

Minnesota may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 9319) declaring an emergency to exist in the matter of certain agricultural commodities and to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 9341) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 21, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERGER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) requesting the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to take steps to enforce the payment of the debt the French Government owes the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER: Resolution (H. Res. 321) providing for the consideration of S. 966, an act for the continuance of construction work on the San Carlos irrigation project, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WINTER: Resolution (H. Res. 322) to pay Edith B. Barrow, widow of Frank H. Barrow, late legislative clerk of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' salary and \$250 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolution (H. Res. 323) for the immediate removal of the voice amplifying devices now installed in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CULLEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, recommending and requesting that Congress make liberal appropriations for carrying out the spirit of the national defense act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 9320) granting an increase of pension to Diana M. Oakley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 9321) granting a pension to Priscilla Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 9322) granting a pension to Thomas C. Ellington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9323) granting a pension to Laura I. Kissell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9324) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9325) granting a pension to Julia A. Cameron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 9326) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Boyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 9327) granting a pension to Susan E. Darrough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 9328) granting an increase of pension to Martha Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9329) for the relief of George Charles Walthers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9330) granting a pension to Laura Banker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 9331) granting a pension to William H. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9332) for the relief of Joseph Y. Dreisonstok; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9333) for the relief of W. J. Cook; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9334) granting a pension to Annie L. Webber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9335) granting a pension to Theodate S. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 9336) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. Fisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9337) granting a pension to Cynthia Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9338) granting an increase of pension to Almira E. McCarron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 9339) granting an increase of pension to Fred Stanley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 9340) granting a pension to Theodore A. K. Gessler; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2806. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of employees of the Electrician's Craft, their helpers and apprentices, of the eleventh congressional district of Indiana, protesting against any favorable action on passage of the Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2807. Also (by request), petition of Parent Webb Cleveland, Staten Island, N. Y., favoring bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2808. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce, Effingham, Ill., favoring the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2809. By Mr. CORNING: Petition of Albany County Bar Association, Albany, N. Y., in opposition to the passage of the Caraway bill to amend the practice and procedure in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2810. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of William F. Stecher, Dorchester, Mass., recommending early and favorable consideration of H. R. 6484, to retire disabled emergency officers of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2811. Also, petition of American Train Dispatchers Association, Boston, Mass., recommending favorable consideration of the Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2812. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of officers and employees of the Pacific Box Co., Tacoma, Wash., urging immediate reduction of income taxes along the lines of the Mellon plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2813. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition of State Board of Agriculture, Jefferson City, Mo., in re potash production in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2814. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of 33 citizens of Dickinson, N. Dak., protesting against tax on radio receiving sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2815. Also, petition of Bottineau Post, No. 42, of the American Legion, Bottineau, N. Dak., urging extension to five years of presumptive period for tubercular veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2816. Also, petition of the Sorosis Club of Harvey, N. Dak., urging legislation for the creation of a membership in the International World Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, May 20, 1924

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

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. We would ask therefore that this morning this may be the desire of our hearts, not simply the utterance of our lips, but that Thy will may be regnant in our lives, directing every thought and action and enabling us to understand that when Thy will is regnant the blessedness of life shall be realized and the high intent of Thy purposes with Thy children shall be fully attained. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. Lodge and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chafee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

- S. 105. An act for the relief of Arthur Frost;
- S. 129. An act for the relief of the William D. Mullen Co.;
- S. 130. An act for the relief of George T. Tobin & Son;
- S. 210. An act for the relief of Peter C. Keegan and others;
- S. 589. An act for the relief of James Moran;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of the New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Co., of Bayonne, N. J.;

S. 1698. An act granting permission to Commander Dorr F. Tozier, United States Coast Guard, retired, to accept a gift from the King of Great Britain;

H. R. 694. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910;

H. R. 837. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 1629. An act authorizing the removal of the restrictions from 40 acres of the allotment of Isaac Jack, a Seneca Indian, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2498. An act for the relief of the East LaHave Transportation Co. (Ltd.), owner; A. Picard & Co., owner of cargo; and George H. Corkum, Leopold S. Conrad, Wilson Zinck, Freeman Beck, Sidney Knickle, and Norman E. LeGay, crew, of the schooner *Con Rein*, sunk by the United States submarine *K-4*;

H. R. 2665. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River in the vicinity of One hundred and thirty-fourth Street, in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois;

H. R. 2881. An act to compensate three Comanche Indians of the Kiowa Reservation;

H. R. 2887. An act 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;

H. R. 3183. An act for the relief of Rush O. Fellows;

H. R. 3800. An act to cancel an allotment of land made to Mary Crane, or Ho-tah-kah-win-kaw, a deceased Indian, embracing land within the Winnebago Indian Reservation in Nebraska;

H. R. 3900. An act to cancel two allotments made to Richard Bell, deceased, embracing land within the Round Valley Indian Reservation in California;

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. 4200. An act to provide for the cleaning of the exterior of the post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio;

H. R. 4462. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the payment of the Choctaw and Chickasaw town-site fund, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4494. An act authorizing extensions 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.;

H. R. 4647. An act for the relief of the Underwood Typewriter Co. and Frank P. Trott;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Edvard T. Williams;

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. 6059. An act authorizing the conveyance to the city of Washington, Mo., of 10 feet of the Federal building site in said city for the extension of the existing public alley through the entire block from Oak to Lafayette Streets;

H. R. 6298. An act to authorize the leasing for oil and gas mining purposes of unallotted lands on Indian reservations affected by the proviso to section 3 of the act of February 28, 1891;

H. R. 6810. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Millersburg and Liverpool Bridge Corporation, and its successors, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River, at Millersburg, Pa.;

H. R. 7063. An act 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;

H. R. 7846. An act 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.;

H. R. 7913. An act 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;

H. R. 8229. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 8304. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundredth Street, in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2169) to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, 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 amendments numbered 6 and 11.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language proposed to be inserted by the House and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Add at the end of section 4c of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, the following: 'When in his judgment efficiency demands such action, the President is authorized to except officers of the Medical Corps, Ordnance Department, and Chemical Warfare Service from the provisions of this section requiring duty with troops of one or more of the combatant arms. The President is further authorized to except from the provisions of this section requiring duty with troops of one or more of the combatant arms such officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department as are now engaged in patent litigation in which the Government is involved.'

And the House agree to the same.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,

RALPH H. CAMERON,

DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN C. MCKENZIE,

HARRY E. HULL,

PERCY E. QUIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is the report signed by all the conferees?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is a unanimous agreement?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

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

The report was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WARREN presented resolutions adopted by the Sheridan (Wyo.) Commercial Club, favoring an amendment of section 4 of the interstate commerce act, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Green River, Wyo., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Howell-Barkley railway labor bill, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BRANDEGEE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 169) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved June 12, 1916," and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 862) amending section 1 of the interstate commerce act, reported it without amendment.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. KEYES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 224, submitted by Mr. ERNST on the 15th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

RELIEF OF INJURED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 2508) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916. Inasmuch as it is an emergency measure I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be immediately considered.

Mr. KING. Let it be reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The reading clerk read the bill.

Mr. KING. This is a very important measure and affects a matter that has received consideration heretofore. I think it had better go to the calendar and be considered in due order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 3343) granting an increase of pension to Fannie H. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 3344) to provide for the establishment of a dairy and livestock experiment station at Tifton, Ga.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EDWARDS (by request):

A bill (S. 3345) to renew and extend certain letters patent to John V. Rice, jr.; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 3346) to provide that jurisdiction shall be 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 certain bands of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 3347) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Theodore B. Warner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 3348) granting a pension to Alice E. Alden (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3349) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Howland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODING (for Mr. WATSON):

A bill (S. 3350) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Vanderburgh County, Ind., and Henderson County, Ky.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3351) granting a pension to Rose G. Bingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3352) to provide for the appointment of an appraiser of merchandise at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to provide for venue of suits against the United States Grain Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NATURALIZATION PETITIONS

Mr. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2178) to relieve United States district judges from signing an order admitting, denying, or dismissing each petition for naturalization, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REIMBURSEMENT TO SENATOR FRANK L. GREENE

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 230), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hon. FRANK L. GREENE, a Senator from the State of Vermont, the sum of \$7,500, as reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred by him in the treatment and care of injuries resulting from an accidental bullet wound received while walking on the street in the city of Washington, D. C., February 15, 1924.

POSTHUMOUS MILITARY PROMOTIONS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned grades of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers. I am sure there will be no objection. I hope the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, will give me his attention.

During the World War a soldier whose appointment to a higher office was made, if not received by him and accepted before he died, was then denied his proper place on the rolls at the higher rank. If he was killed in battle, and his commission had been issued but not accepted in writing, under a decision of the Supreme Court he was denied the promotion which he earned on the field of battle. The joint resolution which I have introduced provides specifically that there is no increase of pay in any particular and no expense involved to the Government, but it simply allows the boy who died in service or was killed in service after the promotion had been made but before it had been formally accepted to be placed on the rolls in the grade and at the rank to which he had been appointed. I ask the Senator from New York if he will kindly state anything I may have overlooked in regard to the joint resolution?

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not object to the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall have to object. We are waiting to call up some matters in the regular way, and I think it is time to stop the granting of unanimous consent to consider measures out of order until we can get something up in the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming objects to the request of the Senator from Georgia, and the joint resolution remains on the calendar.

RELIEF OF INJURED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I ask leave to return to the order of reports of committees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are now in the order of the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I ask unanimous consent to return to the order of reports of committees; and on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary I report back with an amendment to the bill (H. R. 7041) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916.

The bill bears upon the same matter as that referred to a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection—

Mr. ROBINSON. I inquire of the Senator from California if the bill he has just reported relates to an amendment of the employees compensation act?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I answer, yes; as agreed upon.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is the bill similar or substantially similar to the Senate bill which he has already reported?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It is not only substantially similar, but is in exactly the same words, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas. We propose to amend the House bill in the manner in which we propose to amend the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California has asked unanimous consent to submit a report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Arkansas understands that, but he wants to understand what the Senator from California is reporting.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am reporting the House bill, I may answer the Senator, with the amendment agreed upon by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does it embrace the so-called Caraway amendment?
 Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes.
 The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the report will be received.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to occupy about three minutes of the time of the Senate.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the President made a mistake in declaring the attitude of the soldiers as immoral in asking for a readjusted compensation. When the railroads asked for a readjustment of their war pay immediately after the war and received in the neighborhood of \$2,000,000,000, Mr. Coolidge did not then declare their claim immoral, and should not have done so. Afterwards when the war contractors, commonly known as war profiteers, demanded and received \$706,000,000 in readjusted pay, he did not declare their action immoral, and perhaps should not have done so, though there was more room for such a declaration in that particular case. Nor, when the civilian employees of the Government asked for and received hundreds of millions of dollars in readjusted pay or bonus, he did not declare their action immoral, and should not have done so. In some way he has, in my judgment, the mistaken view of limiting his charge of immorality of action in asking readjusted pay solely to the ex-service men.

Harsh criticism of a considerable portion of the citizens of this country may catch the public eye for a short time, but it is never lasting. When we consider the difference in pay that the soldiers received during the war and the enormous profits and pay that were earned by those who remained at home, I should think anyone would see that there were two sides to the question and that it was unnecessary to abuse either side.

Nor is the President's theory that the passage of the bonus bill will prevent tax reduction correct. The \$100,000,000 a year it will take to pay the bonus is a large sum, but not governmentally speaking. For instance, the President has just recommended, through his Navy Department, an increase in the Navy which, if carried out, will cost probably more than the soldiers' bonus. The Republican administration last year recommended a ship subsidy bill that would have cost quite as much as the bonus. The enormous sums spent by the Government on airplanes during this administration that have since been declared useless will amount to very nearly as much as the bonus. The sums spent on submarines, which sums have been thrown away according to the reports, would almost rival the expenditures of the soldiers' bonus.

In addition, the extravagant tax refunds and tax abatements inaugurated by this administration costs the Government several times as much as the bonus. The Gulf Refining Co., in which Mr. Mellon is personally interested, drew from the Treasury Department in less than 30 days after Mr. Mellon became Secretary of the Treasury the enormous sum of \$3,300,000 in tax refunds. Last year he paid over \$2,300,000 to one of the five big Chicago packers. These are types of refunds. During the Wilson administration there were practically few refunds, and those resulting from accidental mistakes made in the assessment and collection of taxes. Since Mr. Mellon has been in office the rise in tax refunds has been continuous and tremendous—\$24,000,000 in 1921, \$43,000,000 in 1922, and \$229,000,000 in 1923. As enormous as these figures are, however, we are advised that in the way of abatements much more has been granted to the wealthy taxpayers, but Mr. Mellon, under the law, keeps these matters secret as much as possible.

We are spending this year \$330,000,000 on an army. We had about as good a one just before the war that cost us about \$100,000,000 per year. We are spending more than twice as much on our Navy as we did just before the war, and it is claimed that our present Navy is not as good as it was then.

None of these extravagances has even been attempted to be checked by the President. He becomes economical only where the soldiers are concerned.

A most substantial tax reduction bill has already been passed by the Congress, and if it does not become the law it will be because of the fault of the President in vetoing it and not the fault of the Congress.

EMPLOYEES OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.
 Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8262, being a bill relating to the salaries of the 2,000 or more employees of the Capitol.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8262) to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government, which had been reported from the Joint Special Committee on Readjustment of Compensation of Officers and Employees of Congress without amendment.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Adams | Ernst | Keyes | Sheppard |
| Ashurst | Fernald | King | Shipstead |
| Bayard | Ferris | Ladd | Shortridge |
| Brandegee | Fletcher | Lodge | Simmons |
| Brookhart | Frazier | McKellar | Smith |
| Broussard | George | McKinley | Smoot |
| Bruce | Gerry | McLean | Spencer |
| Bursum | Glass | McNary | Stanfield |
| Cameron | Gooding | Mayfield | Stephens |
| Capper | Hale | Moses | Sterling |
| Caraway | Harrell | Neely | Swanson |
| Coit | Harris | Norris | Trammell |
| Copeland | Heflin | Oddie | Underwood |
| Cummins | Howell | Overman | Wadsworth |
| Curtis | Johnson, Calif. | Phipps | Walsh, Mass. |
| Dale | Johnson, Minn. | Pittman | Walsh, Mont. |
| Dial | Jones, N. Mex. | Ralston | Warren |
| Edge | Jones, Wash. | Ransdell | Wheeler |
| Edwards | Kendrick | Robinson | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read.

The reading 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, \$2,300; file clerk, chief bookkeeper, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,330 each; first assistant librarian, and keeper of stationery, \$2,780 each; assistant librarian, \$2,150; skilled laborer, \$1,520; clerks—three at \$2,380 each, two at \$2,590 each, one \$2,460, one \$2,100, one \$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—three at \$1,140 each, three at \$1,010 each, one in stationery room, \$1,440.

DOCUMENT ROOM
 Superintendent, \$3,500; first assistant, \$2,380; two 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, \$3,800; 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, one for each Senator having no more than one clerk and two 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; two floor assistants, at \$3,600 each; messengers—five (acting as assistant doorkeepers, including one for minority), at \$2,150 each; 36 (including one for minority), at \$1,770 each; one, \$1,310; one 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; three carpenters, at \$1,390 each; janitor, \$1,520; five skilled laborers, at \$1,310 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,340; three female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,240 each; three attendants to women's toilet rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,010 each; telephone operators—chief, \$2,040; four, 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—three, at \$1,190 each; 84 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, \$1,860 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.

HOLDING 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 librarians, \$2,240; assistant file clerk, \$2,250; assistant librarian, and assistant journal clerk, at \$2,150 each; clerks—1 \$2,150, 2 at \$2,020 each; bookkeeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,940 each; 4 assistants to chief 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 \$190 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; 8 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, \$2,880; 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. Terr-

torles—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. War Claims—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Ways and Means—clerk, \$3,600; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$2,250; janitors—1 \$1,310, 1 \$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; 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.

Police Force, House Office Building, under the Sergeant at Arms: Lieutenant, \$1,520; 10 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 (one for 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 28, 1914, \$1,140.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of December 19, 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; 8 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.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator who has the bill in charge what is the aggregate increase in the salaries allowed for all of the officers and employees covered by this bill?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I yield. I have asked the Senator a question.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah inquires of me just what I was about to say anyway.

Mr. KING. I shall be happy to hear the Senator. There is no report accompanying the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there is a report—a very full report. If I remember rightly, there are 2,361 people provided for here. Starting at what is perhaps the most interesting subject for the moment, the employees here at the Senate, the percentage of raise for the first clerks, the senior clerks of Senators, is a little over 20 per cent above the salary that they are now receiving and the bonus, and that is the only increase of that proportion.

On the House side, opposite that, their increase is but 10 per cent—that is, each Member gets \$4,000, from which he provides for all of his clerks. The minimum that a Senator's clerical force gets is \$3,590. He gets \$3,300 for his first clerk, \$1,940 for the next, \$1,830 for the next, and \$1,520 for the fourth.

In the case of the committees, some of them, where there is not a great amount of work, have the same number of clerks. There are other committees, heavily worked, that have more assistants, and their assistants have higher pay.

The increase in the assistant clerks and in the employees in the Capitol is from 8 to 10 per cent more than the present pay and the bonus. The classification outside of the Capitol, as we understand from what has been done in the other bills, seeks to cover the old salaries and the bonus and from 3 to 5 per cent increase, except in the upper grades—as, for instance, Assistant Secretary of a department. That position has had a salary of \$5,000 for the last 40 years without raise, and in that case the salary has been raised considerably more than that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question. On page 1 it is observed that under the office of the Vice President a clerk is paid \$1,940 and an assistant clerk \$2,080. Why is the subordinate paid more than his superior? Why does the clerk receive less than the assistant clerk?

