, and are hereby, transferred to the Colorado National Forest and shall hereafter be subject to all laws relating to the use and administration of the national forests: Section 10; northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 11; northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, north half of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 15; and the northeast quarter of section 16; township 6 north, range 75 west, sixth principal meridian.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 387) to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BEGG. I think that is entirely too important a bill to be passed in this way, and therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### CLAIM OF RHODE ISLAND FOR EXPENDITURES IN WAR WITH SPAIN

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 913) referring the claim of the State of Rhode Island for expenses during the war with Spain to the Court of Claims for adjudication.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BEGG. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### WIDENING GEORGIA AVENUE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1339) to authorize the widening of Georgia Avenue between Fairmont Street and Gresham Place NW.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That under and in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, within six months after the passage of this act, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for widening of Georgia Avenue between Fairmont Street and Gresham Place NW., with a width of not less than 90 feet, in accordance with maps on file in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That the entire amount found to be due and awarded by the jury in said proceedings as damages for, and in respect of, the land to be condemned for said widening, plus the costs and expenses of the proceedings hereunder, shall be assessed by the jury as benefits against the property which the jury shall find to be benefited.

Sec. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, an amount sufficient to pay the necessary costs and expenses of the condemnation proceeding taken pursuant hereto, and for the payment of the amounts awarded as damages to be repaid to the District of Columbia from the assessments for benefits, and covered into the Treasury to the credit of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

## CONVICT LABOR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. Res. 176) directing the Secretary of Labor to make a report on the subject of convict labor in the United States.

The title of the resolution was read.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

## PAYMENT TO CERTAIN RED LAKE INDIANS IN MINNESOTA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4460) authorizing payment to certain Red Lake Indians, out of Chippewa Indian funds, for garden plats, surrendered for school-farm use.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States not to exceed \$1,000, out of moneys on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to use the same, or as much thereof as may be necessary, in reimbursing certain Red Lake Indians whom he may find to have suffered loss through the taking of their individual garden plats, without remuneration to them, for Indian school-farm purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the text.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

## PAYMENT TO RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 25) authorizing a per capita payment of \$50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

## QUIETING TITLES TO LAND IN FLOMATON, ALA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4437) to quiet titles to land in the municipality of Flomaton, State of Alabama.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. JEFFERS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

## WIDENING HAINES STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4981) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permission to the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to widen Haines Street in front of the National Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pa.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] what is the Government getting out of this bill?

Mr. DARROW. I will say to the gentleman that this is a very needed improvement. The Government is giving up no rights, but merely permits the city of Philadelphia to widen the street from 33 feet to 50 feet, so the city will have an opportunity to construct sidewalks in front of the cemetery. All of the expense is to be borne by the city, and the Government has already, I am informed, built a fence back of the old wall, so that there will be no change at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Will it require the disinterring of any bodies in the cemetery?

Mr. DARROW. No. The nearest body to the line is about 193 feet back from the 8½-foot line.

Mr. BLANTON. This line extends how long?

Mr. DARROW. I think it is 970 feet in length.

Mr. BLANTON. Has this bill been approved by the War Department?

Mr. DARROW. It has been approved by the War Department twice.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no objection by the War Department?

Mr. DARROW. The Secretary of War thinks it is a very needed improvement and there is quite a lengthy letter from the Secretary printed in the report. The street has gotten to be a thoroughfare greatly used by automobiles, and all the foot passengers have to walk in the bed of the roadway, so that it is very dangerous.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object, because I believe it is necessary that the gentleman, who is a member of the steering committee, pass some bill to offset his not carrying out the farmers' request as to raises in salaries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my colleague, Mr. CRAMTON, wanted me to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he would accept this amendment: At the end of the paragraph insert "and erect an iron fence on the new street line along the frontage of the said property"?

Mr. DARROW. I understand the iron fence has already been constructed by the War Department, is in place, and paid for.

Mr. BEGG. Back where it belongs?

Mr. DARROW. Back where it belongs—8½ feet back from the present wall.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to permit the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to use and occupy for street purposes all or any part of a strip of land, 8 feet 6 inches in width, off the south side of the Philadelphia National Cemetery, in said city, and along the Haines Street frontage of said cemetery: *Provided,* That the said city shall remove the present stone wall marking the boundary line between said cemetery and said street and grade, build, and maintain a sidewalk and curb along the frontage of said cemetery and care for and maintain said street the same as other public streets of said city.

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

## UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the independent offices appropriation bill and also on the Veterans' Bureau paragraph.

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

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the paragraph in the pending bill relating to the United States Veterans' Bureau carries an appropriation of \$79,095,773 less than that carried in the 1924 appropriation bill for the Veterans' Bureau. This reduction is in the following items: Salaries and expense, \$3,194,063; printing and binding, \$25,000; military and naval compensation, \$35,450,000; medical and hospital service, \$6,683,710; vocational rehabilitation, \$31,743,000; military and naval insurance, \$2,000,000. The appropriation carried in the pending bill for the United States Veterans' Bureau is the exact amount estimated and recommended by the Budget. It, of course, should be understood that this appropriation is for the fiscal year of 1925. It was estimated by the Appropriations Committee that conditions will now justify a reduction of 4,500 in the number of employees for 1925, which means an annual saving of \$5,629,778. During the year 1924 there was a reduction of 3,246 in the total number of employees.

It will be observed that the work in this department is becoming less and less each year, and it is expected that this rate of decrease in the number of the office personnel will continue for some time. While every good citizen desires that the bureau shall have all necessary office and clerical help, no one wants us to maintain a larger office personnel than is reasonably necessary for the efficient and expeditious conduct of the bureau. So we are glad that the salary and office expense account can be reduced over \$3,000,000 without impairing the efficiency of the bureau. An additional saving of \$25,000 in the printing expense is, of course, worth while.

The largest reduction is in the item "military and naval compensation," \$35,450,000. This does not mean that less money will be expended this year for military and naval compensation than last, but it is unnecessary to make the appropriation so large this year because there is an unexpended balance remaining over from last year of approximately \$43,000,000. So the amount available for military and naval compensation in 1925 will be entirely adequate, and there will be an unexpended balance from the 1925 appropriation which will in like manner reduce the appropriation for 1926. Of course, no one desires to withhold from the service men any just compensation to which they may be entitled, and I am quite sure that the present appropriation for this purpose, with the amount left over from the current year, will be entirely adequate to meet every demand.

For medical and hospital service, the appropriation for 1925 is \$6,683,710 less than for the fiscal year 1924. This amount is the same as the Budget estimated for the year 1925. With \$2,000,000 left over from the current fiscal year, the committee was unanimously of the opinion that the proposed appropriation would be entirely adequate to meet every demand incident to the medical and hospital service. Inasmuch as the subcommittee has gone thoroughly into this question, I am willing to accept the recommendation of the committee, but in so doing I want it distinctly understood that I do not favor any policy that will deprive the disabled ex-service men of any care or attention to which they are entitled under a liberal and just construction of our laws.

I am not willing to economize at the expense of the comfort of the men who suffered and sacrificed to preserve our Government and to perpetuate the ideals for which it stands. May I say in this connection that, while I am convinced General Hines is honestly and sincerely endeavoring to administer the affairs of the Veterans' Bureau in a just and proper manner, I nevertheless believe that certain reforms and new regulations should be introduced in the administration of the bureau. While I do not want to offer any unjust or undeserved criticism against the present management of the bureau, I think it is quite evident that some of the department heads and subordinate officers have promulgated and are enforcing rules and regulations not justified by law and not in harmony with the letter and spirit of the act making provision for treatment and compensation of disabled service men. In other words, I believe that in many instances the regulations are so strict that they defeat the spirit and purpose of the law. It would seem in many instances that the rules are so rigid that every doubt is resolved against the ex-service man and the entire burden of proof is placed on him to establish affirmatively and by convincing and conclusive evidence, and may I say beyond a reasonable doubt, that the disability is of service origin. In many instances those rules are unnecessarily harsh and frequently indefensible. Quantum of proof should not be so great as to render it impossible for the soldier to meet the requirements of the bureau, where, as in many cases, there is great difficulty in establishing affirmatively that the disability is of service origin. There should be a fair, just, and liberal construction of the law to the end that its benevolent purposes and provisions may not be sacrificed on the sharp edge of technicality. I therefore urge on the bureau a policy of more liberal construction of the law and less rigidity in the application of its bureau-made rules.

Much has been said in debate as to the management of the Veterans' Bureau hospitals. In this connection I will say that I am convinced that at all times the appropriations have been ample and sufficient to conduct these hospitals efficiently and properly and afford to the inmates an abundance of wholesome food and all necessary comfort and treatment. If the inmates of any of these hospitals have not received proper care and attention, it is because of inefficient management of those in charge of the local institutions and in such cases there should be an immediate removal of the officers and managers responsible for these conditions. I am hoping that as a result of full publicity every inefficient manager in charge of these hospitals may be speedily discharged and their places filled with capable men who will efficiently manage the institutions, give the inmates an abundant supply of wholesome food and otherwise provide for their care and comfort in harmony with the law under which these institutions are being maintained. No man with a "political pull" should be appointed manager or have the control of one of these hospitals. I think Congress should clearly indicate to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau that these hospitals must be properly maintained, and that the inmates must receive the care and attention to which they are entitled and for which adequate provision has been made by Congress.

While the appropriation for 1925 for vocational rehabilitation is \$31,743,000 less than for the current year, this decrease is justified because the proposed appropriation of \$89,000,000 will be adequate to meet every need during the fiscal year of 1925. Much of the vocational instruction has been completed, and one by one the schools are closing and the men have been rapidly going out of training and into employment. This, of course, is to be expected and it is but natural that the vocational training item should decrease from year to year and the decrease from now on should be very rapid. But, of course, ample funds have been and will be provided to insure vocational training in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law.

The appropriation of \$88,000,000 for military and naval insurance is \$2,000,000 less than the appropriation for 1924. This sum will be sufficient to meet all death and disability claims. In this connection may I state that of 4,500,000 policies in force during the war the number has now dropped to approximately 600,000. Of these policies 216,123 provide for what is known as "term insurance," the insurance provided thereby being \$1,873,692,905, while 338,781 are "converted insurance" policies, calling for \$1,304,909,995.55 insurance. The "converted insurance" policies are of different forms, namely, ordinary life, 20-payment life, 30-payment life, 20-year endowment, 30-year endowment, and endowment at the age of 62. Of course, it is unfortunate that so many ex-service men allowed their insurance policies to lapse.

In making the appropriations we are reminded of the fact that while the war is over a very large part of the cost of the war remains unpaid, and this Nation will for years stagger under the economic load and financial burden which inevitably come as a result of the World War. There is no way by which this financial burden can be avoided. Although the war is over, the war debt remains and must be paid. It is, therefore, of vital importance that strict economy be observed in the conduct of government, local, State, and national, to the end that while we are properly taking care of our ex-service men and discharging our every duty to them, we may at the same time reduce as rapidly as possible our national debt and the burden of taxation.

#### SALE OF LANDS AT THE HEAD OF CORDOVA BAY, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2811) to amend section 7 of the act of February 6, 1909, entitled "An act authorizing the sale of lands at the head of Cordova Bay, in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes."