Mr. WARREN. That arrangement is one where a resolution clerk followed the regular statutory clerk. It occurred in the old bill, and we did not change it. Of course, one proposition has been observed throughout—not to reduce any salary—and that has been carried into all of the reclassifications that are made outside of the Chamber, not to reduce any of the salaries or wages that are received, except in some of the lump sums, where they were running over the normal. The matter to which the Senator refers is one that I shall not be able to explain.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course it seems anomalous to pay the clerk \$1,940 and the assistant clerk \$2,080.

Mr. WARREN. I will acknowledge that, Mr. President. That is a very just and reasonable complaint to make; but the former Vice President, who is now President of the United States, had arranged it that way, and we have not changed it.

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

Mr. WARREN. I was about to finish, but if the Senator wishes to ask me a question I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I did want to ask a question, and perhaps the Senator can continue his remarks in answer to the Senator from Utah by answering my question.

I notice, under the office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, that there seems to be a very marked inequality in the pay of the doorkeepers, and I wondered why that was. Then, when we come to the salaries recommended for the press gallery superintendent and assistant superintendent, why they are not paid at the same rate as the clerk and assistant clerk of a Senator?

Mr. WARREN. Their duties are entirely different, and the salaries have always been very different; so we saw no reason for changing the proportion of salary on account of what the Senator has said.

I was going to say, further, that this bill is the result of the consideration of a joint committee composed of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, who met and spent, perhaps, a month on the matter at our closing time a year ago, and again about a month before we assembled at this session. Those men should, and I think did, reflect the feeling and wishes of their respective bodies. In the consideration of this bill each side met the other, and naturally did the best they could. The House has laid its cards upon the table and passed the bill exactly as the committee recommended it.

There are questions that will occur, I think, to any man. I think it is human nature that one man thinks he does a little more work than another, or that he is worth a little more, and that he is worth at least as much as somebody who is graded higher than he is. It is pretty difficult to take a large lot of

employees and arrange matters satisfactorily to all of them, unless the matter is dealt with at the time of their employment, as in a case where a commercial concern has a line of employment and these matters are agreed upon when the men come in, on a basis of "take it or leave it."

Here are a large number of employees, many of whom have been here a great many years, while others are new. The general result of this arrangement is that the representatives of the House on the joint committee were willing to acknowledge—because they talked it over long beforehand—that we should make a further advancement in the case of the first clerks of Senators, who are given \$3,800, on account of the increase of business; so they are increased, as I have said, at the rate of over 20 per cent. But every Senator gets as the minimum the amount I stated.

As to the employees who receive more than \$2,500 no bonus, of course, reached them heretofore, and in their case there has been an increase similar to that made in the case of employees who had the bonus, because the bonus was to make up differences.

I shall be glad to give any further information that is desired, but that is about all there is to the measure. It stands in this way: The raises have been from 8 or 10 per cent up to 20, except where the salaries are \$4,500, and salaries of that size were not raised at all. On the other hand, as I said, Members of the House received less for clerks than Senators receive. In other words, a Member of the House receives \$4,000 for his clerks, while a Senator's force receives \$8,590 as a minimum. In the House \$4,000 is their maximum, because their minimum is \$3,300 if a Member employs only one clerk and \$4,000 if he employs two.

Mr. KING. Were any new positions or offices created by the bill?

Mr. WARREN. I think not. I do not remember one.

Mr. KING. Is this the bill which provides for automobiles and various other accessories for certain employees in the Capitol?

Mr. WARREN. It does not touch that at all. It has nothing to do with the contingencies. It is simply a straight matter of how much the secretaries and clerks shall receive for their services, and this bill does not appropriate. The appropriation bill will follow.

I am reminded of one or two alleged errors, and I am not contending that they are not errors. If such errors exist, when the appropriation bill comes along, as it will when we reach a point where the House can predicate an appropriation bill upon this measure, we can correct those errors, of course, because there is no intention of allowing the mistakes to go uncorrected. But as a general proposition, I think we will fare better and get through with better spirit all the way, and get better pay for our employees if we accept this bill as it comes to us from the committee and from the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a situation in the document room. For the document room, under the item on page 2, line 20, there are provided a superintendent, \$3,500; first assistant, \$2,880; two clerks, at \$1,770 each; skilled laborer, \$1,520.

For some reason or other this joint committee has failed to appreciate that a second assistant in the document room has been working there for years—

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that I have sent down for my clerk, who has the papers in regard to this matter, and I will be able to show the condition when these papers come up.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator does not mind, I have the entire history of it for 40 years back on my desk. I shall not read it all, but here is the situation: In the legislative act of 1906 the position of second assistant in the document room was created. In 1921, for some reason or other, the position was left out of the legislative act of that year, but it has been filled and paid for by annual appropriations since 1921.

Mr. SMITH. When was the position created?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In 1906.

Mr. SMITH. And was continued up to 1921?

Mr. WADSWORTH. To 1921, when, for some reason or other, it was dropped out of the legislative act of that year, but the man who did the work, and who is doing it now, has been paid by annual appropriations since then. There is no mention of him in this bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I think it will develop that he has been paid out of the contingent fund, because some of those places years ago were taken care of in a resolution, which read "until otherwise provided by law," and I think that the clerk the Senator has mentioned

is one of those. I think that resolution is still alive, and I think the pay is being drawn under it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the situation there is exceedingly unjust. While this bill provides for five employees in the document room, and in former years we have had as many as six, and upon one or two occasions at least seven, literally there are only three men working there now, the superintendent, the first assistant, and this other man, who apparently holds no title whatsoever, and who, with the first assistant and the superintendent, does all the work.

I do not know what the appropriation bills are going to carry for him. He disappears in this shuffle. The Secretary of the Senate tells me he is absolutely essential to the good work in that office, but the joint committee has forgotten him, as far as I can find out. The efficiency of the place is dependent upon somebody remembering each year to slip an item into an appropriation bill to take care of this man.

Mr. WARREN. It has not been handled that way.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then a resolution must be passed putting him upon some roll of the Senate, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. As I explained to the Senator, I think it is handled under an old resolution which takes care of it; but I shall be able to inform the Senate in a few moments.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to inquire if the bill is in its amendment stage?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator intend to offer an amendment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not intend to offer an amendment now, because I want to cooperate with the Senator from Wyoming, who tells me that perhaps the matter can be fixed when certain information comes before the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. There is no doubt that it can be fixed so that no man will be left out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is my idea. I want to say, however, further, that in 1921 the salary of the second assistant was \$2,250. The work is still going on just as it was before. If this bill were put in logical form to carry out what is going on now, and what is right and proper in the matter of salaries, the second assistant, in my judgment, should be put in either here or taken care of in some other statutory way with a salary of \$2,250, plus the bonus of \$240, plus the 5 per cent proposed increase, which would give that man a salary of \$2,602.50. What the functions of a skilled laborer are I am not entirely certain.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have ascertained that what I said in regard to this case is true. There is a resolution covering the matter which has been passed every year for several years past. There are two or three similar places. We tried once to repeal all those resolutions, and have each place taken care of by the session or by the Congress terms, but this is one of those which have been continued. This man has been paid continuously, as I suppose, because the resolution is alive, and he is drawing his pay now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The injustice of it is that he is doing the work of the second assistant, and he is drawing the pay of a laborer.

Mr. WARREN. That is something I do not know anything about, of course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the fact.

Mr. KING. Why should we not abolish the office of second assistant, if the first assistant is doing his work?

Mr. MOSES. And make them all skilled laborers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Make them all laborers?

Mr. KING. No. If he is doing the work of the second assistant, the presumption is the second assistant is doing nothing.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no second assistant now by title under a statute. This man is doing the work that the second assistant did from 1906 to 1921.

Mr. KING. Is the office of second assistant, then, abolished by this act?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. It was abolished in 1921, and it ought to be restored, because there is a man there doing all of that work. He is doing it as the result of a resolution of the Senate which authorizes the employment on a separate roll, not under this statutory roll, of this person, who, as far as I can find out, is drawing the pay of a skilled laborer.

I took this matter up with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], who is fairly familiar with it, and he expressed the

opinion that the second assistant should go in the bill. But if he is to be taken care of in some other way, I am not going to be particular about it, because the Senator from Wyoming tells me that if this bill is amended in any way its passage will be jeopardized.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator tell me, from his examination, whether it is necessary to have a superintendent, a first assistant, two clerks, and a skilled laborer?

Mr. WADSWORTH. From all I know, that office is undermanned now. It does an important, effective service for Senators. If there is anything a Senator wants, it is prompt service from the document room.

Mr. KING. In addition to those to whose positions I have just called attention, is the position now held by the person to whom the Senator is referring a necessary one?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; it is an anomalous position. He is doing the work of a second assistant, and is not being paid enough. They had to get him in there to continue the office. He voluntarily took the position.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator whether, in his conversation with the Secretary of the Senate, the Secretary stated whether he has been detailing others to that office?

Mr. WADSWORTH. He has been detailing this man.

Mr. WARREN. Has he been detailing others?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I believe not, other than the number provided for here.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I wish to offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire offers the following amendments, which the Secretary will report.

The READING CLERK. The Senator from New Hampshire offers the following amendments: On page 2, line 24, strike out "\$3,300" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,200"; on page 3, lines 1 to 23, both inclusive, strike out "\$3,300" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,200"; on page 3, line 24, strike out "\$3,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,500"; on page 4, lines 4 to 24, both inclusive, strike out "\$3,300" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,200"; on page 5, lines 1 to 22, both inclusive, strike out "\$3,300" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,200"; on page 6, line 4, strike out "\$3,300" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,200."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the first amendment.

Mr. MOSES. All the amendments go to the same subject, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and they will be considered together.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, this bill is a most imperfect response to a movement which took place in the Senate toward the close of the Sixty-seventh Congress, at which time a very determined effort was made upon the floor of the Senate to amend the legislative appropriation bill in order to provide greater compensation for the secretaries to Senators and clerks to committees. As a result of that agitation, after the failure of the amendment upon the floor, a joint committee was provided for, the result of whose labors is contained in the bill now before us.

I have described it as an imperfect response to an agitation, because, although the explanation given to the Senate by members of the committee is that the committee considered the result of the reclassification in the civil service in the city of Washington throughout the various departments and, finding the average increase there to be of a certain percentage, decided to make the same average percentage in these increases, that percentage totally loses sight of the principles of the classification bill, because every Senator who is familiar with the terms of the classification act applying to the civil service as a whole knows that in the higher positions, where the largest amount of work was required and where was required also the greatest of ability and the greatest variety of public services, there the increases were much more considerable, in some cases reaching to the extent of 50 per cent of the salary theretofore paid. Twenty per cent is the average increase given here.

I need not advert to the character of the service performed by secretaries of Senators and clerks of committees. Every Senator knows how varied, how continuous, how delicate, how important the services of his secretaries are to him; and I would wish—and the purpose of my amendment is to produce—an increase in salaries for secretaries to Senators which would be something commensurate to the service rendered to us, and something commensurate to the old-time relation between sala-

ries of Senators and their clerks back in the days before any increase took place at all.

We have been told, we will be told again, I assume—the Senator from New York has just put the Senate upon notice—that any amendment made here to this bill will jeopardize its passage. We have been told, we probably will be told again, that the House will absolutely refuse to consider any change which we make in the text of this measure. We have been told, we will be told again, that we must take the bill as it stands or have nothing. To all of that I retort that nobody can tell what the result of an effort to amend the bill will be until the effort is made.

As I said to the Committee on Appropriations when appearing before them in behalf of the amendment which I have now presented, of course if the Senate conferees do not intend to stand for the rights of the Senate as written into an amendment in this bill or any other bill, naturally the Senate can not accomplish anything; and I added that which every Senator knows, namely, that it is always possible to recede if we come to a point such as we have been told will result. I further retort to all those assertions that this is a matter which concerns the Senate alone. If I may say so without being reproached from the other end of the Capitol, this is a matter with which the other end of the Capitol has no business at all to deal.

We do not undertake to interfere with the Members of the House in fixing the salaries of those who assist them. We have never undertaken, indeed, to say to them that the salaries should be paid in given sums to any person. We have given them full liberty of action within the limit of appropriations they saw fit to fix for themselves. Therefore I contend that this is a matter which we should determine. I suppose there are no Senators here who will not admit that a competent principal secretary is worth \$4,200 a year, and if we conclude that is the salary which we should pay our principal secretaries, it is nobody else's business, and anybody who attempts to make it his business should be plainly told that he is going beyond his functions and outside of his jurisdiction.

This is a question which has been argued on the floor over and over again, and I wish to point out only one thing more, that the amendment which I have here presented, while carrying the increases named, maintains every differential now existing as among the clerks to the various committees and the secretaries to Senators.

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

Mr. MOSES. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator mentioned differentials. I should like to ask if his amendment maintains existing differentials?

Mr. MOSES. Wishing to create as little dislocation as possible in the salary scale of secretaries, wishing to produce as few heartburnings as might be in connection with the amendment that I have proposed, I have undertaken to carry on the scale of salaries exactly as it now exists. In a case where a secretary to a Senator or the principal clerk of a committee has been obtaining more salary than that paid to the average clerk of the committees or average principal secretary to Senators, I have maintained that differential.

I suppose I can discern what the Senator from Massachusetts has in mind. The Senator from Massachusetts—and he will correct me if I am not reading his mind correctly—of course, is thinking of the differential, in the first place, of \$300 which is paid to the clerk of the Finance Committee. He is probably thinking also of the small differential which exists in some of the minor places in some of the other committees. But, for example, at one period in the Sixty-seventh Congress there were two committees of the Senate whose chairmen were influential enough to have the salaries of their clerks increased. Those increases have been taken into consideration, although they were made individually and without any relation to the classification of secretaries and clerks. Those increases were taken into consideration and made the basis of the increases proposed in the bill reported by the joint committee, and also in the amendment which I have offered.

I have made no attempt to change the situation as I found it. If the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to criticize the situation as I found it and as I have continued it in my amendment, I shall not attempt to make retort to any such criticism, because I well know that there are committees of the Senate, notably the 10 so-called major committees of the Senate and some of the minor committees of the Senate, where there is an infinite drudgery to be done by the committee, and that drudgery, of course, is loaded upon the capable shoulders of the clerk of the committee. Yet even in those cases there is a dead level of salary that has continued to exist. If I were to criticize in general terms the bill which has been presented by

the joint committee, it would be that, unlike the reclassification of the civil service, no attempt has been made in any particular to grade the salaries in accordance with the measure of work going to a committee; that is to say, the work which the clerk of the committee has to do.

My opinion is that the salaries which I ask for in the amendment are none too high, considering the amount and character of services required and the difficulty which every Senator has to retain in his service competent clerks in whom he has ample confidence.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will allow me—

Mr. MOSES. I yield the floor to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. The matter of the arrangement of salaries can be based on two different systems. We can base it on the amount of public work of each committee. Notoriously there are some of the committees that have very heavy work, while others have much less. If we adopt that as the base we must make variations in the salaries. We can put all the salaries of the clerks on the basis of the work for the Senator who is chairman of the committee, and that personal work as well as public work would justify the system adopted here, though I think it is a poor system, but it would justify it in making the salaries all alike.

But what seems to me can not be justified is taking out of this long list one committee and making that one clerk an exception. No doubt there is a great deal of committee work to be done by that committee and no doubt a most competent man is doing the work, but he is no more heavily worked than the clerks of many other committees, and yet it is proposed to give him \$300 more than any other committee clerk. They all ought to be on the same basis; that is, as to their value to the Senator who is chairman of the committee, or on the general basis of an equality of value to all Senators in the work of the clerk for him as chairman of the committee. But I do not think there is anything that can justify paying one committee clerk more than another if we adopt the uniform payment plan for all committees alike, as is proposed to be adopted here.

Now there is one other point which was suggested to my mind by what the Senator from New Hampshire said, and that is having the House fix the salaries for Senate employees. I do not think there is any defense whatever for that. We do not interfere and we never have interfered, of course, with the House appropriations for their own service and expense of administration, and we ought not to do it. When they send a bill here and tell us we can not make any amendments to it at all, the bill having been made in the House, I would much rather see the bill fail than to submit to that kind of a proposition. It seems to me intolerable that we can not be allowed to fix the pay, great or small, graded or ungraded, for our own employees, and that is what is proposed here, that we must not touch the bill because the House has already made it. To that I object as strongly as it is possible for words to do it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. We have to meet the situation as it is. We can amend the bill as much as we please, but what is going to become of it? What will become of it if we go to amending it? This matter was settled by a joint committee to which the matter was referred in recess. We had a meeting with members of the committee representing the House of Representatives, a committee appointed by that body to meet with us, and we did the best we could. We may have made some mistakes, but if we did they can be hereafter corrected by another bill. But so far as this bill is concerned it is the result of the joint action of a committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Let us amend it if we want to and let us send it back—

Mr. LODGE. That is all I ask.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us send it back to the House of Representatives and let it die. That is the condition that confronts us. We can do as we please.

Mr. MOSES. Of course it would die if the Senate conferees do not vote for it in conference.

Mr. KING. It ought to die anyhow.

Mr. OVERMAN. We will fight for it. We are going to give each clerk \$240 bonus in addition to the salary. We increase the salaries 5 per cent in that way. We must look at the facts as they confront us.

Mr. LODGE. I am not quarreling with the amount.

Mr. OVERMAN. The House of Representatives voted it down because the Senate was getting so much more money than the House that the Members of the House were jealous and voted it down.

Mr. LODGE. I believe I have the floor, but I am not sure.

Mr. OVERMAN. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I did not yield the floor.