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

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman ought to make a report on this bill before it is passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The only change sought to be made in the act of February 6, 1909, is to strike out the words "two years from the approval of the plan mentioned in the preceding section" and insert in lieu thereof the words, "one year from the receipt of written notice from the Secretary of the Interior." Under the terms of the act and patent issued to Donald A. McKenzie he was required to build a pier at Cordova Bay within two years after the plotting and approval of the town site or forfeit all his rights thereunder. Extensions have been granted from time to time for the construction of the piers but the Secretary of the Interior feels that these extensions can not be granted indefinitely. Under the act as amended construction of the pier is deferred until such time as the Secretary shall see fit to require construction.

In other words, I might say to the gentleman that the only purpose of the bill is to amend the act in such a manner that the construction of this particular pier, as provided in the act of February 6, 1909, will not be required until the Secretary of the Interior shall serve notice upon the owners of the town site to proceed with such construction. The fact is that there is no railroad now extending to this town site of Nelson and there are no improvements upon the premises of any kind. If the pier were constructed now it would probably rot or wash away before it could be used for any purpose. The object of the amendment is to protect the equity of the present owner of the town site. She is now an employee of the Interior Department in this city and should not be put to the useless expense of building a wharf. So we are seeking to amend the law in such a manner that she will not have to construct this pier until she receives notice from the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BLANTON. This is for the benefit of one individual?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It is for the benefit of Mrs. Donald A. McKenzie, who is now working in the Department of the In-



terior. Her husband sunk his entire fortune in the development of Alaska and died, leaving his widow practically nothing except the 2,000 acres which constitutes this town site.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the Secretary of the Interior approve this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes; he has approved it. An identical bill which I introduced in the Sixty-seventh Congress was also approved by the department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 7 of the act of February 6, 1909, entitled "An act authorizing the sale of lands at the head of Cordova Bay, in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. That the corporation named in section 1 of this act, or its assigns, shall, within six months from the approval of the plan mentioned in the preceding section, pay to the proper receiver the full purchase price of the lands applied for; and within five years after the issuance of patent said corporation shall do all things necessary to render 320 acres of the land purchased suitable and available for wharfage and town-site purposes in accordance with the plan thereof submitted as required in section 6 of this act, and shall within one year from the receipt of written notice from the Secretary of the Interior construct within said wharfage and dock area a public dock, wharf, or pier, with suitable approaches on the land side and with not less than 34 feet of water at mean low tide leading to and surrounding the same, so as to enable ocean steamers to approach, dock, discharge, and take on cargoes thereat; that patent for said lands shall recite that they are issued under the provisions of this act and are subject to cancellation and the land therein granted to forfeiture as herein provided; and if said corporation or its assigns shall fail to comply with any of the terms and conditions of this act, either before or after the issuance of patent, all interests, rights, or title which may have accrued or vested under this act shall be forfeited to the United States, and the application under which they accrued, or the patent under which they vested, shall be canceled: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, on satisfactory showing, reasonably extend the time within which any of the acts enumerated in this act may be performed."

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

APPROPRIATION TO INDEMNIFY DAMAGES CAUSED BY SEARCH FOR BODY OF ADMIRAL JOHN PAUL JONES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2392) authorizing an appropriation to indemnify damages caused by the search for the body of Admiral John Paul Jones.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

LOAN OF CERTAIN TENTS, ETC., TO THE UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 163) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents, cots, chairs, etc., to the executive committee of the United Confederate Veterans for use at the thirty-fourth annual reunion to be held at Memphis, Tenn., in June, 1924.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized to loan, at his discretion, to the executive committee of the United Confederate Veterans, for use in connection with the thirty-fourth annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held in Memphis, Tenn., June 4 to 6, 1924, such tents, with necessary poles, ridges and planks, cots, blankets, pillows, chairs or camp stools, etc., as may be required at said reunion: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered to said committee designated at such time prior to the holding of said convention as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and Thornton Newsum, chairman of said executive committee: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall, before delivering such property, take from said Thornton Newsum a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TEMPORARY PONTOON BRIDGE ACROSS CALUMET RIVER, COUNTY OF COOK, ILL.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2865) to authorize the city of Chicago to construct a temporary pontoon bridge across the Calumet River in the vicinity of One hundred and thirty-fourth Street, in the county of Cook, State of Illinois.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, is this a toll bridge?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There are no toll bridges in Illinois that I know of.

Mr. BLANTON. This will be no toll bridge?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; this is in the city of Chicago.

Mr. BLANTON. There is a toll bridge in Chicago, and I have been over it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the city of Chicago, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a temporary pontoon bridge and approaches thereto across the Calumet River in the vicinity of One hundred and thirty-fourth Street, in section 36, township 37 north, range 14 east of the third principal meridian, in the county of Cook, State of Illinois, as shown on plan, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "That," insert the words "the consent of Congress is hereby granted to."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "be, and is hereby, authorized."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "River," insert the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

Page 2, line 4, insert the words "city of Chicago."

Page 2, lines 4 and 5, after the word "Illinois," strike out the words "as shown on plan."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment, which is included in the report but not shown in the bill itself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHINDBLOM: In line 6, on page 1, strike out the words "temporary pontoon."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN CARROLL COUNTY, ILL., AND JACKSON COUNTY, IOWA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7063) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois and the State of Iowa, or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River connecting the county of Carroll, Ill., and the county of Jackson, Iowa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Illinois, and the State of Iowa, or either of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Savanna, in the county of Carroll, Ill., and the city of Sabula, in the county of Jackson, in the State of Iowa, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois and the State of Iowa, or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River connecting the county of Carroll, Ill., and the county of Jackson, Iowa."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended. There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE FOX RIVER IN ST. CHARLES TOWNSHIP, KANE COUNTY, ILL.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7104) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River in St. Charles township, Kane County, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, there is on the Speaker's table a bill of the same purport which has been passed by the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that it be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2597) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River in St. Charles Township, Kane County, Ill.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Aurora, Elgin & Fox River Electric Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois, and its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in section 11 of township 40 north, range 8 east of the third principal meridian, being St. Charles Township, Kane County, Ill., in accordance with the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the committee offered some amendments to the bill to make it uniform with the other legislation, which are not contained in the Senate bill, I find.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to the Senate bill?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to offer an amendment as reported by the House committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. MAPES. If so, I will submit the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "that," insert "the consent of Congress is hereby granted to"; and in line 5, after the word "assigns," strike out the words "be and they are hereby authorized."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in what respects do these amendments, if adopted, modify the House bill as reported by the House committee?

Mr. MAPES. It will not change the effect of the bill at all, but the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been endeavoring to follow out the suggestions of the War Department and make all of these bridge bills uniform, and it is for that reason I am offering this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee, I think, misunderstands the gentleman. The gentleman from Michigan is offering the amendment to make it conform to the House bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I see.

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

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection the title will be amended. There was no objection.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

TO LIMIT THE POWER OF UNITED STATES COURTS TO EXPRESS OPINIONS AS TO THE CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES OR WEIGHT OF TESTIMONY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3260) to amend the practice and procedure in Federal courts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in an embarrassing position. I told the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] a little while ago I would not object, and I perhaps will not, after I have called a matter to the attention of the Members who are lawyers. Not claiming to know anything about law, I want to point out—

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman that I did not refer to this particular bill.

Mr. BEGG. Then I will object.

Mr. McKEOWN. I hope the gentleman will reserve his objection and let me explain the situation.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman that I will object anyhow. I thought I was bound by my word to the gentleman.

Mr. McKEOWN. It is the next bill that the gentleman agreed not to object to.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL PLACE FOR HOLDING UNITED STATES COURTS IN THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA AT ADA, OKLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 714) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 714) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 101 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as amended by the act approved February 20, 1917, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The State of Oklahoma is divided into two judicial districts, to be known as the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma.

"The eastern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1916, in the counties of Adair, Atoka, Bryan, Craig, Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Coal, Carter, Delaware, Garvin, Grady, Haskell, Hughes, Jefferson, Johnston, Latimer, Le Flore, Love, McClain, Mayes, Muskogee, McIntosh, McCurtain, Murray, Marshall, Nowata, Ottawa, Okmulgee, Okfuskee, Pittsburg, Pushmataha, Pontotoc, Rogers, Stephens, Sequoyah, Seminole, Tulsa, Washington, and Wagoner. Terms of the district court for the eastern district shall be held at Muskogee on the first Monday in January, at Vinita on the first Monday in March, at Tulsa on the first Monday in April, at South McAlester on the first Monday in June, at Ardmore on the first Monday in October, at Chickasha on the first Monday in November, and at Ada on the first Monday in December of each year: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Ada shall be furnished free to the United States.

"The western district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1916, in the counties of Alfalfa, Beaver, Beckham, Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cimarron, Cleveland, Comanche, Cotton, Custer, Dewey, Ellis, Garfield, Grant, Greer, Harmon, Harper, Jackson, Kay, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, Major, Noble, Oklahoma, Osage, Pawnee, Payne, Pottawatomie, Roger Mills, Texas, Tillman, Washita, Woods, and Woodward. Terms of the district court for the western district shall be held at Oklahoma City on the first Monday in January, at Enid on the first Monday in March, at Guthrie on the first Monday in May, at Lawton on the first Monday in September, and at Woodward on the second Monday in November: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Woodward are furnished free of expense to the United States.

"The clerk of the district court for the eastern district shall keep his office at Muskogee and the clerk for the western district at Guthrie, and shall maintain an office in charge of himself or a deputy at Oklahoma City."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

FLOMATON, STATE OF ALABAMA

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4437) to quiet title in the municipality of Flo-

maton, State of Alabama, to which I objected, may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7399) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution," approved June 9, 1906.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution," approved June 9, 1906, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That the property and affairs of said corporation shall be managed by not less than 40 trustees, who shall be elected annually at such time as shall be fixed by the by-laws, and at least one trustee shall be elected annually from a list of nominees to be made by each of the State societies and submitted in this society at least 30 days before the annual meeting, in accordance with the general provisions regulating such nominations as may be adopted by this society."

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

#### COUNTY OF CUSTER, MONT.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3756) granting to the county of Custer, State of Montana, certain land in said county for use as a fairground.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey by patent to the county of Custer, State of Montana, for use as a fairground, the following tract of public land:

Beginning at a point which is south 5° 30' west of the center of section 33, township 9 north, range 47 east, of Montana principal meridian, and distant therefrom 2,280 feet; thence south 41° 30' west 1,080 feet; thence north 73° 20' west 1,925 feet; thence north 16° 40' east 2,375 feet; thence north 68° 10' east 345 feet; thence south 35° 45' east 2,655 feet, to the point of beginning, containing 96 $\frac{1}{2}$  acres, more or less.

That this grant is made upon the payment of \$1.25 per acre, and before patent may issue the Secretary of the Interior shall cause a survey to be made of the land herein granted, and that there shall be excepted from such survey and from the grant herein made land covered by the Tongue River and the new channel thereof.

Which patent shall be issued upon the express condition that the county of Custer shall use said tract of land as a fairground for the benefit of the citizens of said county: *Provided*, That whenever said lands cease to be used by said county for use as a fairground or are attempted to be sold or conveyed, then, and in that event, title to such lands and the whole thereof shall revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That such patent shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in such land and the right to the use of the land for extracting and removing the same.

[Note: Bill S. 303 is supposed to have passed.]

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

#### CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO MILES CITY, STATE OF MONTANA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4319) authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby is, authorized and directed to convey by patent to the city of Miles City, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Montana, the following tract of public land, to wit:

Beginning at a point which is south 18° 15' west from the center of section 33, township 8 north, of range 47 east, Montana principal meridian, and distant therefrom 1,660 feet; thence north 36° 0' west 1,885 feet; thence north 68° 10' east 1,105 feet; thence north 88° 40'

east 380 feet; thence south 59° 5' east 375 feet; thence south 28° 35' east 365 feet; thence south 12° 50' east 285 feet; thence south 14° 10' west 215 feet; thence south 40° 25' west 325 feet; thence south 46° 25' west 505 feet; thence south 29° 30' west 390 feet to the point of beginning, containing 48 $\frac{1}{2}$  acres, more or less.

That this grant is made upon the payment of \$1.25 per acre, and before patent may issue the Secretary of the Interior shall cause a survey to be made of the tract herein granted, and that there shall be excepted from such survey and from the grant herein made the land covered by the Tongue River.

Said patent shall be issued upon the express condition that the city of Miles City shall use said tract of land for municipal purposes as a public park for the benefit of the citizens of said city: *Provided*, That whenever said lands shall cease to be used by said city for municipal purposes or attempted to be sold or conveyed, then, and in that event, title to such lands and the whole thereof shall revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That such patent shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits as may be found in such land and the right to the use of the land for extracting and removing the same.

[Note: Bill S. 303 is supposed to have passed.]

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

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT MINNEAPOLIS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2488) to authorize the city of Minneapolis in the State of Minnesota to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said city.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the city of Minneapolis, in the county of Hennepin and State of Minnesota, a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of Minnesota, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, extending from a point at or near the intersection of Cedar Avenue and Second Street south across the Mississippi River to a point at or near the intersection of Tenth Avenue and University Avenue SE, in the city of Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

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

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2656) granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of New Orleans, a municipal corporation existing under the laws of the State of Louisiana, its successors and assigns, through its public belt railroad commission, as authorized by the constitution of the State of Louisiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, near and above the said city, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void unless the construction of said bridge is commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT COURTS AT POTEAU, OKLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 644) providing for the holding of the United States district and circuit courts at Poteau, Okla.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That a term of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Oklahoma shall be held in each and every year in the town of Poteau, Okla., beginning on the first Monday in October and continuing until the business is disposed of.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of the United States district and circuit courts at Muskogee, Okla., shall be the clerk of the United States district and circuit courts at Poteau, Okla., until provision be made by law for the appointment of deputy clerks at the several places of holding United States district and circuit courts in the State of Oklahoma.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, insert "*Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Poteau are furnished free of expense to the United States.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 162) to amend the act establishing the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That two terms of the court of two weeks each, or more, in the discretion of the presiding judge, in the eastern judicial district of the State of Oklahoma, for the trial of civil and criminal cases, shall, after the passage and approval of this act, be held at Pauls Valley, Okla., each year, in said district.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, insert: "*Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Pauls Valley are furnished free of expense to the United States."

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for two terms a year of two weeks each. I want to change that, and move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following in lieu thereof, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SWANK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That a term of the United States district court for the eastern judicial district of the State of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Pauls Valley, Okla., for the trial of civil and criminal cases, at such times as may be fixed by the judges of the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Pauls Valley are furnished free of expense to the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition on the amendment. I notice that both in the preceding bill, providing for a court at Poteau, Okla., and also in this bill, at Pauls Valley, the committee has required that the people of those places shall secure a courthouse and furnish it free to the United States.

Mr. SWANK. That is provided for in the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but I do not see why that should be done.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman does not mean to say build a courthouse? They have to furnish it free.

Mr. BLANTON. And provide for quarters. They have to provide a courthouse for holding court there.

Mr. YATES. They have to provide a place.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell the gentleman what kind of a "place" a Federal judge requires. You have to have a suitable court room, and you have to have proper jury rooms, with jury accommodations, both for the grand jury and the petit jury, and you have to have witness rooms, and you have to provide quarters for the judge for his private office in the court room. That is the kind of a "place" that a Federal judge requires to be furnished.

Mr. DYER. But this is the county seat, and they have already these things there.

Mr. BLANTON. It is of no interest to me except that I happen to be acquainted some in Pauls Valley, Okla. Those are awfully good people there; some are as fine as anywhere in the country, and my colleague knows it, and why should those good people of Pauls Valley, Okla., be required to furnish a Federal courthouse?

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

Mr. BLANTON. I do not understand why this great Federal Government of the United States, which can pay \$40,000 for a

little junketing trip over to Europe, does not provide its own court room and its own facilities for holding court. I do not think this committee ought to require this of these towns in Oklahoma. If it were in Chicago, they would not have to furnish it.

Mr. YATES. Oh, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. If it were in Philadelphia, they would not have to furnish it; but down in Pauls Valley, Okla., the people are different from the people in Philadelphia and Chicago in the eyes of Congress. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows, of course, that there is a court room there with jury rooms and ample accommodations.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I know; but sometimes there is not room for holding a State court and a Federal court at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to amend the act establishing the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma, to establish a term of the United States District Court for the Eastern Judicial District of Oklahoma at Pauls Valley, Okla."

#### GRANTING PUBLIC LAND TO SHREVEPORT, LA.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5573) granting certain public lands to the city of Shreveport, La., for reservoir purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that there is a provision in the bill for reversion back to the Government in case they do not use this for a reservoir.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, we have had some bills of this kind before the House, particularly the other evening when we considered private bills. As I understand it, this is a grant of lands belonging to the Federal Government to the city of Shreveport.

Mr. BEGG. That is it; but they must be used for a water supply for the city; otherwise the land reverts to the Government.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to issue patent or patents to the city of Shreveport, La., for use in the establishment of a reservoir for the water supply of said city, for all those tracts of land within what is known as the Cross Lake area, in townships 17 and 18 north, range 15 west, Louisiana meridian, which may be found by the Secretary of the Interior to have been islands in said Cross Lake at the date the State of Louisiana was admitted to the Union, and to which tracts no legal claims have been initiated and duly maintained under the provisions of the public land laws, and shall be timely asserted as provided herein: *Provided*, That the said city of Shreveport shall pay for said lands at the rate of \$1.25 per acre, and shall tender its application for patent, accompanied by the purchase price of the land, within six months after the approval of this act, or within a similar period after the acceptance of the official plat or plats of survey if accepted after the date of this act.

SEC. 2. That no claim alleged to have been initiated and maintained under the public land laws adverse to the disposition of said lands as provided for by this act shall be recognized unless regularly presented to the Secretary of the Interior within the period allowed the city of Shreveport to file its application for patent, and no tract to which an adverse claim is asserted shall be patented to the city unless and until such claim is finally rejected by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "act," insert: "*Provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all gas, oil, coal, or other mineral deposits found at any time in the said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same."

Page 2, line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the lands hereby granted shall be used by the city of Shreveport, La., only for the purpose expressed in the grant, and if said land, or any part thereof, shall be abandoned for such use it shall

revert to the United States; and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to determine the facts and declare such forfeiture and restore said land to the public domain, and such order of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

#### WELFARE OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6142) amending an act for the promotion of the welfare of maternity and infancy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### TERM OF COURT AT CASPER, WYO.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4445) to amend section 115 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that it be reported; it is short.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 115 of the act approved March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 115. The State of Wyoming and the Yellowstone National Park shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the district of Wyoming. Terms of the district court for said district shall be held at Cheyenne on the second Mondays in May and November, at Casper on the first Monday in February, at Evanston on the second Tuesday in July, and at Lander on the first Monday in October; and the said court shall hold one session annually at Sheridan, and in said national park, on such dates as the court may order. The marshal and clerk of the said court shall each, respectively, appoint at least one deputy to reside at Casper, and one to reside at Evanston, and one to reside at Lander, and shall also maintain an office at each of those places: *Provided*, That, until a public building is provided at Casper, suitable accommodations for holding court in said town shall be furnished the Government at an expense not to exceed \$300 annually. The marshal of the United States for the said district may appoint one or more deputy marshals for the Yellowstone National Park, who shall reside in said park."

The committee amendment was read as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out the words "the Government at an expense not to exceed \$300 annually" and insert in lieu thereof "free of expense to the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. It seems quite evident it will be impossible to finish this entire list at the rate we are now going.

Mr. BLANTON. And we will not go this fast later on.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the House desires to remain until 6, I, personally, have no objection, but it seems to me it might possibly be wise to set aside a night this week—if it is the disposition of the House, I have no objection—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas, so I have understood, indicated he did not care for the House to remain in session very much longer this afternoon. If he will withhold the point of no quorum and let us run until 6—

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want the minority leader to put me in a bad attitude. I want to say this: There are only a few here. The House knows those who work on these bills and who make objection to them when they come up are few in number and they stay here all the time. The others do not stay unless they want to do so. I do not think it is fair for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], who does some of this

work, and others; I do not think it is fair to those who work on these bills and try to see whether they are good or not, who have to stay here all the time and—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am not criticizing. The point is this: If the point was going to be made in a few moments I would like to have an agreement—

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman is willing to have it understood we stay until 6 o'clock, I do not think it will be necessary, but let us have an understanding.

Mr. BLANTON. I will stay until 6 o'clock.

#### TAX ON BREAD

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to extend my remarks?

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

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the President in increasing by proclamation the tariff taxes on wheat and flour will have an important bearing on the price of bread. Under the last Republican tariff bill the President was given power to increase or decrease all tariff rates provided for by law. He has refused to decrease the tariff taxes on the necessities of life and now signifies his contempt for the vote of protest in 1922 by increasing the tariff on bread. He has increased the duty on wheat from 30 cents a bushel to 42 cents a bushel. He has increased the duty on flour from 78 cents a hundred pounds to \$1.04 a hundred pounds. The result of the tariff on sugar is a safe measure of the result of this tariff on bread. The President's purpose is to aid the farmers of America by shutting out the competition of the wheat and flour grown in Canada.

All of the evidence before the country justifies the President in judging the condition of the farmers as extremely bad and acute to the actuality of hundreds of thousands of foreclosures and bankruptcies. All of this has happened under the present tariff law. What has contributed to bringing about this condition? Is the right remedy an increase in the tariff rates on wheat and flour? What parts of the population of America other than the farmers have asked for an increase in tariff taxes? Will any other vast multitude of people be hurt by the method now taken to help the farmer?

It is plain that the unfortunate financial condition of the farmer has been caused by tariff taxes on everything the farmer must buy for the operation of his farm. He buys in a taxed market and sells in an untaxed market. When he drives into town and sits in his wagon smoking his pipe, guiding his horses along the road to the market place or to the freight depot he thinks to himself, "The horse's shoes, his harness, whip, the wagon, my clothes, shoes, and hat have all cost me a tariff tax. My plow, scythe, threshing machine, fertilizer, milk churn, ax, hammer, saws, my wire fences, the furniture in my house, and everything my family needs has cost me more money because of the tariff tax. Yet, what I have on my wagon here—wheat or flour—I have got to sell in an untaxed market and let the other fellow get the profits—the railroad, the miller, the baker, the retailer." When the farmer figures up the profits on his sales and the expenses of his purchases, he finds that the tariff tax has driven him to put a lock on his home and sell out if his bank has not already sold him out at a foreclosure sale.