Mr. OVERMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. LODGE. I only wanted to finish what I had undertaken to say. I know it was the work of a joint committee. The work of a joint committee does not bind the two Houses any more than the work of any other committee does. They are the creation of the two Houses. They bring in a report applying to salaries. The House makes its own salaries and we have not interfered with those salaries, but we are told that we must not amend the bill so far as our salaries are concerned, otherwise it will be lost.

Mr. WARREN. I beg the Senator's pardon—I have not said that.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say the Senator from Wyoming had said it.

Mr. WARREN. I do not know of anybody who has said it.

Mr. LODGE. It has been stated to me repeatedly, though not on the floor. That is the principle to which I object. If the House chooses to make changes in the report of the joint committee in the course of their own administration, nothing would induce me to vote against the bill for that reason. It is their right to say what their clerks and their officers shall have, and I think we have a like right. They do not undertake to fix salaries for us in the annual appropriation bills. They are just as anxious to pass the bill as we are. But I do not notice that they ever say a bill can not pass if we make a change. They expect us to make amendments. I think it is a wrong relation between the two Houses. I think we ought to have it understood that we do not interfere with their expenditures and we do not wish to have them interfere with ours. Let each House settle for itself its own expenditures. I yield the floor.

Mr. OVERMAN. Everybody knows that we can amend the bill and everybody appreciates the fact that if we do amend it the conferees, answering the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], will stand for the amendment so far as they can.

We, as Senators, get about \$3,000 more than each Member of the House for clerk hire, and the Members of the House of course may demand that they get as much as Members of the Senate. Members of the House only get \$4,000 for clerk hire and that is the reason why they voted down overwhelmingly the proposed increase. It was called up again and Mr. MADDEN got mad because they wanted to amend it. He said the bill had to pass as it was, and I did not blame him. The joint committee of the House and Senate got together and prepared the bill. We tried to do justice to everybody. We tried to increase everybody's salary, giving a bonus in addition to the 5 per cent.

Where are we going to end up with these great expenses? Are we going to give this clerk \$4,300 and that clerk \$3,500 and the other clerk \$5,000 and some other clerk \$8,000? Where will it all end if we undertake to do that?

We are going behind now by reason of the great expenditures incurred in conducting the Government. We ought to economize if we can. I think we have done very well by our clerks in the pending bill, and I hope it will pass just as it has been reported from the special committee. It is not that we can not amend the bill, for we can amend it and everybody knows it; there is no use to tell us that we can not do so. So if the Senate wishes to amend the bill, let us do it, and we shall try to retain the amendments in conference.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I can speak only for my own office, but I am very conscious of the fact that it would be very difficult for me to operate my office without the very efficient secretary who is there engaged. I received on yesterday 2,500 telegrams from people south of Fourteenth Street in New York City who did not want any bonus for the soldiers. My office has an enormous correspondence. I am here to say that my secretary, by reason of his business capacity, could earn \$12,000 or \$15,000 a year in private employ. I think that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] is a very reasonable one, and that we ought to provide for this increase in the salaries of our employees.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, we all realize that the work here is growing heavier and heavier as time goes on, but we also realize that it is necessary that we shall economize; that we shall stop spending so much money. There is no one here who has a higher regard for those who serve as our secretaries than have I. In order to fill such a position a person must have education, experience, and possess all-around, first-class ability. I do not know of any other place that is harder to fill than is the position of secretary to a Senator; that is, if it be filled efficiently, and as Senators have a right to expect it shall be filled.

I feel, however, Mr. President, that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] should not have been offered, and that it ought not to be adopted. We are doing by our force of clerks as well as the condition of the country will permit. I feel it would be a great mistake now favorably to consider the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. I am satisfied that too many clerks are employed in connection with some of our Senate committees, and those might be dispensed with. Under the conditions in which the people are now we should show to the country that we have their interest at heart, and also that we are not here to legislate for ourselves and for our own affairs alone, but that we are here to legislate for the people all over the country.

When we are reminded that many people are out of employment, that mills are being shut down daily, that people are walking the streets, it is no time to have the newspapers carry the information that we have legislated to increase salaries to any such extent as is proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire. I therefore trust, Mr. President, that the amendment may be defeated.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I have not the least interest in what has been said about the action of the Members of the House in regard to this bill; it does not concern me at all; but I have been deeply impressed by what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Overman] has said, and I believe it is true. We have had a committee which has had this matter under consideration for weeks and weeks. It is a very delicate matter properly to arrange all of these different salaries and to make the proper discrimination, if there be discrimination, as to the pay of the clerks of the different committees.

I have employed office help for 40 years, and I think now I have as efficient office help as can be found in the city of Washington. I realize that what I now shall say will probably incur the enmity of every person who is engaged in office work in the Senate, in the House, and office buildings; but I am frank to say that every position occupied by our employees can be filled in 24 hours by somebody who is just as efficient as those we now have and on the present salary.

Most of the young ladies who are there engaged are taken from the different States; they have come from schools, commercial colleges, and from different occupations. They are here because they get higher salaries here than they could obtain elsewhere, and conditions are more favorable to their happiness here than they would be in any other place in the world. I believe we are paying our clerks amply, indeed highly, that we are paying them more wages than are paid in almost any commercial industry in the land.

It seems to me that, although we may not be interested in what the House may do, we ought to be interested in the taxpayers of this country and how they feel about this matter. Everybody comes to Congress except the taxpayers. We are increasing salaries; we are creating bureaus; we are building up departments; we are increasing the salary list all the time. When I came here there were about 60,000 persons in the employ of the Government; then the number went up to 128,000; and we have been trying to get it reduced, but with very little result.

I am in entire agreement with the Senator from North Carolina, who has had this matter under consideration. I believe that the salaries as decided upon in the report of the chairman of the committee are about what they ought to be; that they are sufficiently high; and I, too, am opposed to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Fernald] has turned the attention of the Senate in the right direction so far as concerns what we as the servants of the people ought to do. The people are demanding that expenses be reduced, and we are being commanded to lower them.

Since the beginning of the World War we have raised the salaries of our employees several times, and now in this instance we propose to raise the salaries of the clerks of Senators twenty-odd per cent. There are no employees either in the House of Representatives or in the District of Columbia or out through the country at large who have received such a percentage of increase as a whole.

I agree with the Senator from Maine when he says that if these employees, men and women both, should vacate their places plenty of others could be found who would take them; in fact, most of us have requests from time to time to find employment for others here in Washington at rates of compensation which are lower than we are paying.

The Senator from New Hampshire in his eloquent endeavor to raise the salaries raised seems to me has been a little gratuitous in his aspersions as to what is assured and what is going to be demanded. I do not know to whom he refers. Possibly he may have referred to me. I shall not state that the bill can not pass if amended, but I say that I believe it would be unfortunate if we should undertake to amend it, because I think we will find ourselves in a better position on the other side if we do not do so. I am but the creature of the Senate, and the Senate, of course, may do what it chooses; but to increase the salary of our first clerks some 75 or 80 per cent I think would be an outrage, so far as that is concerned, when we consider what is paid to junior clerks, also what is paid to department clerks.

I know how ungracious it is for me to stand here and speak about keeping salaries down or to be enlisted against a greater increase of salaries in the Senate for all of our employees. I know how popular it is for Senators to appeal in behalf of their clerks and others for greater compensation for them. Probably such action gives them great personal credit, but I assume that the responsibility of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is to try to consider these questions coolly and do the best he can to help make what may be considered reasonable provision for the employees of Congress.

Now, as to the variations to which the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Massachusetts have alluded. The Senator from New Hampshire says that he bases his amendment upon this bill, and yet he says this bill is absolutely wrong. If the Senate thinks it best to undertake to amend the bill by the various proposals which will be made by Senators on the floor, of course it will do so. I simply wish, as my own thought, to say that I think the best course to pursue would be to take the bill as a whole, and then later to increase any salaries which may be considered too low and to provide for any defects, if any there be, in the bill.

As to the clerks of the major committees, I have always been in favor of their having greater compensation, but I have not been able to convince others that that should be done. For instance, the last time we raised the salaries of our employees the increase was applied to the clerk of every Senator alike, barring, I think, the clerks of two committees.

With reference to the allusion to the higher-salaried clerks, I have nothing to say as to the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, for that is a matter regarding which the Senate can do as it chooses.

As to the clerk of the Finance Committee, the salary in that case was adjusted as it was because on the House side similar compensation is provided for the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means, and it seemed but natural that the compensation of the clerk of the Senate Committee on Finance should be the same as that of the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means, for both committees consider the great tariff and revenue bills of all kinds. I may be wrong, but I myself think that I would rather increase the salaries of other clerks than to reduce the amount provided for the clerks of those two committees, respectively.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jones of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. LODGE. If the compensation of the clerk of the Finance Committee is based on the amount paid to the clerk of the Ways and Means Committee in the House, there is no such basis of comparison in connection with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has not the same work to perform as that which comes to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. For instance, the House committee has no treaties to deal with.

Mr. WARREN. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. So it seems to me that to take the House committees as our standard would be more misleading than to take simply the work of each committee.

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator knows, the House committee has perhaps a little over half of the work which is imposed on the Senate committee; but that has nothing to do with it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. The same observation as that made by the Senator from Massachusetts would apply to the Commerce Committee, for instance, of the Senate. In the House there are committees on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Rivers and Harbors, and Flood Control, which have jurisdiction of subjects matter which in the Senate are dealt with by one committee, namely, the Commerce Committee. So that we can not very well gauge the work of the committees of the Senate by the work of the committees of the House.

Mr. WARREN. They have not been so gauged, and I spoke only of the one committee, because the clerks of the other committees on the House side are paid a less compensation than the clerks of the Senate committees.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. For instance, if the Senator from Florida will allow me, admittedly the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House does not have any such amount of work as the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but the clerk of the House committee does not get as high a salary as is allowed to the clerk of the Senate committee.

Mr. LODGE. I used that example, not on account of existing salaries, but to indicate that to take the House committees for our standard and fix the salaries of Senate committee employees on that basis seems to me to be misleading.

Mr. WARREN. I have denied twice that we have taken such a standard, and I will deny it again.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the Senator's pardon. He said that the reason the clerk of the Finance Committee was given a higher salary than the clerk of any other committee of the Senate was because the clerk of the House Committee on Ways and Means was given such a salary.

Mr. WARREN. That is one committee.

Mr. LODGE. That is taking the House standard, is it not?

Mr. WARREN. It is not taking the standard of the House committees generally; no.

Mr. LODGE. It is taking the standard of the one House committee, and I merely wanted to point out that to do so is misleading.

Mr. WARREN. I do not care to indulge in further remarks now, and I am perfectly willing that the vote should be had on the amendment.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I desire to submit a point of order against the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] on the ground that it is not reported by a standing committee and is to increase an appropriation without an estimate. The point of order is made under Rule XVI, which, in part, is as follows:

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law or treaty stipulation or act or resolution—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that he does not think this is a general appropriation bill, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise principally for the purpose of expressing my dissent from the proposition announced by the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] and New Hampshire [Mr. Moses]. Both have challenged the right of the House to have anything to say concerning expenditures made by the Senate, or resulting from actions of the Senate, in so far as they relate to the salaries and employees of the Senate. In effect their position is that the Senate, in dealing with its own employees, is independent of the House; and that Congress, as defined by the Constitution, means only the Senate when legislation is sought affecting employees and officers of the Senate. Conversely, their position is that the Senate can have no voice in expenditures made by the House relating to its officers and employees. This position, Mr. President, I regard as unsound from every point of view.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator no doubt is about to say, and say very truthfully, that every appropriation bill, every dollar that is expended, has to be voted on by both House and Senate. It is true that we have a contingent fund, and we can use it as we please; but that fund has to come, in the first place, from the joint vote and support of both Houses.

Mr. KING. The Senator has anticipated me. I was about to observe that no money can be lawfully taken from the

Treasury of the United States, except as a result of an appropriation made by Congress. Both the House and the Senate must concur, and their action must meet with the approval of the President of the United States. Both the House and the Senate are guardians, or should be, of the interests of the public. Each Member of the Senate and the House has a responsibility for every dollar taken from the Public Treasury. Both the House and the Senate are responsible for appropriations and neither branch can take refuge for an extravagant or illegal item carried in an appropriation bill, behind the proposition that the responsibility for it rests exclusively upon one branch of the legislative department. If the Senate arranges to pay its employees excessive or extravagant salaries or compensation, I submit the House may not escape condemnation by perfunctorily assenting to the same upon the pretext that the Senate alone is concerned in the matter; nor can the Senate escape criticism if it approves of unjust and improper items of expenditure incurred by the House in the payment of its employees and officials. I insist, Mr. President, that the House has a right to scrutinize items of appropriation which the Senate desires made for its contingent expenses or to meet the salaries of its employees, and I repeat that it is the duty of the Senate to examine the measures reported by the House which carry appropriations for House employees.

When the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] states that "it is no business" of the House what the Senate pays its employees, I respectfully submit that the position is not only unsound but it contravenes organic law and subjects the Senate to merited criticism. It seems to me that the position will be regarded as arrogant, and that it does not recognize the proper relations between the legislative branches of the Government.

May I say, Mr. President, that, in my opinion, too little attention is paid by Congress to appropriation bills, and the people are justly complaining of the extravagant appropriations which have characterized this as well as preceding Congresses, and which have added to the intolerable burdens of taxation from which the people are suffering. I have been amazed at the indifference of both branches of Congress to the increasing appropriations and the expanding powers of the Federal Government. Seldom is any appropriation challenged and our efforts seem to be to increase appropriations. The spirit of thrift and economy and retrenchment certainly does not rest upon the legislative branch of the Government, and Congress becomes a contributor to the tribulations and hardships which are visiting our country and carrying despair to the hearts of millions of the farmers of our land.

I have recently felt that the strength of Mr. Coolidge arises largely from the belief which the people have that he is an exponent of economy in government and is opposing extravagant appropriations emanating from the House and the Senate. May I add in parenthesis, that Mr. Coolidge does have great strength among the people, and if Democrats do not realize it now, they will be awakened from their dreams sooner or later. I have not time to analyze the facts to show whether there is foundation for the belief which the people entertain respecting Mr. Coolidge. In my opinion, his efforts in behalf of retrenchment and economy and efficiency in the public service have been greatly exaggerated by the press, and do not afford foundation for the belief of those to whom I have referred.

Mr. President, I regret that so few voices have been lifted upon either side of the aisle this session in favor of economy and in opposition to appropriation bills.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I always appreciate the pungent and scholarly remarks of my friend from Utah, and he is usually correct. The only place, however, where President Coolidge has manifested any desire to economize is to shut off a few pensions of old Civil War veterans and Indian war veterans and to shut off insurance policies for the soldiers of the Great War. Name any other place where economy has been talked about and I surrender.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I observed a moment ago that I would not stop to analyze the claims made for Mr. Coolidge or the basis for the belief of the people. That I shall do later. I was deploring that so little had been said or done in the Senate to lighten the burdens of taxation by reducing the expenses of the Government and excising from appropriation bills hundreds of millions of dollars which I feel the situation does not call for. My able friend from Arizona is a skilled legislator and one of the most valuable men in public life,

but I do not now recall hearing his eloquent voice at this session in opposition to appropriation bills. I know, of course, that he does stand for economy, and will, at the appropriate time, lift his voice against extravagant appropriations.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me? I am going to vote against the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses].

Mr. KING. I thought the Senator would.

Mr. ASHURST. I believe in fair pay to secretaries and to clerks, but I believe that the arrangement that the committee has brought in is equitable and fair, and I am going to vote against this proposed increase. So I hope that upon my first experience of this kind the Senator will not strike me in the face as I come into the temple of reform. I am proposing now to vote against the increase, and yet I am rather rebuked by the very able Senator. That is the welcome I get when I start out to vote for decreases of appropriations.

Mr. KING. Well, Mr. President, I would not now have the right to smite my friend from Arizona. My ineffective efforts do not warrant me in criticizing him. However, may I say to the Senator with some levity, "So long as the lamp holds out to burn" the handsomest and ablest sinner may return, and I welcome him into the ranks of those who are trying to reduce the expenses of the Government.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not include me in his statement that no voice has been raised on this side of the Chamber for reform and economy. I tried here to save \$4,000,000 to the taxpayers and the Senate voted it in overwhelmingly. It went to the House and, of course, was knocked out. I refer to the Customs Service and other things.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from North Carolina has done as a member of the Appropriations Committee in keeping down appropriations, and regret that he has not received stronger support. But I was about to state that whatever efforts have been made by Mr. Coolidge to limit expenditures they have evoked but little, if any, support from Republicans. The Republican Party, true to its past record, now disregards, as it always has disregarded, the admonitions of wise and courageous men, whether within or outside of its ranks. It came to power more than three years ago upon the false plea that it stood for economy and would conduct the business of the Government along sane, rational, and economical lines. It has utterly failed to keep its promises. Extravagance and waste have attended its administration, and the evidences of maladministration and corruption have shocked the Nation.

If Mr. Coolidge were to cry aloud for retrenchment, few sympathetic voices would be heard upon the other side of the aisle. The Republican Party has control of Congress and all branches and departments of the Government. It could have projected wise and salutary legislation and inaugurated reform measures and policies which would have resulted in economies. It has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

We will have another appropriation bill before us within the next day or two, which will add from sixty to eighty millions of dollars annually to the tax burdens of the people. This bill deals only with increases in salaries. Congress is more concerned in creating bureaus and departments and executive agencies and increasing salaries than it is in promoting the welfare of the people and dealing with vital problems relating to agriculture and domestic and foreign affairs.