What will he gain by an increase in the tariff on wheat and flour? At best it will only keep him from being driven into financial ruin a little faster than he is being driven now. It will not prevent his ruin under the existing conditions. Why? Because an increase in tariff rates on wheat and flour will not benefit until the miller, baker, and retailer have taken their share of the profits allowed by the higher tariff. The remainder they will let the farmer have. The fallacy of the increase in tariff on wheat and flour is no one can guarantee that a fair percentage of the higher price to be charged for bread will be paid to the laborer of the fields—producer of wheat. All it can guarantee is that the man who ultimately sells the bread—the miller, the baker, and retailer—can raise the price higher without fear of competition and with the legal sanction of the Federal Government. The Department of Agriculture in its report of March 20 shows that the farmer at present receives but 15 per cent, which is less than one-sixth, of the final price of bread. Will a sixth of an increase of 3 or 4 cents a loaf save the farmer from destruction? The department also shows that out of the final price of a loaf of bread in New York the retailer receives 15 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent; the baker, 57 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent; the railroad, 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent; the miller, 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. How does the farmer know that the miller, the baker, and retailer will allow him any increase? Will he have to resort to a strike or boycott or lockout to get it, as labor has been compelled to do to secure

a fraction of a living wage from the tariff barons? The advisers of the President think the farmer is a "rube." Instead of reducing the tariff on the things the farmer must buy, he increases the tariff on wheat and flour, which the farmer must sell, without being able to guarantee the farmer that he will receive one penny of the increase which will surely be made in the price of bread.

The President has heard no appeal from the masses of the people who reside in the cities asking him to increase the tariff tax on wheat and flour and thus encourage and license an increase in the price of bread. He has heard no appeal from the people of the Bronx. We have a population of 800,000 people, and not one of them has asked that the price of bread be increased. In the last congressional campaign, fought by the Democratic Party against the increased tariff on the necessities of life, the Bronx spoke in no uncertain terms. It issued a warning that the fraud was apparent and it knew that the tariff laws had been leased out for the benefit of the favored few who sought to oppress and rob the masses of America. The advisers of the President must think the farmer is a "rube" and the city folks "boobs" if they believe that an increase in the price of bread will make him a popular political hero. A smaller loaf at the present price or a higher price for the present loaf will be the result of the President's act in increasing the tariff tax on bread. It is a tax on the bellies of the poor. When the fight for the necessities of life is hard, any man who helps to make the life of the masses of the poor more oppressive and who brings them nearer to starvation commits a moral wrong, as cruel and cold-blooded as any wrong defined in the Penal Code. To the farmer the President offers whatever the miller, the baker, and the retailer will allow to him. The farmer will get the remains of one plunder while he is the victim of the tariff plunder of everyone who sells him what he needs. To the city folks the President offers a smaller loaf at the present price or the present loaf at a higher price. We can take whatever choice the baker makes. Now that the tariff tax is fixed to take effect April 7, the President retires to count his delegates, and the baker, the miller, and retailer, backed up by the full force of the President's approval, will meet to determine how to fool the "rubes" and "boobs."

The new tariff takes effect to-day, April 7. It is the first aggressive policy of the President to be put into operation. It is a measure of his mind, its sympathies, and his statesmanship. He has scorned the masses of the poor in the cities to fool the farmer. Temporary leader of the party that opposes paternalism, he gives to the baker and the miller the full force of Government aid which they do not need, and in the name of the Federal Government he offers to the farmer what the benevolence of the miller and baker will allow him to take. To the city dweller he offers the bill for his statesmanship. April 7, 1924, ushers in the new tax on bread. I trust that this crowning infamy of tariff cruelty will mark the end of a system of taxation that rests on the backs and bellies of the masses of America in order that a few might enjoy an unhealthy and unjust luxury and money power.

#### TRANSFER OF FORT KEOGH MILITARY RESERVATION, MONT., TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4840) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer jurisdiction over a portion of the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, Mont., to the United States Department of Agriculture for agricultural experimental purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute Senate bill 2690.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Is this Senate bill the same as this bill as amended?

Mr. LEAVITT. Just the same.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War having determined that the lands embraced in the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, in the State of Montana, are no longer needed for military purposes, an Executive order of February 2, 1924, having transferred the said lands to the Department of the Interior for disposition, and said lands are hereby transferred to and placed under the control of the United States Department of Agriculture for use by that department for experiments in stock raising and growing of forage crops in connection therewith: *Provided,* That if the lands are not used for the purpose mentioned herein, or having been used for such purpose, are subsequently abandoned

as being no longer needed for such purpose, then, and in that event, the said land shall revert to, and become subject to the control and jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided further,* That this transfer shall not affect any existing legal rights to lands in the reservation: *And provided further,* That there shall be excepted from the effect hereof that portion of said reservation described as follows:

A tract beginning at a point which is south 18° 15' west from the center of section 33, township 8 north of range 47 east, Montana principal meridian, and distant therefrom 1,660 feet; thence north 36° no minutes west 1,885 feet; thence north 68° 10' east 1,105 feet; thence north 88° 40' east 380 feet; thence south 59° 5' east 375 feet; thence south 28° 35' east 365 feet; thence south 12° 50' east 285 feet; thence south 14° 10' west 215 feet; thence south 40° 25' west 325 feet; thence south 46° 25' west 505 feet; thence south 29° 30' west 390 feet to the point of beginning, containing 48.3 acres, more or less.

Also, a tract beginning at a point which is south 5° 30' west of the center of section 33, township 8 north, range 47 east, of Montana principal meridian, and distant therefrom 2,280 feet; thence south 41° 30' west 1,080 feet; thence north 73° 20' west 1,925 feet; thence north 16° 40' east 2,375 feet; thence north 68° 10' east 340 feet; thence south 35° 45' east 2,655 feet to the point of beginning, containing 96.1 acres, more or less.

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

The SPEAKER. A similar House bill will lie on the table. Also House bill 7104.

#### INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL INSTITUTE AT THE HAGUE

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was Senate Joint Resolution 160, authorizing the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain that. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. If the House is willing to hear the gentleman, I will reserve the right to object, but I think, Mr. Speaker, I shall object later.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this statistical institute that is provided for here was established in 1885. Now we have been a member—

Mr. BLANTON. That will furnish an excuse for how many of us to go over there?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It does not pay for anybody's expenses at all.

Mr. BLANTON. What excuse will it offer for somebody's expenses to be paid?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It simply publishes in English and sends over our statistics. There are 12 nations now that are members of this organization. They get out the statistics, and we want our statistics to be authentic.

Mr. BLANTON. I have served notice on the Department of Agriculture that until they find a solution for the grasshopper pest I am going to object to these expenditures. The grasshoppers are eating the farmers up in some States, and the Department of Agriculture in 50 years has not found a solution of the problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### COTTON CROP REPORTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2112) authorizing the Department of Agriculture to issue semi-monthly cotton crop reports and providing for their publication simultaneously with the ginning reports of the Department of Commerce.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, for a statement; but I am going to object to it.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that this bill is one that was agreed upon some time ago, to coordinate the ginners' report and the cotton-crop reports.

Mr. MADDEN. Is this a duplication?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SWANK. I will say to the gentleman that on the 1st of December last a conference was called of Members from the cotton States, and they appointed several committees to draft legislation of this nature. One subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was chairman, Senator HARRIS, of Georgia, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], and myself were members, had conferences with the Department of Commerce and the Agriculture Department, and this is one of the results of those conferences.

Mr. MADDEN. Was this bill submitted to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. SWANK. It was submitted to both of them. This has reference to the report made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose they do not cooperate?

Mr. SWANK. This bill provides that they shall cooperate.

Mr. RANKIN. At this meeting, I will say to the gentleman, we had representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce or the Bureau of the Census, and they agreed upon this coordination.

Mr. MADDEN. Why do they not cooperate in the work? That is the trouble. They are always duplicating. Each one must do it.

Mr. RANKIN. No. The ginners' report is under the Department of Commerce. They collect statistics respecting the number of bales of cotton ginned up to a certain period. The crop estimate is got out by the Department of Agriculture. Last year there was a great deal of trouble. The reports were coming out so infrequently that it was impossible to keep up with the changing conditions throughout the Cotton Belt.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course I want to see the cotton growers get all the information they can, but I can not see any sense in having the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Census having friction, as this indicates. It shows that neither one of them can do anything without the cooperation of the other.

Mr. RANKIN. I will explain that. Here is the danger. We make these reports come out on the same day and at the same time for this reason: If the ginners' reports were to come out one day and indicate a certain production, the chances are that it would run the market up or down. Then when the crop-estimating report came out, if it indicated a different amount, it would have the opposite effect. That is what occurred last year, and it resulted disastrously, not only to the cotton growers but to the spinners throughout the country.

Mr. MADDEN. If all of this were done by one department, there would be no such friction.

Mr. RANKIN. We have no way of getting it done by one department.

Mr. MADDEN. Why not?

Mr. RANKIN. We would have to destroy the Department of Commerce or take the Bureau of the Census out of the Commerce Department and put it in the Department of Agriculture. They gather statistics and their reports are absolutely correct. Now, in order to get this work done in any way it will have to be done in the manner indicated here. We not only had the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce present, but we had present representatives of the various agricultural organizations, and at one of these meetings, down in the Department of Agriculture, we had the representatives of the manufacturers.

Mr. SWANK. I would like to say a word to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] if I had a chance.

Mr. MADDEN. What I want to prevent is duplication.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman from Illinois does not object, I will. This is the same bill that we passed over the other day.

Mr. SWANK. No; it is an altogether different bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Illinois is mistaken about that. Is not the gentleman willing that it be passed over?

Mr. SWANK. And retain its place on the calendar?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over and retain its place on the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER, S. DAK.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2332) granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Hughes County and Stanley County, S. Dak.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of South Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between Hughes County and Stanley County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

#### REAGAN COUNTY, TEX.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8050) to detach Reagan County, in the State of Texas, from the El Paso division of the western judicial district of Texas and attach said county to the San Angelo division of the northern judicial district of said State.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Reagan County, in the State of Texas, be, and the same is hereby, detached from the El Paso division of the western judicial district of Texas and attached to and made a part of the San Angelo division of the northern judicial district of said State.

SEC. 2. That all process against persons resident in said county of Reagan and cognizable before the United States district court shall be issued out of and made returnable to said court at San Angelo, and that all prosecutions against persons for offenses committed in said county of Reagan shall be tried in said court at San Angelo: *Provided,* That no civil or criminal cause begun and pending prior to the passage of this act shall be in any way affected by it.

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

#### PUNISHMENT FOR UNLAWFUL BREAKING OF SEALS OF RAILWAY CARS, ETC.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4168) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 670).

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, in what particular does this amend the act?

Mr. DYER. This amendment is to provide for the prosecution of those who steal from the interstate shipments while they are being transported from one State to another.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The original act does that.

Mr. DYER. I mean in any kind of a vehicle or wagon. For instance, take my own case. In East St. Louis, Ill., goods are all landed there and these drayage companies take them and haul them over to the other side, where they are going on through shipment. The court has decided that while they were in a wagon of that kind and away from the railroad station or depot men who steal them can not be convicted, and this is simply to cure that decision of the court.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It means they can not be convicted in the Federal courts?

Mr. DYER. Yes; it does not extend the act in any other way.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It gives broader jurisdiction to the Federal courts than they now possess?

Mr. DYER. It grows out of that decision. In other words, it is to make the shipment of the goods complete during their entire transit, whether they are in the railroad depot, in the yards, or whether they are on these drayage wagons being hauled to their proper destination.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed but retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed but retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### CHINA TRADE ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7190) to amend the China trade act, 1922.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill retain its place on the calendar without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS NORTH BRANCH OF SUSQUEHANNA RIVER FROM WILKES-BARRE TO THE BOROUGH OF DORRANCETON, PA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7846) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the north branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Wilkes-Barre to the borough of Dorranceton, Pa.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the time for commencing and completing the reconstruction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, as renewed and extended by joint resolution approved February 15, 1921, to be constructed by the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, across the North Branch of the Susquehanna River, from the city of Wilkes-Barre to the borough of Dorranceton, in said county of Luzerne and the State of Pennsylvania, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

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

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

#### SCHOOL SITE FOR UTE INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2882) to provide for the reservation of certain land in Utah as a school site for Ute Indians.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or disposal under the laws of the United States, and set apart and reserved for and as a school site for the benefit of the Ute Indians, an unsurveyed tract of land in San Juan County, Utah, located in township 36 south, range 21 east, Salt Lake meridian, approximately the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 7.

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

#### RESERVATION OF LANDS IN UTAH FOR PAIUTE INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2884) providing for the reservation of certain lands in Utah for certain bands of Paiute Indians.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or disposal under the laws of the United States, and set apart and reserved for the use, benefit, and occupancy of certain bands of Paiute Indians, and such other Indians of this tribe as the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to settle thereon, subject, however, to any valid existing rights of any persons thereto, the tracts of land in the State of Utah, particularly described as follows: Sections 21, 22, 23, and 24, township 29 south, range 18 west, Salt Lake meridian.

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

#### EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF RESTRICTION AGAINST ALIENATION ON HOMESTEAD ALLOTMENTS, KANSAS OR KAW TRIBE OF INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2887) to authorize the extension of the period of restriction against alienation on the homestead allotments made to members of the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the period of restriction against alienation on homestead lands allotted to members of the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, under the provisions of the agreement with said tribe of Indians as ratified and confirmed by the act of Congress of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. L., p. 636), be, and is hereby, extended for a period of 20 years from January 1, 1928.

With the following committee amendment:

*Provided,* That the extension authorized by this act shall not affect the homestead allotment of any member of the Kaw Tribe who has been or may be declared to be competent by the Secretary of the Interior, after proper inquiry and investigation of conditions in such manner as he may deem necessary: *Provided further,* That the production of oil and gas and other minerals on such restricted lands may be taxed by the State of Oklahoma in all respects the same as production on restricted lands, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid the tax so assessed against the royalty interests of the respective Indian owners in such production from the royalties or from any other individual Indian funds held under his supervision belonging to the Indian owner of the land: *Provided, however,* That such tax shall not become a lien or charge of any kind or character against the land or other property of the Indian owner.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, when it would be for the best interests of a restricted Kaw Indian, to permit the sale of his homestead allotment under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe and upon such terms as he may approve.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE SAVANNAH RIVER NEAR AUGUSTA, GA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8180) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga.," approved August 7, 1919.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2538, which lies on the Speaker's desk and which is identical with the bill just reported, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to consider the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2538) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga.," approved August 7, 1919.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act approved August 7, 1919, authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Augusta, Ga., be, and the same is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided,* That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be completed by August 7, 1925.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.



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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CENSUS OF COTTON IN MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS AND WAREHOUSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the House Joint Resolution 231, directing a census to be taken of bales of cotton now held at various places.

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

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. RANKIN] a question. This bill provides for the asking of certain questions on the part of the census in reference to the possession of cotton and various other matters. It also contains on the second page, and from lines 12 to 21 creates, a new penal offense for persons who do not give the proper information. It seems to me that when we are creating a new violation of criminal law it should be given more careful consideration than merely to get unanimous consent. I would have no objection to any part of the bill up to the creation of the new penalty.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman will find that is part of the law now. I know it is with reference to ginners and other people who give information to the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I wanted to ask the gentleman if that was the existing law.

Mr. RANKIN. I think it is. I know it is as to ginners and manufacturers, and so forth, that the Bureau of the Census has the right to ask for such information in compiling their statistics.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. In view of the fact that the gentleman is an expert on cotton questions, I will not make any objection.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman object to having this bill passed over? It will only mean two weeks, and I would like to get with the gentleman on these three bills.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman that this bill does not cost anything, so I am informed, and has been submitted to the Bureau of the Census for approval.

Mr. BEGG. That is one of the questions I have written down here—What is it going to cost? Why does not the Department of Agriculture do it? and a number of other questions, and I would like to have the gentleman have it passed over. It is not of vital importance.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me explain to the gentleman that it is vitally important right now. I understand the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] took this matter up with the Bureau of the Census, and they said they already had the machinery for getting this information, and they submitted this amendment which I have here and wanted it disposed of as early as possible, and for that reason the gentleman asked me to take it up for him to-day.

Mr. BEGG. How can this be done without costing anything?

Mr. RANKIN. Because they have the force now, and I think you will find in the report they state they already have the blanks. There might be a little postage involved in sending out questionnaires to these people.

Mr. BEGG. Is it to be done by mail?

Mr. RANKIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. McSWAIN. If the gentleman will pardon me, it goes to cotton mills and warehouses and also to county agents who know the cotton that is on hand in the farmers' houses, and, as I understand, it will not cost anything.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that there was recently a serious conflict in the amount of cotton that is on hand. There was a variation in the reports or the estimates amounting to around half a million bales. That has been very detrimental to the cotton trade all the way around, and for that reason the Director of the Census and all those who are vitally interested in these matters agreed on these propositions, and they wanted the resolution passed as early as possible, so they might get the information at once.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I will have to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will retain its place on the calendar.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT OWENSBORO, KY.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8181) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill (S. 2914).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 2914) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Edward T. Franks and Thomas H. Hazelrigg, or their assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Daviess County, Ky., and Rockport, Spencer County, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

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

The House bill was laid on the table.

DIXIE POWER CO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2686) to authorize the Federal Power Commission to amend permit No. 1, project No. 1, issued to the Dixie Power Co.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a few questions. It seems in the report, in regard to the dam, that the Federal Power Commission said that this would establish an undesirable precedent. Then a few days later they say that they have no objection. This is an important matter.

Mr. OLDFIELD. It is a very important matter. It was first threshed out with the Federal Power Commission and the Interstate Commerce Committee. The last report from the Federal Power Commission was that they agreed that this ought to be done. As a matter of fact, several hundred people in my district have expended over \$225,000 on it.

Mr. SNELL. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars would not buy the plan for such a dam as is proposed here.

Mr. OLDFIELD. They have been making surveys and making plats, and with diamond drills are boring down to see about the foundation for this immense dam. They are vitally interested in it, and I want to give them a chance.

Mr. SNELL. Changing the provisions of the general power act would not seem to be a very good policy.

Mr. OLDFIELD. If this bill is not passed, some one will probably get the permit, and these local people will not have an opportunity to finance this project and carry on the development and will lose what money they have expended. What they want is to have the permit extended for 18 months to give them an opportunity to carry on the development. The persons who have been interested with these people in Arkansas have agreed that this should be passed.

Mr. SNELL. What does it mean when it says that they have made application for permits themselves?

Mr. OLDFIELD. I do not understand that, they have agreed that this bill should be passed and they are going to cooperate with the local people.

Mr. SNELL. It looks to me like some scheme to sell out.

Mr. OLDFIELD. No, they are going to try and finance it through Cooper & Co.

Mr. SNELL. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars would not even start it.

Mr. OLDFIELD. They have expended their money, and unless this is passed they may not get it back.

Mr. SNELL. What would be the situation if the bill was not passed?

Mr. OLDFIELD. They would lose all of their rights.

Mr. SNELL. They would be on equal footing with every one else getting a permit.

Mr. OLDFIELD. No; they probably would not. They might claim that they had failed on the proposition and give it to some one else.

Mr. SNELL. I understand these other people who made application for a permit want to have this bill passed.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes, that was all threshed out before the Interstate Commerce Committee, and Cooper & Co. agreed to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Reserving the right to object, as I understand there is no provision in the bill that would change the term of the water power act itself.

Mr. OLDFIELD. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Federal Power Commission be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed, on application made therefor by the Dixie Power Co., to amend preliminary permit No. 1, project No. 1, on the White River in Arkansas, issued on March 3, 1921, as amended by order of said commission on March 14, 1923, extending the expiration of said amended permit to March 1, 1924, so as to extend said permit as amended by authority of this act for 18 months from the approval of this act, such extension being desired and necessary in order to enable the permittee to prepare maps, plans, and estimates for incorporation in its application for license and to finance its project and to enable it to further test the river bed by core drilling to determine the most suitable foundation for its dam under said permit, and to enable it to comply with any other requirements of law and regulations of said power commission in making an application for a license.

SEC. 2. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out lines 9 and 10, page 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cotter Dam proposition affects my district directly. It is a very important matter to me and to my constituents. Three hundred or more of my people are interested directly and indirectly in this bill, and I ask that it be passed without opposition.

I beg to say to my colleagues that the enterprise is a proper one; that the Dixie Power Co. has spent more than \$200,000 in organizing and surveying, and in good faith expects to construct this dam. I beg to urge the bill's passage. It affects not only the 300 stockholders in my district and Mr. OLDFIELD's district but a great stretch of country, and thousands of people will be beneficiaries of this measure which will result in the construction of a great dam. I vouch for the good faith and integrity of all the officers, promoters, and stockholders of the company.

#### RELIEF OF CLAIMANTS IN MONTANA

The next business was the bill (H. R. 3511) to extend relief to the claimants in township 16 north, ranges 32 and 33 east, Montana meridian, Montana.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That if by reason of the adjustment to the plat of resurvey of entries in township 16 north of ranges 32 and 33 east of the Montana principal meridian, Montana, entrymen or their assigns have heretofore acquired or may hereafter acquire patents to a less area than such entries when made were believed to contain, the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, cause patents to issue to such entrymen or their assigns for such area of surveyed, unreserved, unappropriated, nonmineral public land in the State of Montana, not containing merchantable timber, as when added to the area to which the entries were adjusted will equal the area the entries were supposed to contain when made: *Provided,* That applications for such additional area shall be filed within six months from the date of the issuance of patent or within six months from the passage hereof if patent has already issued: *Provided further,* That patents for such additional area shall issue without further final proof and without payment of fees or commissions.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

#### RELIEF OF BOLL-WEEVIL, DROUGHT, AND FLOOD STRICKEN FARM AREAS, OKLAHOMA

The next business was the House Joint Resolution 202, for the relief of the boll-weevil, drought, and flood stricken farm areas of Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to pass the resolution over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL PARK, HAWAII

The next business was the bill (H. R. 4985) to repeal the first proviso of section 4 of an act to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii, approved August 1, 1916.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first proviso of section 4 of an act entitled "An act to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii," approved August 1, 1916, which is in words and figures following: "Provided, That no appropriation for the maintenance, supervision, and improvement of said park in excess of \$10,000 annually shall be made unless the same shall have first been expressly authorized by law," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to repeal a proviso contained in the act which created the Hawaii National Park, which provides "that no appropriation for maintenance, supervision, and improvement of said park in excess of \$10,000 annually shall be made unless the same shall have first been expressly authorized by law."