Mr. President, if the Democrats desire to win the next election—and they can, and I believe will win—they could have no better slogan than economy, retrenchment, reform in governmental affairs, and a reduction in the tax burdens of the people. When the farmers of the United States are earning a mere pittance, perhaps averaging less than \$500 per annum, and they behold what is paid to employees of the Federal, State, and municipal governments, and when they feel the grinding heel of poverty, they can not be other than resentful toward their Government and would be justified in demanding the adoption of such measures as would relieve them from the crushing burdens under which they rest.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party here should stand for economy and should fight the extravagant appropriations which daily pass this body. But little help will be received from Republicans. I hope there will be unanimity upon the part of the minority in opposing measures which add so greatly to the sufferings of the people.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated.

The reading clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 24, strike out "\$3,300" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,600."

On page 3, lines 1 to 23, both inclusive, strike out "\$3,300" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,600."

On page 3, line 24, strike out "\$3,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,900."

On page 4, lines 4 to 24, both inclusive, strike out "\$3,300" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,600."

On page 5, lines 1 to 22, both inclusive, strike out "\$3,300" wherever appearing therein and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,600."

On page 6, line 4, strike out "\$3,300" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,600."

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly.

Mr. MOSES. This is a uniform change of \$600, is it, in the amendment which I have offered?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; it makes the compensation \$3,600 for the first clerk instead of \$3,300.

Mr. MOSES. And it is offered as a substitute for my amendment?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. MOSES. I accept it as such, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire accepts the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am not going into the question of what the House has to say about employees of the Senate, or what the conference committee will do. I believe that the Senators on the conference committee will do their very best to carry out what the Senate votes for. I am going to discuss only the merits of this question.

The private secretaries to Senators have more work to do than the secretaries to the governors of States. The average salary of the secretaries to governors of the States of the Union is more than \$4,000. This amendment provides for a salary of \$3,600. Senators' secretaries have to spend large sums in going to and returning from their homes with their families in the holidays and in the vacation—in my State from \$250 to \$300—and that is deducted from their salaries.

I know of no men in the Government employ in Washington who do the secretarial work they do and get less than \$3,600. I think we ought to increase this salary to at least that amount. It is unjust to pay them less than others receiving this salary for similar work.

I am not so fortunate as some of the other Senators, who can better afford to pay for extra clerical help out of their own resources. I have to do that and I am not able to do it. If we lose our efficient secretaries, valuable men that they are, or if the salaries are put at so low a point that we can not hold those men, it will make the work of Senators harder. It is utterly impossible for a Senator to do in person all the departmental work and the other work that is asked of him. I want this salary to be more, because I want my secretary to give service to the people of my State, help look after the many claims of soldiers, and do many other things that require ability, character, and loyalty which it is impossible for a Senator to do and keep up with his committee and other work of the Senate. If the salary is so low that we can not hire efficient men, the people of the States—the soldiers, farmers, laborers, and business people—are going to suffer, and not the Senators. For that reason I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I think I should cut a poor figure to stand up here and argue against an increase of salary for a secretary or clerk to a Senator. If I may be pardoned for a personal reference, my secretary is a man of family and four children, and the salary heretofore has been insufficient.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield gladly.

Mr. HARRIS. What does it cost the Senator's secretary to go home and come back here?

Mr. ASHURST. A vast amount.

Mr. HARRIS. It means several hundred dollars out of his salary.

Mr. ASHURST. The salary has been heretofore, and is now, I think, \$2,740. Under the pending bill a moderate and yet, I think, a substantial increase is proposed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the present salary is \$2,500. He gets \$2,740 by reason of the bonus. The bonus is done away with now; and therefore, unless this bill is passed, he will get only \$2,500.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes. Here is a substantial increase that I favor and for which I would vote; and I hope it will not be

construed that my voting against the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire means that I want to begin cheeseparing with the salary of a secretary or a clerk. In fact, Mr. President, they are the last upon whom I should want to apply the knife of retrenchment.

It so happens, however, that we are confronted with a practical difficulty. Here is an increase, and it is a substantial one and I think a just one. If we amend this bill, it is my opinion that we may lose the bill.

Mr. President, I had in mind the proposing of an amendment on page 6 of this bill. Take, for instance, the upholsterer and locksmith, the cabinetmaker, and the carpenters—they get, respectively, \$147 a month, \$126 a month, and \$116 a month. They make these desks. They upholster these chairs. There is not one in the carpenter shop but that could go out and get his \$10 a day in private employment. They are men of the highest type of efficiency, and I think their compensation ought to be increased; and I would take pleasure in proposing the amendment now, but I am of opinion that if we amend this bill we will run the risk of losing what it does contain.

Legislation is a compromise; legislation is subject to many exigencies which in a practical way we can not overcome. Therefore I will withhold the proposed amendment, which I intended to offer, which would give the upholsterers and the cabinetmakers and the carpenters increases. I call upon every Senator here to witness that these carpenters and these upholsterers who take care of these desks and who make a great amount of furniture for the Senate are underpaid. But rather than run the risk of losing this bill I withhold the amendment. That is the only thing that keeps me now from voting for the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire—the practical difficulty in the way.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia; the secretaries must go home; they must pay their own railroad fare; they get no mileage, and it is a hardship—a great hardship, especially if they have families. But I fear, I repeat, we will run a risk of losing the substantial increases the bill grants if we amend it.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. President, it frequently happens that a bill is passed without a roll call. Thinking perhaps that may be the case with this bill, I desire to say just a word.

I am not going to make a plea for economy. That would take some time, and serve no good purposes here. I realize quite well that the Senate talks economy, and yet at every opportunity increases the expenditures of the Government.

The people of the country are burdened with high taxes. Pleas are coming from every section for a reduction of taxes, for relief from heavy burdens. We answer the letters, the telegrams, the personal pleas, and pledge ourselves constantly to an effort to reduce taxes, and yet, as I said, we are constantly increasing those burdens. Hardly a day passes but that the tax burden grows heavier.

I realize quite well that there are some cases where an increase of salary should be granted, but I believe firmly that we are making a mistake with regard to most of these matters. As I said, I do not expect to make a speech on economy, but I simply rose to announce my position, and to put myself on record on this proposition.

I do not believe there is any justification for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, nor do I believe there is any justification for many of the increases contained in this bill. For these reasons I expect to vote both against the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire and against the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]—as modified by the proposal of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. WARREN. Which I hope, Mr. President, may not be agreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the vote just taken dispose of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does. The Senator from New Hampshire accepted the modification.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he is thoroughly convinced that the adoption of one amendment having to do with the second assistant in the document room would actually threaten the life of this bill? Would the House be disposed to refuse to concur in an amendment of that sort, to take care of a situation which is notorious, and which affects our document room?

I will accept the advice of the Senator from Wyoming or the Senator from Utah, but I want it given in public. Here is a situation which can not be defended. I want that man classified as he was formerly and as he should be to-day.

Mr. WARREN. I do not understand that the man's salary has been reduced.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The place was abolished in 1921. I think perhaps the Senator fails to understand some of the details of it. The place of assistant superintendent was established in 1906.

Mr. WARREN. None of these places were established by law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just as this bill establishes positions and salaries.

Mr. WARREN. For the time being.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; for the time being. The next Congress can repeal this whole thing if it wants to, but it becomes the basic law regulating the salaries of the employees in the House and Senate.

In 1906 the position of assistant superintendent in our document room was established, a man was appointed, and he went to work. In 1921, in the drive for economy, the position was abolished by being unmentioned in the legislative act of 1921. Instantly the document room fell into such confusion and became so far behind in its work that the Secretary of the Senate had to secure authority to employ a man on the contingent roll and send him to the document room to do this work. His salary was only \$1,200, and the same man who had been doing the work before volunteered to continue. Since that time the Secretary of the Senate has secured an increase of pay for that man of \$300. He is now getting \$1,500, plus the bonus.

Mr. KING. Why should they not just change him around and make him first assistant if he is so invaluable?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The place of first assistant is filled, and that man is working hard. This man is doing the work of a second assistant; has done it right along, and the Secretary of the Senate tells me that we can not get along without him. Why not have him classified as such, as he was formerly? I have not found a Senator but who says it ought to be done, except that the House of Representatives may defeat this measure because, forsooth, the Senate proceeds to name a second assistant in its own document room.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is going entirely too far.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the question I ask. That is why I have been deterred from offering the amendment. I have not offered it yet.

Mr. WARREN. I have said to the Senate, and I will say it again, that in five or six days we shall have the appropriation bill here, and this matter and any other thing of the kind can be fixed. If the Senator wishes to offer his amendment now, as I said before, it is with the Senate; it is not with me.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I call attention to the fact that the bill carries for the document room a superintendent at \$3,500; first assistant, \$2,880; two clerks, at \$1,770 each; and a skilled laborer, at \$1,520; total, \$11,440. That is carried in this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is one less than was provided for years and years, prior to 1921. This provides for five employees altogether. Formerly there were six, and it is notorious that the document room does not serve Senators to-day as promptly as they should be served.

Mr. FLETCHER. This raises the present cost by \$400. The present cost is \$11,040, and this makes it \$11,440.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The present cost?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is \$11,040.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For the document room; yes. There are only four men actually working there, of whom one is this man, who is not carried in this bill. The two clerks do not work there. They are shifted off somewhere else at somebody's earnest request.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator should not hold us responsible for that. The Secretary has immediate charge of those. I do not know why he should detail them somewhere else, but if he does there is no reason why an authorization bill should be changed on that account.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not asking for it on that account, and the Senator knows that. The Senator leaves it to the Senate to decide whether this bill will be killed if an amendment is offered?

Mr. WARREN. I make no such assertion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator left it to the Senate to be decided. That was the assertion the Senator made.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is not justified, and I think it should be resented.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it the opinion of the Senator from North Carolina that the House would reject this whole thing?

Mr. OVERMAN. After considering the whole matter as it exists there, what was said by Mr. MADDEN on the floor, and what was done with the bill, I believe we can not get it up again in the House of Representatives if we amend it here.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now I have a direct answer, and I shall not offer the amendment; but my efforts to cure this situation will not cease from now on.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will help the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They will be made when every appropriation comes up here containing items for the support of the legislative employees. They will be made whenever the contingent fund of the Senate is under discussion. This thing ought to be fixed. There is no defense for it in its present situation.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will help the Senator.

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

POSTMASTERS AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I desire to make a motion, but before doing so I want to make just a very brief statement. I am going to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1898, which is a bill prepared by the joint committee of the Senate and the House to readjust the compensation of postmasters and reclassify and readjust the salaries and compensation of employees in the Postal Service. The bill affects 300,000 employees in the postal department in every State in the Union. I am very anxious that the Senate shall give it consideration. I understand, however, that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] desires to speak at 2 o'clock on the results of the inquiry of the special committee of which he was chairman, so that I will not attempt to discuss the bill, giving way to him.

I move now that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1898, to readjust the compensation of postmasters and reclassify and readjust the salaries and compensation of employees of the Postal Service.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state his inquiry.

Mr. KING. Is it permissible under the rules to offer as a substitute for that bill some other bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not. If the Senate votes down the motion to take up Senate bill 1898, of course a motion to take up another bill would be in order.

Mr. KING. It is debatable, I presume?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not until 2 o'clock. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading clerk will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Adams | Edwards | Jones, Wash. | Robinson |
| Ashurst | Ernst | Kendrick | Sheppard |
| Ball | Fernald | King | Shipstead |
| Bayard | Ferris | Ladd | Smith |
| Borah | Fletcher | Lodge | Stanfield |
| Brandegee | Fraser | McNary | Stephens |
| Brookhart | George | Mayfield | Sterling |
| Broussard | Gerry | Moss | Swanson |
| Bruce | Glass | Neely | Trammell |
| Cameron | Gooding | Norbeck | Underwood |
| Capper | Hale | Norris | Wadsworth |
| Caraway | Harrel | Oddie | Walsh, Mass. |
| Colt | Harris | Overman | Walsh, Mont. |
| Copeland | Heflin | Phipps | Warren |
| Dale | Howell | Pittman | Weller |
| Dial | Johnson, Calif. | Ralston | Wheeler |
| Edge | Johnson, Minn. | Ransdell | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] to proceed to the consideration of House bill 1898.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

CHILD LABOR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, just prior to the close of the business of the Senate on yesterday I indicated a purpose to bring before the Senate for consideration Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, providing for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution in relation to child labor, reported to the Senate on April 15 last. On April 28 there came to us from the House, House Joint Resolution 184, identical in language, dealing with the same subject. I am desirous of

having speedy consideration by the Senate of one or the other of the joint resolutions, but some Senators who are opposed to the resolution have asked that its consideration be deferred. I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, May 27, one week from to-day, at the close of the routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 184.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. EDGE. If the bill which I am seeking to make the unfinished business shall be made the unfinished business, then if the request made by the Senator from Montana is granted, would that displace the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not until the time fixed in the Senator's request.

Mr. EDGE. After the time is reached, if the measure suggested by the Senator from Montana be taken up, would the unfinished business only be temporarily laid aside or would it lose its place permanently?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The unfinished business would be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. LODGE. The time asked for by the Senator from Montana would not possibly interfere with the bill of the Senator from New Jersey that it is now proposed to have taken up.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should not think so.

Mr. LODGE. I think we shall finish the postmasters' bill before that time. I mean it is quite safe so far as the Senator is concerned.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, we may have appropriation bills of importance before us at that time, or we may have before us farm-relief legislation which is of great importance. I think we had better wait until a later period before we take up the child-labor question, and I am therefore constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah objects.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As objection is made, I shall seize the first opportunity that presents itself to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House joint resolution to which I have referred. I fixed the day which I did for the accommodation of Senators who had some objections to urge to it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let me state in connection with the request of the Senator from Montana that there are absent now two Senators who want to be present when the joint resolution is taken up and who will return before the date he has mentioned. I myself would be glad to see an arrangement perfected for the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In view of the objection made I give notice that, upon the conclusion of the consideration of the bill now about to be made the unfinished business, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 184.

ALIEN PROPERTY TRADE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senator from Montana to the fact that I gave a similar notice as to one of the farm-relief measures pending here that ought to be taken up, in my judgment, before we keep on increasing a lot more salaries. When the time came and I sought recognition in competition with some one who wanted to take up a bill to increase salaries, I could not get recognition. The Senator from Montana is in the same predicament that I am in. I want to give notice that unless some arrangement is made by which the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) to create a body corporate by the name of the "Alien Property Trade Investment Corporation" is taken up I shall move to take it up, and I shall take the time of the Senate to go into it while some other bill is pending. If those who want to consider some legislation of that kind are interested, they will have an opportunity to vote for it even if they do displace something else. We ought to be considering that measure now.

Mr. BORAH. If a vote can be taken upon the motion of the Senator from Montana without debate, I am willing to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KING. No; it can not.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I suspected.

Mr. EDGE. I understand the Senator from Montana has not made a motion?

Mr. BORAH. No; he merely gave notice that he would make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is entitled to the floor, and will proceed.

SENATOR BURTON K. WHEELER

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask that the Clerk may read the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Clerk will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of five Members of the Senate be appointed by the President pro tempore to investigate and report to the Senate the facts in relation to the charges made in a certain indictment returned against Senator BURTON K. WHEELER in the United States District Court for the State of Montana.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the unpleasant task which was assigned to the committee has been finished so far as the committee's work is concerned. Reports, both majority and minority, have been filed, and I now desire, preliminary to making a motion to accept the report of the committee and discharge the committee, to discuss more in detail than we did in the report the facts which we were authorized to investigate.

The statute under which the charges against Mr. WHEELER arise was known originally as section 1782 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and has later been carried into the Criminal Code under section 113. There is in my opinion no difference in legal import between the act as it originally appeared and as it appears in the Criminal Code so far as the charges against Senator WHEELER are concerned. There was a change in phraseology, some additional officers were included, and in some respects modification was had, but the statute as it originally existed and as it was construed by the Supreme Court of the United States in my judgment covers the entire work of the committee.

Mr. STERLING. It is agreed, on my part at any rate, that the import of the two statutes, so far as the Wheeler case is concerned, is the same. There is no dispute about it.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I therefore direct particular attention to the statute as it originally appeared, because of the construction which has been placed upon it by the Supreme Court. There are two offenses designated and defined in the statute—one that of making an agreement upon the part of a Member of Congress to perform service before a department. That is one offense. The second offense is that of receiving compensation, regardless of whether any previous agreement had been made for the performance of services by a Member of Congress before a department. That was the original statute. That is the statute still.

The important feature, therefore, of the investigation appeared from the beginning to be whether Mr. WHEELER had made an agreement with anyone after his election to the Senate to perform any service before any of the departments at Washington; secondly, whether, regardless of any previous agreement, he had received any compensation for the performance of such service. I know of no way, the committee seemed to know of no way, to arrive at the facts which we were authorized and instructed to investigate other than to go directly to the question of whether or not such an agreement had been made or whether such compensation had been had.

The statute does not inhibit or prohibit a Member of Congress from performing services before a department provided he is not acting under an agreement for compensation or provided he does not receive compensation. As I stated upon yesterday, every western Senator particularly understands how almost daily he is called upon by his people at home to go before the departments, particularly the Department of the Interior, to render some service to some constituent. I take it in all probability that every western Senator would agree with me that that is a thing we are called upon to do almost every day and certainly every week that we are here. The statute does not prohibit that. It only prohibits the performing of a service under agreement or for compensation.

I digress to say that it would be a great convenience, to western Senators particularly, if the statute prohibited one from going before a department in those matters at all. It requires a vast amount of service which it is very difficult for us to decline to perform. We really owe it to our constituency to do it, and yet it is really a service outside of our duties as Senators. One who does not have the misfortune to represent a State largely, if not almost wholly, under control of the National Government can not realize the burden which it imposes upon a Senator. But daily we perform those services, and there is no inhibition, there is no impropriety in it, so far as any statute now obtaining defines our duties.