The part of the Hawaii Park where the immediate expenditure of money covered by H. R. 3682, now pending in Congress, is contemplated consists of the active volcanoes on the island of Hawaii.

This park was visited by 41,150 persons during 1923.

Besides the scenic beauties and spectacular features of the volcanoes, they are of great scientific importance.

In order that the park may be made accessible for the interested public, it is necessary to have roads and trails to and through it. Up to this time all road construction has been carried on by the Territorial government. About \$300,000 has been spent by the Territory of Hawaii in the construction of a concrete road connecting the main seaport, Hilo, with the park. This road is 30 miles long and will ultimately cost \$1,000,000.

It is necessary to pass this bill in order to make the money which will be allotted to the Hawaiian Park under H. R. 3682 for the construction of roads and trails within the park available.

The Secretary of the Interior approves the passage of the bill, and a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee is made a part of this report.

Inasmuch as the Territory of Hawaii donated the land for the Hawaii Park after acquiring same from private owners and has expended a considerable amount of money in opening and developing same, your committee feels that all obstacles to the fullest cooperation between the United States Government and the Territory of Hawaii should be removed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, March 6, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,

House of Representatives, United States.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I have your request of February 23 for report on H. R. 4985, entitled "A bill to repeal the first proviso of section 4 of an act to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii," approved August 1, 1916.

This measure proposes to repeal a proviso contained in the organic act creating the Hawaii National Park, which provides "that no appropriation for the maintenance, supervision, and improvement of said park in excess of \$10,000 annually shall be made unless the same shall have first been expressly authorized by law."

There is now pending before Congress H. R. 3682, a bill authorizing a three-year program of road construction in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of this department, contemplating an expenditure of \$7,500,000 over the three-year period. This measure was submitted to Congress in accordance with the rules of the Bureau of the Budget, and I have been advised that the contemplated expendi-

ture is not in conflict with the President's financial program. Hearings on this measure have been held just recently by your committee.

This general road program as presented to the committee in detail provides for an allotment of \$260,000 for road construction in Hawaii National Park, and should the authorization be made by Congress and appropriations later made, under existing law, the road work in Hawaii National Park could not be undertaken. For this reason it is essential that the limitation on appropriations be repealed.

In this connection it should be stated that since 1916 the Federal aid road bills have not carried any funds for Territorial roads. At the present time the Territory is building a concrete road from the port of Hilo on the island of Hawaii toward the park on which there has already been expended in the neighborhood of \$300,000 and the total cost of which will be \$1,000,000. The Hawaii National Park, because of its scientific interest and importance and because of its spectacular features, is receiving a heavier travel each year and its development by roads should be undertaken in connection with this road program. I have, therefore, to recommend this bill to the favorable consideration of your committee.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WORK.

DAIRY BUREAU IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The next business was the bill (H. R. 7113) to establish a dairy bureau in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, at the present time the consumers of the country pay about \$4,000,000,000 per year for dairy products. It is very important that there should be an organization of this kind in the Department of Agriculture. In connection with this I have had prepared by the Department of Agriculture a table of statistics showing the exports of canned milk and evaporated milk last year, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record by including that table at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Exports of milk from the United States, 1925, as compiled from Monthly Export Report issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture (pounds)

Exports to—	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Belgium.....	8,400	7,800		18,900									34,600
France.....	8,400	24,000	46,200	42,000	134,400	66,200	21,000		168,000	154,200	126,000	21,600	811,400
Germany.....	4,343	31,872	125,132	41,022	154,810	82,914	969	14,933	15,433	218,816	331,543	422,555	1,444,342
Latvia.....													242,540
Netherlands.....			48,140	101,400	93,000								446,473
Russia in Europe.....	69,890		78,795	164,788			143,000						446,473
Turkey in Europe.....					2,100								2,100
Ukraine.....						188,042							188,042
United Kingdom.....	271,475	236,400	204,953	26,060	76,500	37,800	81,000		81,900	102,900	60,326	16,800	1,226,114
Panama.....	42,649	170,134	45,159	90,768	40,620	19,545	46,530	191,136	158,496	61,150	80,580	152,016	1,068,741
Mexico.....	69,654	74,623	59,468	60,764	109,366	64,875	157,709	102,086	181,471	107,353	62,793	129,773	1,208,910
Jamaica.....	19,702	8,912	19,500	31,140	72,453	46,970	18,580	10,710	9,970	22,230	27,630	241,020	528,817
Cuba.....	1,709,324	1,354,313	1,473,292	1,513,988	2,583,974	1,941,181	1,799,175	1,986,146	2,174,689	2,735,546	3,212,923	2,202,737	24,987,288
Brazil.....	15,823	20,886	32,408	19,284	24,500	13,152	32,784	25,920	62,766	38,032			300,800
Peru.....	5,821	5,715	12,498	31,656	40,626	19,826	44,701	29,019	48,066	44,247	11,349		344,942
British India.....	420	2,100	8,400	4,270	2,100	6,300	10,500	5,945	2,100	14,850	10,023		75,487
Straits Settlements.....	3,900		2,400	218,444	130,770	70,800	53,724	36,000	113,400	37,800			776,838
China.....	113,400	176,685	409,500	20,220		8,400	10,458	228,800	151,320	400,080	656,996	423,860	2,890,459
Other Dutch East Indies.....		25,200	21,150		19,080		14,670	21,538	31,748	29,500	9,570		183,208
Hongkong.....	42,000	168,000	294,000	345,621	207,586	84,000	168,000	277,490	84,000	284,004	404,754	192,000	2,550,855
Japan.....	750,992	274,350	824,254	423,735	406,515	685,800	100,848	584,556	671,734	258,152	676,220	349,152	6,156,578
Philippine Islands.....	17,640	59,000	85,640	169,221	282,534	661,176	999,084	443,946	714,252	403,748	539,700	235,310	4,696,271
British South Africa.....	42,000	129,150	444,400	637,779	437,725	291,000	274,150	36,000	32,500				2,098,849
Other countries.....	356,566	246,088	465,549	683,934	622,858	295,513	406,392	362,447	367,978	222,273	416,105	489,708	4,935,411
Total.....													57,378,043

EVAPORATED

Belgium.....	148,200	134,400	302,400	322,800	287,032	223,920	288,000	106,500	435,360	895,975	1,453,819	2,066,574	6,865,940
France.....	541,700	112,641	777,720	800,640	950,400	642,000	626,400	418,800	950,400	1,315,210	1,862,184	1,372,272	10,376,397
Germany.....	1,242,783	391,295	3,252,240	4,141,801	2,987,501	991,816	155,613	25,263	845,358	1,895,637	3,346,627	10,510,845	29,756,839
Latvia.....	480,000	1,755,840	5,150,016	2,435,616									9,821,472
Netherlands.....			240,000	288,000	464,204	60,000				466,600	1,117,960	2,782,375	5,299,039
Russia in Europe.....			594,870	426,864									961,734
Turkey in Europe.....				80,800	67,200	60,000							198,000
Ukraine.....		1,732,752				26,271							1,759,023
United Kingdom.....	2,410,992	2,784,634	1,764,102	1,705,856	2,624,156	1,185,496	1,795,647	3,644,637	3,264,888	4,250,899	3,997,692	4,265,619	32,243,978
Panama.....	300,559	652,150	162,862	514,080	338,851	122,791	235,020	236,370	530,974	235,148	304,940	331,416	3,960,161
Mexico.....	210,327	256,320	214,281	281,317	267,302	268,489	242,003	144,604	203,402	232,003	302,517	101,116	2,723,681
Jamaica.....	9,708	10,496	22,927	19,968	13,740	10,105	6,750	1,920	6,815	1,680	1,872	7,200	113,181
Cuba.....	353,809	182,546	260,123	406,082	131,024	137,716	260,555	263,866	287,456	375,460	345,531	330,484	3,334,652
Peru.....	31,952	223,840	183,240	473,510	634,009	530,978	425,153	469,340	621,037	276,583	403,942	610,716	4,684,000
British India.....	132,814	81,022	55,638	62,119	38,540	60,940	69,000	36,780	36,569	87,630	89,940		780,803
Straits Settlements.....	123,256	170,372	220,720	53,210	92,320	185,210	234,006	64,791	61,722	171,541	97,176	112,107	1,587,031
China.....	12,480	47,586	218,629	93,138	117,825	378,862	287,056	147,984	628,120	211,680	433,700	175,961	2,652,991
Other Dutch East Indies.....	46,600	42,480	62,836	64,960	65,650	25,920	19,630	46,800	75,000	29,280	7,200		460,306
Hongkong.....	62,154	43,200	25,264	41,280	115,148	173,408	114,770		159,660	36,000	133,860	32,420	939,484
Japan.....	45,996	32,172	158,049	45,724	245,689	83,628	151,393	113,089	636,559	238,772	25,230	34,733	1,798,625
Philippine Islands.....	119,124	831,872	926,200	636,800	617,920	439,396	784,680	471,632	472,604	1,124,060	936,200	877,200	7,536,688
British South Africa.....	64,414	10,172	4,800	38,940		6,000			36,450		32,000	6,800	222,726
Other countries.....	396,559	654,473	797,829	508,760	494,253	1,141,578	492,239	427,162	443,630	578,373	490,993	916,558	7,340,407
Total.....													136,886,323

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the bureau of dairying.

SEC. 2. That a chief of the bureau of dairying shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be subject to the general direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. He shall devote his time to the investigation of the dairy industry, and the dissemination of information for the promotion of the dairy industry.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of Agriculture and the chief of the bureau of dairying to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to transfer to the bureau of dairying such activities of the Department of Agricul-

ture as he may designate which relate primarily to the dairy industry, and to employ such additional persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, as may be necessary.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act and the activities of the bureau of dairying, such sums of money as Congress may deem necessary are hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to such sums provided for in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925.

SEC. 5. That this act shall be in full force and effect on and after July 1, 1924.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I am going to take only half a minute. I want to say that if this had been a bill for the creation of a bureau for any other interest except the farming interests of the country I would have objected to it, because we ought to stop creating

these bureaus. This bureau is going to require another \$7,500 chief and all the incidental expenses, but as it is for the farmers of the country I shall let it go by.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

#### AMENDING THE PENAL CODE OF THE UNITED STATES

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5946) to amend section 84 of the Penal Code of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar Senate bill (S. 2146) will be substituted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 84 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (34 Stat. p. 1088), be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 84. Whoever shall hunt, trap, capture, willfully disturb, or kill any bird or wild animal of any kind whatever, or take or destroy the eggs of any such bird on any lands of the United States which have been set apart or reserved as refuges or breeding grounds for such birds or animals by any law, proclamation, or Executive order, except under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time prescribe, or who shall willfully injure, molest, or destroy any property of the United States on any such lands, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5946) was laid on the table.