The most important figure perhaps in this controversy outside of Mr. WHEELER is Gordon Campbell. Mr. Campbell is a geologist; he has been for some time engaged in developing the oil fields in north Montana, which is known as the Kevin field.

In January and February of 1923 he was engaged in a number of lawsuits in Montana, which lawsuits were in the State courts of Montana involving a large part of his property. The testimony discloses that at least 19 or 20 lawsuits were on the docket, and at one time I believe the number was as high as 40. Mr. Campbell became dissatisfied with the legal assistance which he had and concluded that he wanted to employ other attorneys. To that end he talked with a friend of his about whom he should employ. Among others whose names were suggested was that of Mr. WHEELER, of the firm of Wheeler & Baldwin, of Butte, Mont.

The first witness called by the investigating committee with reference to this matter was a Mr. Tom Stout. I call particular attention to his testimony. Mr. Stout has been for a number of years the owner and editor of a newspaper in Montana; he was twice a Member of Congress from that State, and is a citizen of prominence and standing in the State. He knew Mr. Campbell; he was somewhat interested in a friendly way in the work of Mr. Campbell or in his interests, and they talked over the question of the employment of attorneys. Mr. Campbell asked Mr. Stout if he would see Mr. WHEELER and talk with him about taking employment. Mr. Stout went to Butte and had a talk with Mr. WHEELER.

I am going to trespass upon the time of the Senate to-day to some extent by reading the testimony. I think it absolutely essential to a proper consideration of the matter that we take the time to do so. After reading the views of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] this morning and observing the construction which he placed upon some of the testimony I do not feel like trusting myself to place a construction upon the testimony as I see it. I think it better to read it as it was given. Mr. Stout testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Are you interested in any way in the oil matters in which Mr. Campbell is interested?

Mr. STOUT. None whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. You may state the conversation which you had with him [Mr. WHEELER], as you recall it.

That was in December, 1922.

Mr. STOUT. Well, Mr. Campbell said that he desired, if possible, to employ Mr. WHEELER to represent him in some litigation that he had there in Montana, but that he did not know him. I told him that I was making a business trip to Butte in a few days and if he desired I would take the matter up with Mr. WHEELER, and he commissioned me to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any interest in the matter other than that of being acquainted with the situation of the two parties?

Mr. STOUT. None at all; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you afterwards take it up with Mr. WHEELER?

Mr. STOUT. Yes; I went to Butte, as I advised Mr. Campbell, arriving in Butte about 8.30 or 9 o'clock, I think it was. I called upon Mr. WHEELER. I do not remember whether I had previously telegraphed him or not, but at any rate he came down to his office that evening, and I met him there about 9 o'clock and we took this matter up. Do you desire me to just go ahead now, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. Before you take that matter up, what was the business—the kind of business—law business, which you were delegated to speak to Mr. WHEELER about?

Mr. STOUT. About some litigation in the Montana courts.

The CHAIRMAN. Relative to what subject matter?

Mr. STOUT. Relative particularly to, I think, an application for a receivership which had been made by some parties to have one of Mr. Campbell's companies thrown into a receivership.

At the time Mr. Campbell concluded to employ additional counsel a suit for receivership covering a large portion of his property was pending, and the matter was coming up for hearing. This was a case in which Mr. Stevenson, a former associate in interest with Mr. Campbell, was seeking to have the property placed under the control of a receiver.

The CHAIRMAN. And in what court was this coming up?

Mr. STOUT. In the district court—the State court at Great Falls, Mont.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you may state the conversation that you had with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. STOUT. Well, I advised him of Mr. Campbell's desire to retain him—his firm. We talked it over for some time. He stated finally the terms under which he would undertake the case. I told him that that was a matter that would have to be taken up with Mr. Campbell, and that I would telephone him; and during the course of that conversation Mr. WHEELER stated that, of course, he could not represent him except in the State courts there. In other words, assuming that Mr. Campbell might have some business in the public Land Department of the Government, he advised me at that time

to so advise Mr. Campbell—that he would not represent him in anything except the litigation local to Montana and in the State courts.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you afterwards communicate with Mr. Campbell?

Mr. STOUT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. By phone?

Mr. STOUT. I think I phoned Mr. Campbell that night.

Senator STERLING. Where was he at that time?

Mr. STOUT. Mr. Campbell was in Great Falls at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any further conversation with Mr. WHEELER in regard to this matter of the employment?

Mr. STOUT. I do not recall ever having talked with him again, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, Mr. WHEELER stated to you the terms under which he would be employed. I presume you mean—

Mr. STOUT. The retainer.

The CHAIRMAN. The retainer; the amount of the fee, etc.?

Mr. STOUT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who brought up the subject with reference to his employment being confined to court matters, etc.?

Mr. STOUT. Senator WHEELER himself brought that up.

The CHAIRMAN. When you spoke to Mr. Campbell over the phone in regard to the matter, did you say anything to him in regard to the terms which Mr. WHEELER had suggested with reference to the fee and the scope of his employment, etc.?

Mr. STOUT. I do not recall, Senator, that I spoke any further than with reference to the fee. I do not think that I did.

The CHAIRMAN. After you reported to Mr. Campbell in regard to this employment, I understand you to say that you never talked with either Mr. WHEELER or Mr. Campbell further in regard to it?

Mr. STOUT. No, no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You had no further interest in it?

Mr. STOUT. None whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there other attorneys talked of between Mr. Campbell and yourself?

Mr. STOUT. No; there were not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any fact connected with this matter in any way that my questions have not called out, that you think has any relevancy to this matter?

Mr. STOUT. I think not, Senator. Of course, there have been many reports, but it is all hearsay and would hardly be relevant.

At the bottom of page 5 this question is asked by Senator SWANSON:

Senator SWANSON. Did Senator WHEELER state the amount of compensation he would expect?

Mr. STOUT. Yes, sir.

Senator SWANSON. How much was it?

Mr. STOUT. It was \$10,000 a year retainer.

Senator SWANSON. And what was he to do for that \$10,000?

Mr. STOUT. His firm was to look after Mr. Campbell's litigation there in the State of Montana.

Senator SWANSON. You recall that he distinctly stated that it was to be confined to that litigation—his employment?

Mr. STOUT. It was so very distinctly stated, Senator.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stout, the statement which you have made with reference to Mr. WHEELER's raising the question of his inability to represent Mr. Campbell other than in the State courts is a very important feature of this testimony. Can you recall anything like the substance of the language which was used by Mr. WHEELER?

Mr. STOUT. No; I can not, Senator. The matter came up rather casually. We were talking about the terms of the agreement, and WHEELER said, "Of course, I can not represent him except in the State courts here"; and not being an attorney myself, the significance of it did not appeal to me until it was later explained.

Mr. President, that testimony relates to the making of the contract with Mr. WHEELER. The testimony comes from a witness who, so far as I know or as the record discloses, would have no interest in the subject matter other than the fact that he might be personally friendly to Mr. WHEELER. I assume he is friendly to Mr. WHEELER, although they were opposing candidates in the senatorial election. However, outside of that there is no relationship other than that which I have indicated.

It seemed to me at the time of the hearing, and it seems to me now, that the testimony of Mr. Stout must be disposed of and utterly disregarded, or we have the inception and making of this contract wholly disengaged and divorced from any possible dereliction of duty or of wrongdoing upon the part of Mr. WHEELER. I shall undertake to show as we proceed that the services performed, the acts under the contract, and all matters in relation thereto not only failed to contradict or impeach Mr. Stout but sustained the contract as he states it.

I wish to digress here to say, but not necessarily by way of harsh criticism, though worthy of observation, that it is a little

difficult for me to understand that in none of the criticisms lodged against Mr. WHEELER by those who have seen fit to charge him with a violation of the statute, not even in the report of the able Senator from South Dakota, is any reference whatever made to the testimony of Mr. Stout or to the testimony of any other witness who was present at any time during the making of the contract. If I understand the report of the Senator from South Dakota, he even complains that we placed Mr. Stout upon the witness stand at all.

The testimony of Mr. Glosser, who was not present when the contract was made and who states he knew nothing about it except from hearsay, and the testimony of Mr. Rhea, who was not present and knew nothing about it except from hearsay, are referred to, and discussed; but the witnesses who had knowledge of the making of the contract and who were the only ones who could give legal or competent evidence concerning it are never referred to. It is a peculiar state of affairs that requires primary and competent evidence must be put aside and appeal made to hearsay.

The next witness to whom I shall call attention is Mr. Campbell. I shall not take much time in reading his testimony, but I shall ask leave to insert in the Record excerpts from it.

Of course, Mr. President, Mr. Campbell is an interested witness. His testimony must be viewed in the light of an interested witness. He is under indictment for using the mails for fraudulent purposes, and those matters must be taken into consideration in weighing his testimony. There is another feature to it, however, which has its compensation against that fact, and that is that while Mr. Campbell is interested, and while he is under indictment, he was an exceedingly frank witness. He willingly waived immunity. He made no claim that he might incriminate himself, but stated that he was there to give the facts and all the facts and supply any documentary evidence that was in his possession. This had some weight with me in these days when there seems to be a great familiarity upon the part of a large class of people with that provision of the Constitution of the United States which enables them to claim privilege from incriminating themselves.

Mr. Campbell testifies as to these lawsuits, as to the fact that he felt that his property was being gradually taken away from him; that every time he had litigation it seemed to him, as he said, that while he felt he was in the right, the litigation wound up by giving the other party a piece of his land; and he said to Mr. Stout: "I want somebody who will fight. I want some one who will fight for me"; and finally it resulted in what I have already disclosed, Mr. Stout talking with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. Campbell says that Mr. WHEELER stated to him several times, in discussing these matters, that he must understand that he could not attend to these matters in the land department or before the Government; and let me pause here to say, Mr. President, something which seems to me rather exceptional—that in all the career of Mr. WHEELER as a lawyer in Montana it appears that he never at any time had any practice or business before the land department in Montana or the Interior Department in Washington. As an active practitioner in a State situated as Montana is with reference to her land titles and the Federal Government, undoubtedly he was many times called into a position where it would have been advantageous for him to do so; yet he eschewed the practice, as I take it from what appears, because it was not to his professional taste. If it does appear now that he appeared in the land office or before the Interior Department, it is the only instance in all his professional career in which he undertook to attend to that kind of business. In other words, throughout his professional career, when he could have done so with perfect legitimacy and without any criticism from anyone, he preferred not to take that kind of practice and eschewed it; but when it became dangerous, prohibitory, and illegal to do so, it would seem, according to the claim that is made, that he was inclined to take a chance at it.

I think it is worth remembering that it was not only by reason of the statute but by reason of his professional taste that he preferred the actual trial of cases, and it was for that kind of service and that kind of legal, professional work that Mr. Campbell employed him. Having some twenty-odd lawsuits in the State of Montana, as he said, he employed Mr. WHEELER to give his time and ability and fighting qualifications to seeing if he could preserve his property.

As to the fee of \$10,000, I do not know but some might consider that a large fee. I have heard that comment. In my opinion it was an exceedingly reasonable fee when you take into consideration the fact that all the property of Mr. Campbell was involved, more or less, that his entire holdings and his

entire work and the fruits of his years of effort were involved, and, the witnesses say, the values at that time were estimated in the millions. In view of the fact that he was to take care of all the litigation it was a reasonable compensation.

A line or two from Mr. Campbell's testimony, and I will insert the balance in the RECORD:

Senator CARAWAY. Mr. Campbell, I want to ask you a question. Did you have any understanding, either expressed or implied, for a consideration or without a consideration, under which Mr. WHEELER was to appear before any department of the Government to represent you?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, sir.

Senator CARAWAY. Mr. WHEELER had no relation at all to any matter that was pending before any governmental agency?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Absolutely not, and that was understood between us, that he should not, and he was not employed for that. He was employed to handle my suits in Montana.

The testimony preceding that is quite in detail in regard to it, and I only read those few lines as the concluding sentences in regard to his testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have a conversation with anyone relative to employing Mr. WHEELER?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. With whom?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Tom Stout.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall about the date of this conversation?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Possibly about the middle of December.

The CHAIRMAN. 1922?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This was after Mr. WHEELER had been elected Senator?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. State in a general way what the conversation was with Mr. Stout.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think Mr. Stout came to Great Falls, and we were quite friendly, and I used to talk my matters over considerably with Mr. Stout, being a friend, and I had told him, or practically he knew, about my lawyers, and how some of them had not treated me right, as I called it; so I said: "It is funny that I can not get a lawyer that will stand pat with me and will work for me and make a fight." Most of the lawyers, when I would take them in, would want to compromise with somebody and give them a lot more of my land—compromise instead of making a fight.

The CHAIRMAN. This is what you said to Mr. Stout?

Mr. CAMPBELL. To Mr. Stout. I said: "I don't know Mr. WHEELER, but it seems to me that he is a fighter, and I should like to get a lawyer that has got some fighting qualities." We talked along that line, and Mr. Stout said: "Well, I am going to Butte, and I will take it up with Mr. WHEELER," which he did.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he report to you?

Mr. CAMPBELL. He reported to me by phone that night or the next night.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have litigation pending in the State courts at that time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the nature of it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. My past associate had filed or had started a suit to call for a receiver on my company. He had instituted a suit a year before that in the Lewistown courts, and it was thrown out of court. Afterwards Mr. Wilson, my attorney, had settled with him and gave him a considerable portion of my field or part of my acreage for a complete settlement, simply to call off all litigation, so we could work.

Senator STERLING. Who was that past associate?

The CHAIRMAN. Did you, after talking over the phone with Mr. Stout, afterwards see Mr. WHEELER?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Where?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. WHEELER came down to Great Falls, in my office.

The CHAIRMAN. About what date?

Mr. CAMPBELL. About the 20th of December, I think—the latter part of December, 1922.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have a conversation with him about employing him?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where?

Mr. CAMPBELL. In my office.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this employment in writing? Did you reduce it to contract form?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think so; no, sir; I do not recall any writing; I am quite sure it was not.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, then, you had a conversation with him about employment?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. State what it was—the terms.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. WHEELER asked me the character of these suits, and, in fact, I think Mr. WHEELER had known in a general way what they were, and I told him about the suits that were coming up and what I wanted to do in starting some other suits, which we did, countersuits, and I wanted him to handle all of my litigation on these suits; and we talked the matter over from his standpoint, and he informed me that, of course, he could not do anything for me if any land matter came up. I told him that Mr. Beaulieu was attending to all our land matters; that he was employed for that purpose.

Senator STERLING. Exactly what did you mean by "land matters" there?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I had a permit, and some of our leases were in bad shape. We had to clear the title of them. There were a great many mortgages against this land and liens in different ways that had to be cleaned up.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the testimony of Mr. Beaulieu. Mr. Beaulieu is an attorney, and was located in the home town of Mr. Campbell. He has been engaged in the practice of law for some time in Montana. He is now located in Los Angeles, Calif. So far as I can see, he has no possible interest in this controversy. He might have a sympathetic interest, knowing the facts, perhaps believing in the innocence of Mr. WHEELER, but no interest which would have any bearing upon a man of any sense of right or any intellectual integrity in the coloring of his testimony. Mr. Beaulieu was the regular attorney for Mr. Campbell. He was what might be called his office attorney. He attended to his land titles and practically to the details of all his litigation. He states that all these matters passed under his supervision, no only with reference to the land-title matters, but he was also, of course, as general counsel, familiar with the litigation.

I undertake to say that it would be practically impossible for any contract to have been made, and certainly impossible for it to have been carried out, in which Mr. WHEELER's professional services included the kind of practice of which he is now accused without the general counsel being familiar with it. It would seem that he would be quite as familiar with it as incidental employees were, men who were not connected with the legal department, men who were simply in the field service. Mr. Beaulieu tells us that Mr. WHEELER had nothing to do with this part of the work for Mr. Campbell.

I read a line or two from Mr. Beaulieu, on page 44:

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the employment of Mr. WHEELER by Mr. Campbell with reference to some matters in Montana?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Well, I was not present when they made their agreement, but I do know that Mr. WHEELER did some law work for Mr. Campbell.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the nature of the business which Mr. WHEELER transacted for Mr. Campbell?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Why, he appeared as one of the attorneys in what we called the receivership case. The firm of Wheeler & Baldwin appeared in several cases in which I was also counsel in the State courts of Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the nature of those cases?

Mr. BEAULIEU. One was an attachment suit brought by L. C. Stevenson to recover some money, I believe \$14,000 or \$15,000, from Gordon Campbell Kevin Syndicate No. 1.

Another was a receivership case to have a receiver appointed for the Gordon Campbell Kevin Syndicate No. 1.

Then some of them involved private leases from landowners to the syndicate and to Mr. Campbell.

I call particular attention to that statement. The titles were not only involved to a certain extent, so far as the National Government was concerned, but there was a controversy with reference to titles as between individuals. There are two kinds of titles referred to—those in which the Government is involved and those in which there might be a conflict of interests between individuals.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator give the page from which he is reading?

Mr. BORAH. Page 45.

I read further from Mr. Beaulieu:

The CHAIRMAN. What was your particular work, or what did your professional services cover, in your employment with Mr. Campbell and your work with Mr. Campbell as attorney?

Mr. BEAULIEU. I was chief counsel. I had control of all the litigation that was handed to me by him.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have anything to do with titles?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Yes; I did. I examined probably all the titles he had, and drew the pleadings, and everything.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe you stated you were not present when the contract was made between Mr. WHEELER and Mr. Campbell?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Yes, sir; I was not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever talk with Mr. WHEELER about the nature of that contract?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Yes; I think I did; on one occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that; about the date of it?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Oh, I could not say. It was shortly after he was retained, and I believe before he went abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you state that conversation? First, I will ask you, was there anyone else present besides you and Mr. WHEELER?