#### TICK-INFESTED CATTLE

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5791) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why admit tick-infested cattle when the Agricultural appropriation bill, about to come up, carries, as I understand it, a large appropriation to fight the tick?

Mr. HAUGEN. This is to prohibit the importation.

Mr. BEGG. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. As I read it, it was to remove the restriction.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. Without objection, the Senate bill will be considered instead of the House bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2184) 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.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That 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 (36 Stat. L. p. 1240), which amended the act of August 30, 1890, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture under joint regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the admission of tick-infested cattle from Mexico into that part of Texas below the southern quarantine line, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

#### WILLOW CREEK RANGER STATION, MONT.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5941) to complete the construction of the Willow Creek Ranger Station, Mont.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the necessity for this bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. The construction is authorized, and on account of the increased prices the estimated cost additional to complete is \$300, but to be on the safe side it is suggested it be made \$500.

Mr. BLANTON. Five hundred dollars for what?

Mr. HAUGEN. To complete.

Mr. BLANTON. With the total of \$500?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In other words this bill will not cost, but \$500, to be taken out of the Treasury?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; the estimate is \$300, but in order to play safe we have asked for \$500.

Mr. BLANTON. The total amount of money that is going to come out of the Treasury is \$500?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; that is the total.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Without objection a similar Senate bill will be considered. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2147) to complete the construction of the Willow Creek Ranger Station, Mont.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to expend, out of any moneys appropriated for general expenses of the Forest Service, not to exceed the sum of \$500 to complete the construction of the Willow Creek ranger station in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, Mont.

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

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

#### EXTENDING INVITATIONS TO GOVERNMENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN WORLD POULTRY CONGRESS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 189, authorizing the President to extend invitations to foreign governments to participate in a World's Poultry Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know what kind of ridiculous invitations we are going to extend hereafter to European nations. We are going to have them come over here on the subject of raising turnip greens, kale, and various other subjects. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this money ought to be expended, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. That completes the bills in order to-day. There is one at the bottom of the page, a bridge bill, which under the rules the Chair thinks might be considered.

Mr. MAPES. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE DETROIT RIVER

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8084) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. There is a similar Senate bill. Without objection, the Senate bill will be considered in lieu of the House bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2825) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by act of Congress approved March 4, 1921, to be built by the American Transit Co., its successors and assigns, across Detroit River, within or near the city limits of Detroit, Wayne County, Mich., are hereby extended one year and five years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar House bill will lie upon the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair finds that by inadvertence earlier in the day two House bills were passed similar to two

Senate bills. Without objection, the proceedings whereby H. R. 4319, authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes, and H. R. 3756, granting to the county of Custer, State of Montana, certain land in said county for use as a fairground, were passed will be vacated and the House bills laid upon the table, and S. 303, authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes, and S. 306, granting to the county of Custer, State of Montana, certain land in said county for use as a fairground, will be considered, read twice, ordered read a third time, read a third time, and passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### FUTURE OF LAND RECLAMATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the reclamation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has before it numerous problems of national and international importance, many of which are of great interest to the country generally, as well as from the standpoint of good citizenship. Among these questions there is perhaps none more vitally important, as it relates to the stability of government and of business institution than that of the national policy of land reclamation and settlement. From the earliest times the land question has been recognized as fundamental in the stability of all government; in fact, one of the most difficult questions, and one which threatened the existence of the Nation as a whole, was that growing out of the ownership and use of the vast tracts of land west of the original Colonies. When the title to these lands was finally confirmed in the United States, then and not until then was the stability of the Union assured.

The necessity of using these public lands for homes for citizens was early appreciated, but the ways of assuring the best use were not finally agreed upon until the passage of the homestead act, which in effect practically dedicated to home making the greater part of the public lands of the country. The growth of the United States in population, industry, and in everything which makes for good citizenship has been closely connected with the utilization of the vast extent of lands which could be employed in the creation of the small self-supporting farm homes; small in distinction from the great estates or ranches of other countries, but which are large enough to absorb the available labor of the owner and his family.

The fact that these public lands, suitable for home making, had practically disappeared by the beginning of this century, led the late President Theodore Roosevelt and his associates to urge that the benefits of the homestead act be extended by removing obstacles to the cultivation of lands which were then lying idle because of lack of water. In his first message to Congress, December, 1901, President Roosevelt urged that the public lands of the arid region be reclaimed so that homesteading might continue. Under the stimulus of his personal interest in the matter and with the active efforts of many notable statesmen, the reclamation act finally became a law, being signed by President Roosevelt on June 17 (Bunker Hill Day), 1902.

Two decades have elapsed since that time. The vacant public lands, so far as these may be irrigated or reclaimed, have practically all disappeared. Although about 190,000,000 acres of vacant public lands remain on the tract books of the Land Office, practically all of these consist of rejected areas of mountains, of plateaus, or rock-strewn valleys, and lands where the soil is too thin for cultivation. Every valley in the arid region has been explored, every piece of land which, under any conceivable plan, may ultimately be utilized is gone so far as Government reclamation is concerned.

The extraordinary and unlooked for success of the reclamation act has resulted in a great stimulus of enterprise in the arid region as a whole, and to an extent such as to force land prices so high, as compared with recent crop values, as to render further reclamation plans a matter for serious consideration from the financial or economic standpoint.

It is not to be inferred that the West is completely developed. On the contrary, we are at the beginning of development, but we must go at it in some other way than has been practiced in the past. This is shown by the many applications for relief from payment of the installments due the Government. This is in spite of the fact that the conditions for such payment for water for the reclaimed land have been made, by act of Congress, more lenient than in any other part of the world or by

any other country or organization. Last year 2,000 people applied for relief or extension of time of payment and this year over 4,500 are urging some concession. Many of these claims are doubtless meritorious, but the fact that so many people are making application indicates that there must be some change in present methods.

It must not be assumed that the West, which has contained such vast areas of public land, is the only undeveloped portion of the United States. The country as a whole, as concerns its continued growth and prosperity, can not confine its efforts to any one section. A self-supporting home established in the East is as important to the Nation as one in the West. It is the contented and prosperous home which should be considered, not the particular locality of that home.

This important consideration that the Nation is concerned, not with the reclamation of public lands because they are public lands but with the ultimate object of home making gives a broad view of the situation. It forces us to consider the opportunities offered in every part of the country. For many years the people of the South have been insistent that so far as national and business stability are concerned it is the unused land of the South which should have early consideration. They have claimed that with the rapid development of the West the South now presents more opportunities. There are no public lands remaining in the South.

The existence of public lands should not be made the prerequisite for the continuation of the national policy of home making. On the contrary, this policy should be adapted to present conditions of landownership and be so modified as to encourage the settlement of vast tracts of land suitable for home making.

There is no doubt but that the success of reclamation in the West has stimulated other parts of the country to demand that equal consideration be given to their claims. It is a matter of history that when the reclamation act was under consideration the South voted to help the West and with the understanding that if the time should come that the South was in a position to need similar legislation the western men would come to its aid.

The time has now arrived when the people of the South are demanding such consideration and are pointing to the fact that if the ultimate object of the reclamation act is the making of homes, then under present conditions homes can be made in the South as well as in the West.

To put it in another way, the success of national reclamation in the arid region has stimulated interest and enthusiasm in the underlying ideals of home making; and if the West is to continue with Federal assistance, it must share this with other parts of the country. It can no longer stand alone or claim the unique distinction of having public land to be reclaimed in any considerable tracts.

This claim for general consideration is by no means new. Congress has already recognized that something should be done, and in 1918 appropriated \$100,000 for a study of the unused lands in every State. The report printed in 1919 illustrates the fact that there are lands available in every section of the country, many of which may be utilized as need arises. It is true that these lands are in private ownership, individual or corporate, but they can be obtained on terms not much more onerous than those attached to public lands; that is to say, the owners of many of these tracts, seeing the hopelessness of financial gain in the reclamation and settlement of these lands, have offered to turn over these areas to bona fide settlers at rates which may be approved by competent authority as being fair.

It is possible to conceive of a land reclamation and settlement district, organized under the State law, embracing suitable lands and conducted in such way as to give reasonable assurance to homeseekers that they will have a square deal. It is also possible to conceive that the financing of such districts may be done under Federal auspices in such way as will ultimately recover the investment, although the interest may be lost to the Government during the years of pioneering. Compensation for this loss of interest is more than made up by the fact of the ultimate settlement of the land and the making of self-supporting homes. It is recognized that in every undertaking of this kind some aid must be given; the most effective way is through this forfeiting of interest on the investment during these early stages.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING LAW

The reclamation law as it now stands is applicable only to lands in the 17 arid or semiarid Western States—Kansas to California, Montana to Arizona. It has been amended from time to time in certain details, particularly those having to do

with the repayment of the amount owed to the Government on account of the capital investment in irrigation and drainage works. The result is that the law as a whole is more or less of a patchwork; it is somewhat inconsistent in its details and requires for effective application many fine-drawn distinctions or inferences, which should be covered by explicit statement of principles. In short, the methods of administration forced by the necessities of the case are not embodied in the law, but are permissible by inferences drawn from apparent intent of the act, rather than from direct authorization.

This latitude of the reclamation law was very desirable and even essential 20 years ago when conditions were almost unknown, but now that Federal reclamation has become an established fact it is the part of wisdom for Congress to recognize the larger needs and to place responsibilities more definitely than in the past.

#### RECLAMATION DISTRICTS

The formation of reclamation districts under State law is one of the large steps in advance in the carrying out of the objects of the reclamation act. These districts should be encouraged or even compelled to take a larger responsibility in the administration of affairs, not leaving the landowners and their tenants to shift the burdens of operation and maintenance to the shoulders of Uncle Sam. The reclamation act in its very essence requires that large responsibility be assumed by the Federal department or bureau having the matter in charge, but the duties have been greatly increased by this strongly marked tendency to force good-natured Uncle Sam to carry the burden longer and to a larger extent than was contemplated originally.

Under the act of 1902 it was assumed that payments would be made without interest during the pioneer period of 10 years, and that before this time had elapsed the local people would have assumed full responsibility and control. Congress extended the time to 20 years, but made no requirements such as to facilitate the Government laying down the burden. Recently a provision was inserted in one of the appropriation acts which may require the Government, in connection with the Milk River project, Montana, to keep control and to practically peddle out water for 40 years. It is thus forced to interfere in the local affairs of water distribution to small communities, a condition which tends to continued misunderstanding and exasperation. We must get over this and go back more nearly to the original conception—that if the Government initiates the work and puts it on its feet, there must be some organization or district acting under State law which must take up the petty details of dealing with the individuals.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME

In connection with the operation of the reclamation act, there is no one thing which has taken up so much time of Congress, and in its committees, and has led to such exasperation on the part of all concerned, as is the steadily increasing demand for extension of time of payment. At the end of the first 10 years Congress concluded that a 10-year period for payment of the capital invested in the water, which made the farm available, was too short, even though this payment was made without interest. After considerable discussion it was concluded to grant terms so easy that under no possible condition could any landowner fail to make good; that is to say, to make the installments on the capital invested less than the ordinary payment of interest. For example, the Government may have invested \$80 per acre in the reclamation of land. This land was given away originally under condition of settlement. The man getting this piece of land was required to pay this \$80 for the water in installments without interest, extending over a period of 20 years.