Mr. BEAULIEU. I believe not.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you state that conversation?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Why, in substance it was this: I asked Mr. WHEELER what he thought about a certain Government permit—some question of law; I forget just what it was; and, to use the exact words—

Senator STERLING. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course, it is understood, I suppose, that we go a little beyond the rule that would be applied in the trial of a case in court here.

And finally, after we settled that controversy, the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. You may state what this conversation you had with Mr. WHEELER was as fully as you can.

Mr. BEAULIEU. I asked Mr. WHEELER some question with reference to a law point concerning a certain permit, and Senator WHEELER had lived in Montana so long that he used pretty strong language sometimes—plain—and he said, "I don't know a ——— thing about Government permits. I wouldn't know one of the ——— things if I saw it. Besides, I told Campbell I would not have anything to do with his Government land." That was his answer.

Mr. President, it seems singular to talk about the impressions which Mr. Glosser said he got, because he says that all he had was impressions, or to talk about the hearsay testimony of Mr. Rhea and to wholly disregard the testimony of Stout and Beaulieu, men who were in a position to know, and the duty of one of whom it was to know, who states that in the very beginning of this transaction Mr. WHEELER was careful to say:

Besides, I told Campbell I would not have anything to do with his Government land.

I say here that there is no conflict of legal evidence, so far as the making of this contract is concerned. So far as legal or competent evidence goes, I challenge anyone to show a conflict of evidence with reference to what the nature of this contract was. Every witness, interested or disinterested, who was in a position to know the facts, who helped to make the contract, or who knew of its execution, states, emphatically that Mr. WHEELER was careful to confine his employment to the State courts of Montana. In addition to that, Mr. President, Mr. Beaulieu took up these titles himself, and each permit, each lease, or other thing which brought them in contact with the National Government, Mr. Beaulieu states he attended to himself; that he took it up directly with an attorney in Washington, whose testimony I will come to in a few moments, and that Mr. WHEELER was neither counseled nor in any way consulted in regard to the matters in any way whatever. Mr. Beaulieu and Mr. WHEELER did consult and counsel with reference to all State litigation, but when Beaulieu called the permit matter to his attention Mr. WHEELER informed him he knew nothing about it, and besides, he [WHEELER] had informed Campbell he would have nothing to do with such matters. If Mr. WHEELER had considered himself employed relative to these matters, he would naturally have consulted many times with Campbell's regular attorney, and Beaulieu would have consulted with WHEELER. Now, is Beaulieu a perjurer? For what reason? Why should a reputable attorney and now no longer Campbell's ally and far removed from the State come here and swear falsely? His evidence is to me most conclusive.

I will ask to have inserted in the RECORD part of page 47 and part of page 48 of the record.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. You may state what this conversation you had with Mr. WHEELER was as fully as you can.

Mr. BEAULIEU. I asked Mr. WHEELER some question with reference to a law point concerning a certain permit, and Senator WHEELER had lived in Montana so long that he used pretty strong language sometimes—plain—and he said, "I don't know a ——— thing about Government permits. I wouldn't know one of the ——— things if I saw it. Besides, I told Campbell I would not have anything to do with his Government land." That was his answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think that is self-serving.

Senator STERLING. No; his answer is not.

Senator CARAWAY. He speaks the language of the West, does he not?

The CHAIRMAN. I object; don't you, Senator McNARY?

Senator McNARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, did you have any other conversation in regard to his employment and the performance of his duty as attorney for Mr. Campbell?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Only in that same conversation he says:

"I told Campbell that I would appear for him in the State courts out here in Montana, and that is all I would do."

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever after that assume to consult Mr. WHEELER about permits?

Mr. BEAULIEU. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever, as an associate counsel or counsel for Mr. Campbell, have any professional relationship with Mr. WHEELER thereafter with reference to any matter which was pending or to be pending before the land office in Montana or before the Interior Department here?

Mr. BEAULIEU. No, sir; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you were in close touch with Mr. Campbell's business all the time, were you not?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Yes; I was.

The CHAIRMAN. You were practically in his office, were you not; or did you have a separate office?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Well, he furnished the office. I practiced generally in addition to doing his work.

The CHAIRMAN. Were your offices together—in the same building?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You had supervision and charge and knowledge of all his legal business?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Well, I assume I did; that was, all he handed to me I took care of.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever know of Mr. WHEELER performing any legal services for Mr. Campbell in connection with any matters pending in the Land Office or in the Interior Department or before any of the departments here?

Mr. BEAULIEU. No, sir; I do not know of any matter at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Campbell employ, afterwards, an attorney here in Washington with reference to some matters—a Mr. Feely?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Yes; he did.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you communicate with Mr. Feely?

Mr. BEAULIEU. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you communicate with Mr. Feely through letter or telegram?

Mr. BEAULIEU. I wrote him several letters and telegrams.

The CHAIRMAN. That was with reference to matters pending before the department?

Mr. BEAULIEU. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. WHEELER have anything to do with that?

Mr. BEAULIEU. No, sir; not that I ever heard of.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you consult him in regard to it in any way?

Mr. BEAULIEU. No, sir; not about that. In fact, I never saw Mr. WHEELER from before he went abroad until just the other day when I came to Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of Mr. WHEELER ever performing any services for Mr. Campbell with reference to these public-land matters, or matters of any kind before the departments?

Mr. BEAULIEU. I have no knowledge of his performing any service with reference to these matters.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any knowledge of any agreement on his part to perform such services?

Mr. BEAULIEU. I have not.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the testimony of Mr. Baldwin. Mr. Baldwin is the law partner of Mr. WHEELER, and to that extent an interested party. But perhaps, while I am discussing the testimony of Mr. Beaulieu, it will be more logical to take the testimony of Mr. Feely, the attorney in Washington.

As I have stated, Mr. Beaulieu had charge of this matter of titles and permits and took up these several matters coming before the department in Washington with Mr. Feely. Mr. Feely is a practicing attorney here in Washington. He belongs to the firm of Vogelsang, Brown, Cram & Feely. He is a man of ability, and testified with clarity and candor. Their principal business seems to be that of practicing before the departments, two of the members of the firm having been at one time or other connected with the Interior Department.

I ask particular attention to the fact that all these matters which relate to the land matter passed directly from Mr. Beaulieu to Mr. Feely.

I read the following from the testimony of Mr. Feely:

The CHAIRMAN. What were the circumstances and the place and time where you met him?

Mr. FEELY. I met Mr. Campbell in March, and he was introduced by Mr. Booth. Mr. Campbell stated to me that he had matters pend-

ing before the department with reference to clearing up certain titles, and that he had heard of our firm in Montana, and he arranged with our firm through me to take care of all the matters that he had pending and in connection with which he was interested in the Kevin Sunburst field.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give the date, about?

Mr. FEELY. I can not, Senator. It was some time in March; I am quite certain about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the contract of employment in writing?

Mr. FEELY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The terms of the contract were, then, that you were to take charge of the matters concerning Mr. Campbell's interests before the department?

Mr. FEELY. That was it. Mr. Campbell told me he had several matters pending there respecting titles, and he had an attorney named Beaulieu in Great Falls who took care of matters there, and that he would refer all matters through Mr. Beaulieu to our firm, which he did.

The CHAIRMAN. With whom did you communicate in Montana as representative of Mr. Campbell?

Mr. FEELY. Mr. Beaulieu, of Great Falls, Mont., extensively.

The CHAIRMAN. By letter and by telegram?

Mr. FEELY. Oh, I imagine 50 or more telegrams passed between our firm and Mr. Beaulieu and more letters than that. We handled all those cases and were in constant correspondence with Mr. Beaulieu regarding all the matters that he referred to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you, then, take up the matters that Mr. Campbell had before the department?

Mr. FEELY. Yes; we took up all of the permits and all the applications for extensions and the various assignments of all those permits which were assigned to us by Mr. Beaulieu.

The CHAIRMAN. In your employment by Mr. Campbell, was your firm employed individually—or singly, I should say—or in connection or in association with somebody else?

Mr. FEELY. No, sir; our firm was employed as a firm here.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FEELY. But we had no connection; that is, no financial connection or social connection with Mr. Beaulieu. Mr. Beaulieu, as I understood it, was Mr. Campbell's attorney in Montana, and Mr. Campbell sent everything in to us through Mr. Beaulieu.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anyone else present when you were employed except Mr. Booth?

Mr. FEELY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you acquainted with Senator WHEELER?

Mr. FEELY. I met Senator WHEELER during the summer of 1923, and I think it was practically after we had carried out all the business that was intrusted to us by Mr. Campbell through Mr. Beaulieu. I never met Senator WHEELER until during the summer of 1923.

The CHAIRMAN. You had no acquaintance with Mr. WHEELER, no business connection with him, then, at the time that the contract was made with Mr. Campbell?

Mr. FEELY. No, sir; I never saw Senator WHEELER before, and the only thing I ever heard about Senator WHEELER was that he beat Mr. Riddick, of Montana; and that is all I ever knew about Senator WHEELER.

Senator CARAWAY. You never had any connection whatever with him in this matter of Mr. Campbell?

Mr. FEELY. No, sir; I never wrote to Senator WHEELER in connection with anything, only in the summer of 1923 after I met Senator WHEELER personally.

Senator CARAWAY. But you never consulted with him about these matters?

Mr. FEELY. No, sir.

Senator CARAWAY. He had nothing to do with them?

Mr. FEELY. No, sir; I never addressed a communication to Senator WHEELER in Montana or to Senator WHEELER's firm.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what interest did the United States have? Was there any controversy there with the United States in regard to that permit?

I ask some attention to this statement. In my opinion, if all the evidence in this case were taken against WHEELER, it would be very doubtful—I mean as construed by those who think it proves guilt—if Mr. WHEELER would be guilty under this statute at all. I read further:

Mr. FEELY. No; not in the Scott case, there was not a controversy. There was no controversy with the permittees or the assignees in any of those cases—that is, with the United States. Those permits were granted, as I stated, under the act of February 25, 1920, for compliance with the terms of the act; that is, within a certain length of time that they would place derricks, etc., upon the land, and within the first year they would go down 500 feet and the next succeeding year 2,000 feet. There was not any controversy between the United States and any of those permittees to whom I have referred. Of

course, the United States, through the Commissioner of the General Land Office, decided all questions as to who was entitled to the assignments of those various permits; but I do not consider that as a controversy between the permittee and the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. What I was going to reach is, what financial interest or what interest would the United States have in the question of whether John Doe or Richard Roe held a particular permit?

Mr. FEELY. None whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with any of these permits to which I have called your specific attention and which are mentioned in the indictment, or any other permit, what, if anything, did Mr. WHEELER have to do with you or you with Mr. WHEELER or your firm with Mr. WHEELER with reference to these matters, whatever they may have been, in which you presented the question to the department?

Mr. FEELY. Absolutely nothing.

So we have not only the contract as made by Mr. Stout and as affirmed by Mr. Campbell and stated by Mr. Beaulieu but we have that which is much stronger proof, more conclusive evidence, that in carrying out this contract Mr. WHEELER observed the declaration which he made to Stout and made to Campbell that he would have nothing to do with the presentation of these matters before the department, and the result of it was that Beaulieu took the matter up with Feely, and Mr. Feely put every single one of those controverted matters through the department, without consultation in any way with Mr. WHEELER. Neither Mr. Beaulieu in Montana nor Feely in Washington consulted or knew Mr. WHEELER in these matters before the departments. The matters passed through a wholly different channel.

I do not know how legal evidence could more thoroughly establish the fact that this was a contract outside the inhibition of the statute, and that Mr. WHEELER observed in good faith the terms of the contract as he understood it. If there was no agreement to accept payment, if there was no compensation made for the services, Mr. WHEELER had a right to do what every western Senator does every day, to make any suggestion with reference to his constituents which he thought was in their interest. I venture to say that if you will open the files of any western Senator, you will find evidence of such transactions going on from day to day. This entire matter turns upon the question of whether there was an agreement behind what he was doing, or compensation to come, and all legal and competent evidence disproved it. The testimony of interested and disinterested witnesses alike declares that no such contract as inhibited by the statute was made. You must find that Mr. Stout deliberately falsified his entire testimony. You must find that Mr. Beaulieu, a disinterested and reputable attorney at the bar, colored his testimony. You must find that Mr. Feely, a practicing attorney here in Washington, wholly disinterested, must have colored his testimony, or else you must conclude that the contract was clean, and that the parties carrying it out were clean from the beginning to the close. All legal or competent testimony must be disregarded, and all disinterested witness put aside in order to avoid the conclusion that Senator WHEELER stands clear of any wrongdoing.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. I feel impelled to call attention to the fact that this is a matter gravely affecting the integrity of one of the great executive departments of this Government. Not only does it involve the integrity of a great executive department of this Government but it involves the question, as some of us think, of attempted blackmail by that department through the forms of law. Yet when the chairman of the committee investigating the facts of this matter appears here to present the facts and to argue them we have on the other side of the Chamber not exceeding four Members, including that member of the committee who acted as prosecutor of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator excuse me for calling his attention to a word which I hardly think he is justified in using? The Senator from South Dakota does not act as prosecutor of the Senator from Montana in these proceedings. All the Senator from South Dakota was interested in was the truth, so far as it affected what I deemed the proper question in this case, and that is as to whether the grand jury were justified in finding an indictment even if we should go that far, and I object to the use of the word "prosecutor" in characterizing my connection with this proceeding.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I used the term as it has generally been used here to designate that member of the committee who has made himself especially active in seeking, apparently, to convict the Senator or person charged.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, again the Senator from Virginia misrepresents me. I am not seeking to convict the Senator from Montana. I should regret to see the Senator from Montana convicted.

Mr. GLASS. Well, I do not think you will see that. I meant the designation in no offensive sense whatsoever. I ventured to interrupt the distinguished Senator from Idaho in order to call the country's attention to the sort of proceeding we have here in a matter of this kind, as I said, gravely affecting the very integrity of one of the great executive departments of this Government, charged with undertaking to blackmail the Senate of the United States and to cause it to terminate its investigation of rascality by involving one of its own Members in a serious charge. There have been as many as four Senators on the other side of the Chamber to hear an exposition of the facts adduced by this investigation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I now call attention to the testimony of Mr. Baldwin. Mr. Baldwin is the law partner of Mr. WHEELER. Of course we must take into consideration in weighing his testimony that he is his law partner and perhaps feels an interest deeply in his welfare. But Mr. Baldwin came before the committee and brought with him all the books of the firm that had any relation to the matter under investigation. I do not want anyone who is interested in besmirching the character of Senator WHEELER to forget for a moment that Senator WHEELER and Mr. Baldwin brought everything in their possession for the purpose of uncovering it before our committee. The docket as they kept it from day to day, the registry of their transactions in the office, the record of their lawsuits, any correspondence that they had, was at the beck and call of the committee.

Mr. Baldwin appeared and no one could hear Mr. Baldwin testify without concluding that he was stating with care and caution the facts as he understood them. He stated, in corroboration of the testimony already given by other witnesses, that their firm's sole duty and obligation under the contract was to look after the litigation in Montana. They opened the records and disclosed the proceedings, the number of suits pending, what they did in the suits, the motions filed, the demurrers filed, the motions argued, the demurrers argued. It was all thrown open to the committee. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read Mr. Baldwin's testimony, but it is clear covering all points, and conclusive and in complete harmony with the facts as developed by the acts of the respective parties in carrying out the contract.

I now read from the testimony of Mr. Baldwin:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, coming back to this \$2,000 payment and contract, did that have anything to do with any matter other than the matters to which you have referred and in connection with the litigation in the State courts?

Mr. BALDWIN. Absolutely nothing. That was our retainer to care for his business in Montana in the courts for a period of one year.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, disposing for the moment of the receivership, did you bring other suits for him?

Mr. BALDWIN. We brought a number of suits, and also defended a number of suits. This record shows 19 cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Nineteen cases in which you appeared as plaintiff or defendant?

Mr. BALDWIN. For the Campbell interests; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. State generally, Mr. Baldwin, the nature of that litigation.

Mr. BALDWIN. Well, some of it was large litigation and some of it was not so large.

The CHAIRMAN. About what was the nature of the litigation? What did it have reference to?

Mr. BALDWIN. It had reference to—one case was a case for a libel involving \$100,000. There were certain publications put in circulation for the purpose, as we thought, of damaging Mr. Campbell's company and ruining his reputation and the reputation of his concerns; and for the purpose of stopping further circulation of such matter we brought an action against L. E. Stevenson, as I recall it, for \$100,000. There were suits brought against Mr. Campbell that would, if carried to a successful conclusion, put his companies out of business, and we defended in those.

There was a case brought by L. E. Stevenson against one of Mr. Campbell's companies for a number of thousand dollars—tens of thousands of dollars, I think—claimed to be due on account of percentages earned in financing one of the concerns.

There were smaller suits brought against others for the purpose of recovering amounts of money that we supposed they had abstracted improperly from the companies' funds.

There is an action pending in the district court at Shelby involving a transfer made by one of the Campbell companies to some one in Seattle. If you want the detailed information, I have the record here.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I do not think it is necessary to go into details. Mr. CAMPBELL. But that is a general statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anything pending in your office at any time relative to Mr. Campbell's affairs which required you to appear before the Interior Department or the local land offices in Montana?

Mr. BALDWIN. Absolutely nothing. I have never appeared before the Interior Department for anybody. So far as I know, the firm was never retained in any case to appear before that department.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there ever anything placed in your office to be looked after which would lead you to the land office either in Montana or in the Interior Department here?