To put it in another way, if the landowner paid 5 per cent a year for 20 years he could have the water for nothing. More than this, to cover the pioneer period, it is provided that for the first four years the landowner need pay only 2 per cent installments, then for the fifth and sixth years only 4 per cent installments, and for the remaining 14 years 6 per cent, all of these without interest on the deferred amount. Here were terms far easier than those offered by any county or community, and Congress gave a sigh of relief that the whole thing was settled and for all time. Many Members thought this too easy and urged that at least a small interest charge should be demanded and conditions after the first 10 years made comparable to those of the Federal farm-loan banks.

Now, however, after a few years of payment of the installments on the capital invested of 2 per cent, thousands of landowners plead that they can not keep up this rate of installments. Last year 2,000 appealed for relief. This year over twice as many. There is no doubt but that many of the settlers do need help, on account of excessive cost of the project, poor soil, small

yield, and so forth, but those unfriendly to the reclamation policy argue that the beneficiaries under the reclamation act should be required to meet their payments or accept terms comparable to those of the Federal farm loan act, amortizing the debt in from 30 to 40 years, but with payment of a small interest, equivalent to the amount the taxpayers are carrying on money borrowed by the Government.

The annual relief bills will probably come before Congress as long as there remains any debt to the United States, unless some general rule should be laid down consistent with sound business principles, and the Commissioner of the Reclamation Service or a board shall be given the power and duty to establish regulations for adjustment of payments after a thorough investigation has been made of the necessities of the settlers on the different projects and to see that these regulations are carried out in a spirit of fairness.

#### COOPERATION BETWEEN STATE AND NATION

One of the chief criticisms of the reclamation act is that it is too one-sided. The Federal Government is furnishing all the money, doing all the work, is being criticized because it does not enter into more details, while the State is doing little or nothing in the way of solving the problems of its citizens on the reclaimed lands.

Undoubtedly there will be better appreciation of the work done by the Government if much of this is made contingent upon the performance of equally important functions which fall within the State jurisdiction. For example, the selection of settlers, the getting of the reclamation lands into the hands of men who will actually use them, the providing of advice in the way of better crop production—all of such work and many other details should be handled to a larger extent by the State or State organizations, farm bureaus, and others. The National Government should be in a position to deal with the State or municipality organized under State laws and not be put in the position of supervising the details of water distribution to thousands of farms.

In particular, the financing of the settler is a matter which should be taken up by the State. Under present conditions the landowners must borrow considerable sums of money on which they are paying 8, 10, and 12 per cent, a rate which it is impossible to continue for any considerable time without injury. There are many arguments why, if the Federal Government will provide the water, the State or its subdivisions should give proper attention to these financial needs.

#### TAXES

In addition to the heavy interest charges for which relief should be afforded, there are the steadily increasing taxes which are piled on the back-breaking load of the irrigator. Remember that the greater part of the taxes is of local origin—State and county. These taxes are under local control and yet they have increased with such rapidity that many an otherwise well-to-do farmer has been compelled to give up, the taxes representing a proper margin of profit.

The reason for this heavy taxation is evident in that on the reclaimed areas the people in the towns especially have demanded the conveniences of a highly settled community. They are building roads, bridges, schools, and public buildings surpassing those of communities which have been settled for a hundred years. They are trying to pay for these things in a few years. All of them are desirable, some are necessary; but more necessary is it to keep the taxes within the limits where they can be paid.

#### A VISION OF THE FUTURE

In what I have said I have tried to point out the things which should be done, and it might be inferred that, because I have pointed these things out they are the large features of reclamation. On the contrary, while important they are not the whole story. I have not taken time to amplify upon the advantages and the great opportunities which lie before us in the future. I am merely pointing out the bad places in the road. At the same time the road does lead through pleasant valleys and has great attractions. It leads to far better conditions than I have touched upon. We are only at the beginning of land reclamation. We will realize even more largely than in the past the vision of the men who work for reclamation and the making of farm homes. We will ultimately achieve these, but we can do so more quickly and more satisfactorily to all concerned if we consider the rough spots and smooth them out.

The country as a whole not only needs more opportunities for homes but can provide these opportunities to be taken up in an orderly manner as needed when we make use of the experience we have had in the last 20 years. By utilizing that experience and by doing some of the things which I have de-

scribed we will be performing not only a necessary duty but one which will redound to the peace and prosperity of the whole Nation.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Cotter Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### SALE OF WINE AND BEER

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. I do this for the purpose of reading a telegram, which is as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., April 5, 1924,

Representative J. ALFRED TAYLOR,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Commending you on your noble stand for the right, 400 members of Charleston W. C. T. U. ask your support of H. R. 728; also H. R. 6645. We ask a special protest on the floor of the House against any measure legalizing wine and beer. The sixth district and the State are behind you when you say they shall not pass.

Mrs. W. A. RADFORD, Corresponding Secretary.

I make this solemn protest here now, and I hope to make it more effectually if any bill legalizing the sale of wine and beer is ever brought up for passage.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. FLEETWOOD), for one week, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MAPES), for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WELSH, for three days, on account of death in his family.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 3682. An act authorizing the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 593. An act authorizing the issuance of service medals to officers and enlisted men of the two brigades of Texas Cavalry organized under authority from the War Department under date of December 8, 1917, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and further authorizing the wearing by such officers and enlisted men, on occasions of ceremony, of the uniform lawfully prescribed to be worn by them during their service; and

H. R. 2876. An act to provide for the payment of claims of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for back annuities.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, in accordance with the order previously made, until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 8, 1924, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

428. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copy of letter of the Major General Commandant, United States Marine Corps, dated March 5, 1924, forwarding list of useless records on file in headquarters, United States Marine Corps, and copy of letter of the Bureau of Navigation, dated March 20, 1924, requesting authority to destroy useless individual weekly drill reports pertaining to various drilling organizations of the Naval Reserve Force, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LAMPERT: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7962. A bill to create and establish a commission, as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, to

regulate rents in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GASQUE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6628. A bill to change the name of Jewett Street west of Wisconsin Avenue to Cathedral Avenue; without amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1332. A bill for the relief of Dennis Shevlin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3257) making eligible for retirement under certain conditions officers of the Army of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 8301) granting an increase of pension to Byron W. Jacks; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8487) to establish the Peel National Military Park at the Pea Ridge battle field in Benton County, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8488) to authorize the Federal Power Commission to amend permit No. 1, project No. 1, issued to the Dixie Power Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8489) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Spencer, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WARD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8490) to authorize the erection of a public building at Ahoskie, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8491) to regulate the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 8492) to revive the right of action under the act of March 12, 1863 (12 Stat. L. p. 820); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8493) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Stockbridge Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8494) providing for care of graves of British soldiers in Greenwood Cemetery, Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURTON: Resolution (H. Res. 251) appropriating additional funds for the select committee appointed under the provisions of H. Res. 217, adopted March 12, 1924; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 8495) granting a pension to Arthur E. Palmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 8496) granting a pension to Mrs. Rea Ingersoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8497) granting a pension to Isabel D. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8498) for the relief of Harry L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 8499) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 8500) granting a pension to James M. Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 8501) to provide additional compensation for Frank J. Viti; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8502) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Savage, State of Minnesota, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8503) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winthrop, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8504) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. McNeer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 8505) for the relief of Capt. Norman D. Cota; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8506) granting a pension to Matilda Bittner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LYON: A bill (H. R. 8507) authorizing the Secretary of War to make a survey of South River, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 8508) for the relief of Luis Rosario and Jose M. Caballero; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 8509) granting an increase of pension to Lida M. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8510) granting an increase of pension to Rachel L. Herbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8511) granting a pension to Mrs. John Petty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8512) granting an increase of pension to Mary Longo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8513) for the relief of W. S. Wakeman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8514) for the relief of J. I. Richardson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8515) granting a pension to Della Elder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8516) granting a pension to John S. Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8517) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stallings; 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:

2215. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, urging Congress to make adequate provision for the care, treatment, comfort, and entertainment of disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2216. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Department of the American Legion, urging Congress to make full and adequate provision for the care, treatment, comfort, and entertainment of disabled veterans and orphan children of disabled veterans before making provision for foreign relief of any nature, with special reference to the German relief bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2217. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of various citizens of Willow Hill, Ill., asking that the Johnson immigration bill be enacted into law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2218. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of Tulare County, Calif., protesting against a modification of the Volstead Act and the recognizing of 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2219. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Greater Boston Chapter, Military Order of the World War, Boston, Mass., condemning the action of the House of Representatives for passing an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the relief of German children; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2220. By Mr. LINEBERGER: Petition of L. A. Sutton and others with reference to House bill 2702; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2221. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Jugoslaviya Lodge, Frank Lukancic, secretary, of Sugarite, N. Mex., opposing the

present immigration proposals; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2222. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of Roundhead Camp, Sons of Veterans, No. 165, of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the immediate passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2223. Also, petition of Wampum Council, No. 181, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, of Wampum Pa., urging the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2224. Also, petition of Ellwood City Council, No. 182, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2225. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Dubuque, Iowa, advising support and enactment into law of the Johnson immigration bill, based on the census of 1890; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2226. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of citizens of Latonia and Covington, Kenton County, Ky., indorsing the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2227. By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Petition of citizens of Franklin County, Nebr., favoring House bill 4081; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2228. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the department executive committee of the American Legion, urging Congress to provide adequate comfort and entertainment for disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, April 8, 1924

(Legislative day of Monday, April 7, 1924)

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

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Edwards	King	Shields
Ball	Fernald	Ladd	Shipstead
Bayard	Ferris	McCormick	Shorridge
Borah	Fess	McKellar	Simmons
Brandee	Fletcher	McKinley	Smith
Broussard	Frazier	McNary	Smoot
Bruce	George	Mayfield	Spencer
Bursum	Gerry	Neely	Stanfield
Cameron	Glass	Norris	Stephens
Capper	Gooding	Oddie	Sterling
Caraway	Hale	Overman	Swanson
Colt	Harrell	Owen	Tammell
Copeland	Harris	Pepper	Underwood
Couzens	Harrison	Phippis	Wadsworth
Cummins	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Howell	Ralston	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Ransdell	Warren
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson	Weller
Edge	Keyes	Sheppard	Willis

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness.

I was requested to announce 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 attending a hearing before a special investigating committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF NEAL DOW

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD an address of the Hon. WESLEY L. JONES of Washington, delivered in Portland, Me., on Sunday, March 23, at the services in commemoration of the one hundred and twentieth anniversary of the birth of Neal Dow.

I ask to have printed also the letter of the Hon. Percival P. Baxter, Governor of Maine, which was read at this service.

In the RECORD of March 20 a letter appeared, addressed to Hon. WESLEY L. JONES, by Arthur C. Jackson, president of the Neal Dow Association for World Peace and Prohibition, and inviting the attention of Congress to the purposes of this organization as formulated in its brief constitution. The consti-