Mr. BALDWIN. Absolutely nothing. Mr. Campbell and his companies had an attorney named Beaulieu who took care of all their records and titles. And when it did appear to be necessary—now, this again is hearsay with me; it was not placed before me—when it became necessary for Mr. Campbell to secure counsel before the Interior Department, he employed attorneys here in Washington, D. C. We were not consulted at all about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your firm ever communicate with the lawyer here in Washington with reference to these matters—with Mr. Feely?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly not. I do not think there was any correspondence ever had between Mr. Feely and our office. I have searched the files—or, rather, run through the files—and I never saw a letter of that kind.

Here I call attention to some letters which passed between Mr. WHEELER and Mr. Campbell. These letters are photostatic copies of documents which were impounded in Montana, part of the documents which, as has been stated in the public prints, were so damning to Mr. WHEELER. I shall only read some paragraphs, but in all references to the matter in this correspondence, where they were in controversy about the payment of the fee and the delay in paying the fees, there is not an intimation anywhere to the effect that the services of Mr. WHEELER covered anything other than the litigation in Montana. The letters refer to the fact that "You are employed to attend to the litigation in Montana." I pause to say also that there is not a piece of documentary evidence in the case that controverts that proposition.

Mr. Campbell said in one of these letters:

We are wondering what we are going to do about our lawsuits and cases. Mr. Beaulieu has left our organization and gone to California. We have not employed another attorney, and I do not want to do so at this time, but we wish to work through your office if we possibly can.

This was the time when they were having some controversy because the fees had not been paid. There had been \$2,000 paid in January and \$2,000 paid in February and the balance was unpaid. It was to be paid, as I understand it, \$1,000 a month thereafter.

We do not know when these suits are set for trial, as this was all left to Mr. Beaulieu, and I did not get to see him before he left to get all the data.

Mr. WHEELER, in reply, said:

With reference to your litigation there is no reason why you should not handle it through our office. I am quite sure Mr. Baldwin would be glad to handle it, and, as I indicated to you before, if some of the litigation were of sufficient importance I might go to Montana myself and assist in the trial. But, Campbell, I can not handle this litigation without being paid.

Again, in a letter from Mr. Campbell:

We were under the impression that we were to pay you \$10,000 a year for your services. I believe this was the understanding, that we were supposed to pay you originally \$3,000. We have already paid you \$4,000. We were under the impression that this would carry at least until our suits came to trial and something was done in regard to our litigation. But now, WHEELER, I want you to get me right. I am not trying to crawl out of any obligation or make anyone the goat except myself, but I really think enough money has been paid to our attorneys and that our cases should at least be taken care of.

Again he said in another paragraph:

I think Mr. Baldwin could well afford, on the money paid into your partnership, to carry on this litigation at least to the point where it comes to trial in the courts.

Mr. WHEELER, in reply, said:

The understanding that you speak of in your letter is not accurate. The understanding was that you were to pay \$4,000 down, and that you were to pay each month until the sum of \$10,000 was paid. How-

ever, I want to do everything I can to help you out, but you must in turn do something to try to raise the money also. I shall be glad to see you when you come East.

I think it more than significant—I think it convincing proof—that when they were discussing the matter with reference to the fees and where there was some impatience expressed upon the part of Mr. WHEELER that the fee was not being taken care of, that these parties in their correspondence, which must have been under circumstances in which they would not be supposed to be speaking other than that which they understood to be the fact, referred to the services as litigation in the State of Montana. It is much stronger to me, the almost unconscious expression of "litigation" as they had understood it from the beginning, than any oral testimony that could be given. So I repeat that the documentary evidence before the committee supports the contention of the oral testimony of those who made the contract. You must controvert, disregard, or disprove not only the oral testimony of those who made the contract but the written evidence of it as expressed between the parties from time to time when it was being carried out. Does not the direct testimony prove there was no illegal contract; does not the acts of the parties, such as Mr. WHEELER's statement to Beaulieu, prove there was no illegal contract; does not the letters referring to the litigation prove there were no illegal contract?

Now let us turn to another phase of the matter. I have already called attention to the services of Mr. Beaulieu and Mr. Feely. What do we find when we get to the land office? Particular stress is laid upon the fact by the Senator from South Dakota that when Mr. WHEELER came to Washington he called upon Mr. Edwin Booth, the presumption being apparently, as viewed by the Senator from South Dakota, that one acquaintance can not call upon another acquaintance from Montana without some sinister motive behind the transaction. Mr. Booth and Mr. WHEELER had been acquainted for 20 years. They had been in Montana politics on opposite sides of the fence. When Mr. WHEELER came to Washington he called upon Mr. Booth. If Mr. WHEELER had not called upon Mr. Booth until he was employed by Mr. Campbell, it might have been argued, and I presume would have been argued, and, indeed, is argued inferentially in the minority report, that he immediately sought him out for a sinister purpose. But Mr. WHEELER came down here in December, 1922, after his election and before he was employed by Mr. Campbell, and had no reason for calling upon Mr. Booth so far as Mr. Campbell was concerned, but it was then that he called upon Mr. Booth in the first instance. I think he went out to his home. If I remember correctly, their wives visited. They were acquaintances. He called upon Mr. Booth, and, as Mr. Booth said, no discussion whatever was had with reference to any matter touching business interests in Montana. So it is apparent that when Mr. WHEELER came here again in January he called upon Mr. Booth because of his acquaintanceship and friendship, which had caused him to call upon him in December prior to his employment by Mr. Campbell.

What happened when he called upon Mr. Booth? In the conversation, said Mr. Booth, who was a Republican appointee of the Department of the Interior, Mr. WHEELER stated that he had been engaged in some heavy litigation in Montana for Mr. Campbell, and that Mr. Campbell's business was in bad shape; that he was financially embarrassed; that some of his titles seemed to be involved, but that he thought he had helped to straighten him out some by winning his receivership case. He also said to Mr. Booth that if there was anyone Mr. Booth was acquainted with whom he thought might be interested in investing in oil properties in Montana he would like to get in touch with him, because he would be very glad to help Mr. Campbell in that respect. Mr. Booth spoke of a certain gentleman whom he thought might be interested in the proposition and the discussion proceeded along that line, such a general discussion as might very well take place between two gentlemen from Montana who were somewhat familiar, one of them entirely familiar and the other more or less familiar, with the situation.

When Mr. Booth is asked if Mr. WHEELER undertook to present any matter to him in which Mr. Campbell was interested in the way of asking his services as a solicitor of the department he states emphatically that he did not; that the most important feature of the discussion was with reference to finding some one to finance his situation.

I here read from the testimony of Booth:

Mr. BOOTH. Yes. I think, Senator, just to keep straight—my recollection is that the first day he came in and I was holding a conference. The boys from Montana were interested in the Crow Lake irrigation project, and that day he came in, and I think he went out, and I do not remember anything he said. I think he went away.

The following afternoon he returned and we had some conversation and we talked about some matters. He finally said to me—this is just my statement in a résumé, not the exact words—I am not trying to quote Senator WHEELER's exact language; I could not—the effect of his conversation was that he had very shortly before that been into quite a lawsuit in Great Falls in which Gordon Campbell's properties, or some portion of them, were involved. He talked with me about the lawsuit; told me that Campbell's properties were in very bad shape—that is, his condition—that the situation of his properties was bad; that it was rather complicated; that his financial condition was bad, and that he was desirous of assisting Mr. Campbell; that that lawsuit had in a measure, I think, done some adjusting, but Campbell had some difficulties with oil lands which he had, including some Government lands; and I asked the Senator if he knew what Government lands and he told me he did not. I asked him if he could give me the serial numbers of any of them and he said no; and I think I asked him if he knew anything about it, and he said he did not; that Campbell had that information and that he did not have it. I said that he would have to get it from Campbell in some way, and discussed the matter, and I think that the Senator said that it would probably be best if Campbell would come to Washington and take it up, and asked me if I would discuss it with Mr. Campbell if he did come here, and I told him I surely would, and would certainly help him in any way I could.

We discussed the matter of Mr. Campbell's finances, and during the conversation he asked me if I had met any men, or if I knew anyone who might likely be interested to the extent that Campbell might finance his property, and I told him of a gentleman in New York; and while we were talking my secretary may have been in there quite a portion of the time; but at any rate, if he was not, he came in and heard a part of this conversation, and he spoke up and said that Mr. Nyce was in the building, and that possibly some of the companies in which he was interested might be interested, and I said, "Step out and get him." He stepped out and got Mr. Nyce and brought him in and I introduced him to Senator WHEELER. Peter Q. Nyce is his name.

He talked to Senator WHEELER and asked him about what properties Mr. Campbell had, if he had a plat or description or anything about them, and Mr. WHEELER said he did not; and he wanted to know what the condition was, whether Campbell had title to the lands; and WHEELER, as I recall, told him that he did not know about that. He asked him whether there was some school land, and the different kinds, and I do not know who suggested it, but probably Mr. Nyce, as I recall, suggested that if Senator WHEELER would get a description of the lands and let him have that he would submit it to such people as he was interested with, and there might be something done.

Senator CARAWAY. May I interrupt you for just one moment? Mr. Nyce has nothing to do with the Government?

Mr. BOOTH. No, no; purely outside the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that was all outside of the Government.

Mr. BOOTH. That was just the social side, and my trying to assist. The brief of it was that Mr. Nyce and Senator WHEELER and myself—I guess all of us took a hand in it—dictated a telegram to my stenographer requesting Mr. Campbell to send in a list of the properties; and it did come, and I got hold of it and forwarded it to Mr. Nyce.

The CHAIRMAN. This list of properties you were sending for was sent for as the result of this conversation with reference to financing the land?

Mr. BOOTH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That had nothing to do with departmental matters.

Mr. BOOTH. No, sir.

Senator CARAWAY. It was not for you at all; it was for Mr. Nyce?

Mr. BOOTH. Sure; for Mr. Nyce and this other gentleman in New York I spoke of. It was not anything to do with the department at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Was Mr. WHEELER ever at the Interior Department after that about this matter that you recall?

Mr. BOOTH. Not to my knowledge, ever. Let me say, Senator, that Senator WHEELER left my office that evening late; it was very nearly 5 o'clock when we left with Mr. Nyce, and that evening or the next morning he and his wife left, as I recall, for Florida, and he told me he expected to come back and then was going to Europe; and the next I heard my wife got a letter from his wife saying that they had changed their plans and gone to Europe, and I did not see Mr. WHEELER until during the Shrine convention, when he returned here to Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. WHEELER, to your knowledge, at any time appear before you in your department presenting the question of assignments of leases or anything of that kind?

Mr. BOOTH. He did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he solicit your aid or your help with reference to these assignments or anything connected with them?

Mr. BOOTH. Do you mean these cases?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BOOTH. No, sir.

It has been said that Mr. Booth afterwards entered into correspondence with Mr. Campbell. Certainly he did. It was entirely natural that he should, because Mr. Campbell wanted his affairs attended to. Mr. Booth was in the department. He wrote to him and it finally resulted in what—not in Mr. Booth going to Mr. WHEELER and consulting WHEELER and taking his advice or counseling with him as to what he should do, but it resulted in Mr. Booth suggesting the employment of an attorney here in Washington for the purpose of taking care of the business before the department. Upon the suggestion of Booth, Mr. Campbell went, not to his Senator for his influence or as his attorney, but, upon the suggestion of Mr. Booth, Mr. Feely, of the firm of Vogelsang, Brown, Cram & Feely, was employed. The entire business after that time was transacted between Mr. Feely and Mr. Beaulieu with reference to the matter.

I called attention yesterday to the testimony of Governor Spry. I shall not reread it to-day, but I undertake to say that if Mr. WHEELER had been seeking to exert his influence or in any way to control the action of those who had to pass upon these questions it would have been practically impossible for the Commissioner of the Land Office not to have known it. Certainly it would have been impracticable and practically impossible for anything to have been consummated without the officials of that office knowing it. Commissioner Spry states that Mr. WHEELER came into the office one day, and, after a few pleasantries, it was stated by Mr. Booth that Mr. WHEELER had a client in Montana who was in the oil business; and WHEELER immediately spoke up and said, "The only interest I have is that he gets a fair deal before the department." Commissioner Spry said, "That he will get, as does everybody else." Commissioner Spry states that Mr. WHEELER's conduct before the department was the same as that of other western Senators, that apparently of suggesting fair play for his clients.

Now, reflect, Mr. President, upon the exertion of influence upon the part of the United States Senator with the Land Office! The only two men he ever came in contact with testified definitely and positively that he at no time sought to present these matters to them or to ask their influence in regard to it.

There is only one theory upon which Mr. WHEELER can be held responsible; there is only one theory upon which he can be condemned; that is, in the first instance, that he is presumed to be guilty; in the second instance, that every disinterested witness who testifies directly to the contrary is a perjurer.

The Senator from South Dakota said yesterday that a United States Senator under charge was upon a level with the humblest citizen charged with crime, and that he must take his position upon a level with the most humble citizen. Certainly so; nobody contends otherwise. Mr. WHEELER, in my judgment, would be the last man to contend it. I certainly do not contend that because a man is elected to the Senate of the United States he shall be tried in a court of criminal justice upon any other theory or under any other rule than that which is applied even to the vagrant upon the street. All are equal, or should be, before the bar of public justice, and each man's guilt or innocence shall be tested by the same rules and adjudged under the same law. If, however, you were trying a vagrant from the street you would give him the benefit of the presumption of innocence until the evidence established his guilt. Not only that, but if you were trying a vagrant from the street you would not go to the man who was testifying on impression or from hearsay and take his testimony against that of a reputable citizen who was standing at the source of authority and testifying to direct facts. Try Mr. WHEELER upon the same basis that you would try anyone else; take the witnesses who are familiar with the facts, who testify and give legal and competent evidence; give him the presumption of innocence that accompanies every man charged; and there is not a scintilla of testimony here which shows that he ever entered into a contract for or received compensation for any services which he performed before the Land Office or the departments.

Now, Mr. President, let us take up some of the testimony upon which some persons seem to think, if nothing more, that there was probable cause for the grand jury finding this indictment. Of course, I am not going to discuss the question of whether or not there was probable cause. I think, Mr. President, that you could indict anybody if you would withhold from the grand jury all the evidence which was legal and competent and only introduce hearsay and impressions; and, while I am not interested in what the grand jury did, the fact stands out that not a single witness who knew of the making of the contract or who could give legal and competent evidence of it was called before the grand jury. There was probably not a member of the grand jury who had any knowledge whatever of this transaction as it is narrated before the committee by witnesses who are familiar with the

facts. No one could criticize the grand jury, not being familiar with the rules of the competency of the evidence, for taking almost any view.

Now we come to the evidence upon which the grand jury is supposed to have acted. I first call attention to the testimony of Mr. Glosser. I read from page 79 of the hearings. The first time he saw Mr. WHEELER nothing took place of any moment. The chairman said:

Fix the date when you next saw him.

Mr. GLOSSER. I would have to refer to the records of lawsuits and things like that. I have not got them with me. Mr. WHEELER was interested in the lawsuits, and he was up at Great Falls at the time a lawsuit was tried there.

The CHAIRMAN. The next time that you saw him, if you can recall, was there anything said about his employment as an attorney?

Mr. GLOSSER. Oh, yes; he was there working on cases.

That is, the litigation in Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; he was there working on cases. But was there any conversation—did you have any conversation with Mr. WHEELER—about his employment?

Mr. GLOSSER. You mean with reference to his direct employment by Campbell?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GLOSSER. Only in so far as Campbell's business was affected. I would never discuss with the Senator his deal with Campbell or anything like that. I talked of Campbell's business to the Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the nature of the business you talked of to him?

Mr. GLOSSER. We had discussed at various times various lawsuits, all the land titles, and Campbell's business generally in the prospecting field, and the outcome there. All of Campbell's business was at various times discussed, or a good part of it.

Senator STELLING. With Mr. WHEELER?

The CHAIRMAN. With Mr. WHEELER?

Mr. GLOSSER. Yes; with Mr. WHEELER.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anyone else present when you were discussing this business of Mr. Campbell with him?

Mr. GLOSSER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was present?

Mr. GLOSSER. There were several at different times. Mr. Rhea was present several times and Mr. Campbell was present, and at other times I think Mr. Harvey was there.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the nature of the discussion? How did you come to discuss it with him? What was the nature of the discussion?

Mr. GLOSSER. We discussed the matters because WHEELER was representing Mr. Campbell and I was representing Mr. Campbell, too; and it was natural that we should discuss the business Campbell had. We had that common point in view, of arriving at the same thing; a lot of business—that is, all of Campbell's business.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand; but is there any specific subject matter in the business which Mr. WHEELER had charge of that you could now recall that you talked over with him?

Mr. GLOSSER. Yes; Mr. Campbell had a good many lawsuits, and they were discussed in a general way; and one lawsuit in particular that Mr. WHEELER was handling at that time was discussed a good bit. Other times the land titles were discussed, and Government permits, and everything that Mr. Campbell had anything to do with was discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever present when Mr. Campbell and Mr. WHEELER talked over the terms of his employment?

Mr. GLOSSER. You mean his compensation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GLOSSER. No; I was never present when they talked that over. The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever talk over with Mr. WHEELER the scope of his employment—what he was employed to do?

Mr. GLOSSER. No; I never discussed that point with Mr. WHEELER. I took it for granted; to represent Mr. Campbell.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the nature of these lawsuits in which Mr. WHEELER was acting?

Mr. GLOSSER. The lawsuits?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GLOSSER. They were suits that Mr. L. C. Stevenson and his associated companies had filed against Campbell individually and Campbell's companies.

The CHAIRMAN. They involved the question of having a receiver appointed over Mr. Campbell's property?

Mr. GLOSSER. Yes; that was one particular—

The CHAIRMAN. Did that include all of Mr. Campbell's property; did they ask for a receiver?

Mr. GLOSSER. No; they asked for a receiver of the Gordon Campbell Kevin Syndicate.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that valuable property?

Mr. GLOSSER. Some of his land was very valuable. It was thought so at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. It was very important litigation?

Mr. GLOSSER. Yes; it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. WHEELER was brought into that litigation?

Mr. GLOSSER. I think he had more or less to do with handling the legal end of the suit; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It had been begun before he was employed?

Mr. GLOSSER. You mean the suit had been filed?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. President, that is the distinguishing feature of Mr. Glosser's testimony. He says that he never talked over with WHEELER the terms of the employment; he did not discuss it with Mr. Campbell in the presence of Mr. WHEELER; but that he was under the impression that Mr. WHEELER was representing Mr. Campbell. Whatever he might say in regard to it would be pure hearsay.

He made two affidavits, one in Montana and the other in Colorado; and there is a wide difference in the affidavits. He testifies that he had an impression that Mr. WHEELER was representing Mr. Campbell in these land permits; but it was only an impression, only an understanding, and not arrived at by reason of anything that he ever heard WHEELER say or any agreement that he ever heard WHEELER discuss with Mr. Campbell. It would not make any difference what the testimony of Glosser was; it could not be anything but hearsay testimony. It would certainly not be considered against the testimony of those who made the contract.

Mr. Glosser's testimony is tied to Mr. Rhea's testimony. I read into the Record yesterday, Mr. President, Mr. Rhea's testimony; I shall not read it again to-day; but I will recount it in connection with Mr. Glosser's testimony. Rhea says that at the same time Glosser had his talk with Campbell and Mr. WHEELER or in their presence he also was present. Rhea was there for the purpose of discussing primarily the question of a new trustee. The property was controlled by a board of trustees. Mr. WHEELER had insisted that Mrs. Campbell retire as trustee, and Mr. Rhea had been called on to take the place of Mrs. Campbell. This conversation took place between Mr. Glosser, Mr. Rhea, Mr. Campbell, and Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rhea doing the principal part of the talking. What was this conversation? It was to this effect: Mr. Campbell said to Mr. Rhea, who owned the Philip McGowan permit:

I think Mr. WHEELER will be able to straighten that out in Washington, and if he is able to straighten it out, we ought to give him a pretty good slice.

When asked what Mr. WHEELER said, he replied that he said nothing. If Mr. WHEELER heard the conversation, he paid no attention to it. But how did it terminate? Mr. Rhea immediately said to Mr. Campbell that that permit belonged to him; that he had his own attorney; that he did not desire to employ Mr. WHEELER; that he did not employ Mr. WHEELER; that Mr. WHEELER did not attend to the matter for him; that Mr. Beaulieu did attend to it for him; that he paid Mr. Beaulieu for it; and that Mr. WHEELER had nothing whatever to do with it.

There is the testimony of Mr. Glosser, which is hearsay, and of Mr. Rhea, who wholly exonerates Mr. WHEELER, against the testimony of Stout, the letters between WHEELER and Campbell, the testimony of Beaulieu, the testimony of Feely, the testimony of Campbell, of all of those who testified directly. They are putting into this record against Mr. WHEELER the hearsay of one witness and the absolute exoneration of Mr. WHEELER by the other witnesses, and cry "Guilty."

I repeat, Mr. President, that so far as the making of the contract is concerned or the receiving of compensation, there is no conflict of testimony in the record. Upon the issue upon which guilt or innocence depends, to wit, the making of the contract or the receiving of compensation, there is no conflict of evidence. And we might stop right here. For if there was no agreement nor no compensation had, then any and all things which WHEELER might or might not have done before the department were proper, legal and in line with what every western Senator does year after year.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] asks me if Mr. WHEELER testified. Mr. WHEELER did testify. I am not going to discuss his testimony, because I hardly have time to go over it. He testified to all the facts and details with reference to his employment, stated what he did, and took up the several telegrams and letters and discussed them; and as his testimony is here, and doubtless will be read by all Senators who wish to know the facts, I have not planned in my line of discussion to go into it. I think the cause complete without the Senator's statement.

Now, Mr. President, I want to refer briefly to the documentary evidence. I have already taken up the letters which passed between these parties.

In the first place, I call the attention of the Senate to the documentary evidence in this respect: If you take the documentary evidence and look it over, upon its face there is no suggestion whatever of any improper conduct. Mr. WHEELER sent no telegrams and wrote no letters that he would not have a perfect right to send and write and with perfect propriety could send and write if we are correct in our construction of the evidence up to this point, that there was no agreement for compensation and no compensation paid for the services. This documentary evidence of itself does not disclose any agreement to receive compensation nor does it disclose the receipt of any compensation. Therefore, in order that the documentary evidence shall have any pertinency at all, or any condemnatory effect, you must relate it back to a contract or an agreement to receive compensation or the receipt of compensation. What I wish to impress upon the Senate is that the documentary evidence itself does not reveal a contract nor does it reveal compensation nor does it reveal any improper conduct upon the part of the Senator from Montana. They read these telegrams and letters which are in and of themselves proper and then assume or presume an illegal contract, although all who keep within the contract disclose it was not illegal.

I could undoubtedly find in my files plenty of correspondence—letters and telegrams to constituents—with reference to having looked after a matter before the Land Department, saying that "the matter has been closed up," or that "I will present the matter," or that "I have presented the case as best I could to the Land Department," and so forth; and that is far more than appears upon the face of these telegrams or the face of these documentary evidences, unless, as I say, you go back to the proposition of an illegal contract and base them upon that proposition, and that I think I have disposed of.

This documentary evidence should be read in the light of another outstanding and undisputed fact, and that is that Mr. WHEELER undertook to find some one who would help Mr. Campbell finance his undertaking; and that is particularly true with reference to the letter of March 8, to which reference is made by the Senator from South Dakota and to which much reference has been made in the public prints, found at page 134.

This is a letter written by Mr. WHEELER to Mr. Campbell under date of March 8, 1923. In this letter he says—I will come to another paragraph in a few moments—

On the train coming down I met Mr. Chisom, and he seemed quite taken up with your proposition, but stated that he felt that a million dollars should be raised, and I thoroughly agreed with him. Within the next day or two I will also take the matter up with some other parties here in the city, whom I think will be interested.

I call attention to that because that runs all through the telegrams and letters and documentary evidence—that one of the things that Mr. WHEELER was trying to do, a thing which he had a perfect right to do, in which the Government was in no wise interested, purely a matter between individuals, a private affair, was to help Mr. Campbell finance his undertaking, to find some one who would be interested in it.

Bear in mind that these telegrams referred to were called out by information desired with reference to financing the property. This is not only shown by oral evidence but is revealed by the telegrams and letters themselves, a portion of one I have just read. It is quite clear that they did not relate to matters before the department in which the Government was interested, because Mr. WHEELER never at any time—never at any time, I repeat—returned to the department or communicated with the department after he sent these telegrams or wrote any of the letters. All these matters passed through the department through Beaulieu and Feely.

I now read a paragraph from the letter of March 8:

I wish that you would have your office send me a detailed report of the condition of your permit that we discussed with the Standard Oil Co. of California, in order that when I take it up with the Department of the Interior that I will be able to intelligently discuss the matter.

The letter refers to the conversation which Mr. WHEELER had with the attorney for the Standard Oil Co. It seems that some time previous to his coming to Washington, upon one occasion when he was in Mr. Campbell's office, Mr. Campbell introduced Mr. WHEELER to the attorney of the Standard Oil Co., and the attorney for the Standard Oil Co. was complaining, as the evidence discloses, that in some sale of land or some sale of interest of Mr. Campbell to the Standard Oil Co. there was a misunderstanding, a misapprehension, or a mistake with ref-

erence to certain property, the Standard Oil Co., as I understand, not getting the amount of property to which they thought they were entitled. So Mr. WHEELER, in discussing this matter with Mr. Campbell, calls his attention to the fact that he would like to have him send the information with reference to that, so that when he took it up before the Interior Department he would know how to discuss it intelligently.

This was a controversy between Mr. Campbell and the Standard Oil Co. It does not appear that the Government had any interest whatever in the matter. It had to be adjusted between these two parties; but, as a matter of fact, Mr. Campbell never replied to the telegram or the letter. The matter was not taken up by Mr. WHEELER. If it was ever adjusted, it was adjusted by other parties, and if it had come to Mr. WHEELER he could have very properly taken it up and adjusted it without being within the inhibition of the statute at all. It was, as I say, a matter between private individuals.

Certain telegrams were sent by Mr. WHEELER to Mr. Campbell, and other telegrams were returned by Mr. Campbell to Mr. WHEELER, calling for a description of the permits and the matters concerning which it was necessary for Mr. WHEELER to be informed, both with reference to the matter of financing the proposition and with reference to straightening out such matters as related to the Standard Oil controversy. As I said a moment ago, these telegrams do not disclose any improper conduct upon the part of Mr. WHEELER. They do not disclose any compensation expected or received, or any agreement; and if, as we contend, the contract related to the litigation in the State of Montana, there was not the slightest impropriety in anything that he did with reference to the presentation of these matters before the Land Department. There were also some letters passed between Mr. Booth and Campbell after WHEELER went to Europe, but they in no possible way involve Mr. WHEELER.

Now, Mr. President, unless some one desires to ask a question, I shall conclude very briefly.

I want to say, in conclusion, that all parties to this contract of employment place one construction upon it. All parties who were familiar with its making or its carrying out place one construction upon it. There is no discrepancy in the testimony upon that point, no differences of opinion or understanding as to what the contract was. Such men as Glosser got an impression that it covered the permit. It was only an impression. He did not hear the contract. Rhea got the same impression, perhaps. It was only an impression. He did not hear the contract. The parties who made the contract, who were familiar with its execution, who were in a position where they had to know what it was, are all agreed—and there is no difference of view—that it related alone to the litigation in the State of Montana.

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator has very clearly stated what the evidence did disclose when it came down to the question of what the contract was and what it was not, and before the Senator takes his seat I call his attention to this fact:

If the testimony of Mr. Glosser and the testimony of Mr. Rhea, with reference to the conversations that were had in the presence of Senator WHEELER should be given full value, they would be nothing more nor less than admissions in the nature of confessions; and that evidence, if given its full weight and full effect, never can establish an offense. When you go back to what the contract was, as the able Senator has so very clearly shown, it discloses the entire absence of any offense. I merely wish to direct the Senator's attention to that fact. It is relied upon in the minority report as the first premise upon which the action of the grand jury is justified. It is in the nature of a mere admission; however; and even if it is taken at its full face value and given full force and full effect this inquiry relates to what the contract was, but you never could establish it by that admission if it were made and undenied, and if it were made under circumstances that called for an answer by Senator WHEELER. I should like to direct the Senator's attention to the further fact that it is of the very nature of all confession evidence or admission evidence that no one is called upon to make a reply to a charge unless the circumstances demand it; and in this case Mr. Rhea himself relieved Mr. WHEELER of the slightest necessity of making any reply to the suggestion made by Mr. Campbell, because he repudiated the suggestion himself and said that he had an attorney and would not enter into any such agreement as that.

Mr. BORAH. So far as Mr. Rhea's testimony is concerned, I think it is a very conclusive piece of evidence in this case in favor of Mr. WHEELER. There was a contention, apparently, upon the part of those who were engaged in presenting this

matter against Mr. WHEELER, that Mr. WHEELER was mixed up with the Philip MacGowan permit. Now the owner of the permit, the holder of the permit, comes in and says, in effect: "Mr. WHEELER was not mixed up in it at all"; that he declined to employ Mr. WHEELER; that Mr. WHEELER was not employed; that he had his own attorney; that his own attorney attended to it; that Mr. WHEELER never attended to it, and he never sought his help to attend to it. If there had been any question at all about the MacGowan contract or permit, the owner of the contract or the owner of the permit absolutely exonerates Mr. WHEELER from having anything whatever to do with it.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, not from having anything to do with it, I should say, but rather from having Mr. WHEELER as an attorney on his part to do anything in his behalf.

Mr. BORAH. Well, what did Mr. WHEELER have to do with the Philip MacGowan contract?

Mr. STERLING. I think that was one of the first permits that Mr. WHEELER gave his attention to after he came to Washington, if I remember correctly.

Mr. BORAH. Why, if the Senator from South Dakota will refresh his memory, there can not be any doubt at all about the proposition. Mr. Beaulieu says that he himself attended to it. Mr. Rhea says that Mr. Beaulieu as his attorney did attend to it. There is no evidence in this case that Mr. WHEELER ever touched the Philip MacGowan permit.

Mr. STERLING. There were two permits, the Philip MacGowan permit and the Lincoln permit, that were in controversy here before the department at Washington, to which attention was being given.

Mr. BORAH. Yes, exactly; and Mr. Rhea established beyond peradventure that Mr. WHEELER had nothing whatever to do with the Philip MacGowan contract.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, is the indictment based upon the dealings in reference to the Philip MacGowan permit?

Mr. BORAH. That is one of them, I believe. All you need to do is to take the testimony of Mr. Feely and Mr. Beaulieu. They take up these permits separately and individually, deal with them, and dispose of them, and say that Mr. WHEELER had nothing to do with them. Then comes Mr. Rhea, the owner of the permit, and says that while Mr. Campbell suggested that he might well secure the services of Mr. WHEELER that Mr. Rhea informed him that he did not want them, and he did not employ him.

So I say that all parties to the contract establish one fact, that Mr. WHEELER was to attend to the litigation in the State courts of Montana. In addition to that, all parties who had to do with passing these permits through the Land Office, every single one of them, disinterested absolutely, exonerates Mr. WHEELER from having anything to do with it.

First, we have the contract established by the witnesses who made it. Secondly, we have the people who put the permits through the department establishing the fact that Mr. WHEELER was not connected with it—Mr. Beaulieu, who took the permits up and passed them on to Washington; Mr. Feely, who put them before the Land Office; Mr. Booth, who says that Mr. WHEELER never presented them to him; Mr. Spry, who says he searched the records, and that Mr. WHEELER nowhere appears as the representative of these permits.

I repeat, Mr. President, there is not even a conflict of testimony here, and I have left out entirely the statement of Senator WHEELER. His statement adds conclusiveness, but leaving that aside, I submit the evidence seems conclusive.

I repeat, that upon the testimony of disinterested witnesses, Mr. WHEELER is perfectly clean of any condemnation under the statute.

I have felt that so far as this particular presentation is concerned, it was not incumbent upon me to go further and to call attention to the evidence. There is another feature of it about which I feel very deeply, but I do not think that relates to the duty of the chairman of the committee. After I feel that I have fully discharged my duty as chairman and brought the matter before the Senate as chairman of the committee and given the facts as they appeared to the committee, the views which I may entertain and thereafter express as a Senator disconnected with the obligations of the committee will be a matter for which no one will be responsible but myself, and that will come up for later consideration. I feel now I am speaking for the committee and should confine myself to the matters upon which the committee reported.

FARM LOAN BOARD

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, it might appear that I had upon my desk a long written speech, but such is not the case. However, as I wish to be accurate respecting certain charges

which I shall make, the first portion of my statement will be from written pages.

The names of four nominees for the Federal Farm Loan Board are now on the Executive Calendar awaiting action by the Senate.

The candidates were selected by President Harding, and hence have been in office as recess appointees. Two have served approximately 15 months and the other two about 12 months and 11 months, respectively.

In short, these nominees have been a majority of and in control of the Federal Farm Loan Board for nearly a year, and to all effects and purposes, considering the circumstances, since March 4, 1923.

In view of these facts, I desire to call the Senate's attention to this proposition: Whereas the record of any candidate in office may not constitute conclusive evidence as to his fitness to continue therein, yet when misconduct is alleged, as is the case in connection with these nominees, such record then becomes a most important factor in deciding upon further incumbency and hence should be scrutinized with the greatest of care and deliberation.

Therefore in passing upon these nominees it should be kept clearly in mind that the Senate is not dealing with recent appointments but with appointees who have records as members of the Farm Loan Board. As a consequence, the question to be decided in considering these nominations is not one of mere personality but as to whether the Senate is justified—yes; can the Senate afford to put its stamp of approval upon these records?

For several months past the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has had under consideration the nominations in question. Various persons have appeared for and against confirmation, and evidence has been adduced.

From the facts developed at such hearings, Mr. President, the Farm Loan Board—and hence these nominees, constituting a majority of the membership thereof—stands convicted, in my judgment, of the following charges, namely:

(1) Violation of a cardinal principle of public policy enunciated in section 6 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting a legislative officer from enjoying the emoluments of any office created during his incumbency. Prior to July 1, 1923, Charles E. Lobdell was a member of the Farm Loan Board and served as farm loan commissioner or chairman of the board. In addition, he performed the duties of fiscal agent of the land-bank system, as had all farm loan commissioners preceding him. His salary was fixed by Congress at \$10,000 per annum. On June 12, 1923, at a meeting of the members of the Farm Loan Board and the 12 land bank presidents, the farm loan commissioner was relieved of the duties of fiscal agent through the creation of a new office to be known as fiscal agent, at a salary of \$25,000 per annum. Of course, this was done by and with the approval of the Farm Loan Board both as to the creation of the office and the fixing of the salary.

On the same day it was arranged that Mr. Lobdell should become the new fiscal agent, and he assumed his duties some 20 days later; that is, on the date that his resignation as member of the board and farm loan commissioner took effect. Thus a member of a quasi legislative board became the beneficiary of a new office, with an increase in salary of two and a half times, for the performance of but part of his previous duties—a result rendered possible only by the approval of the board in question, of which he happened to be the chairman—an act utterly against that recognized principle of public policy that no legislative officer may enjoy the emoluments of an office created during his incumbency.

The second charge is as follows:

(2) Unlawful procedure in approving of the creation of a new official for the farm-loan system to be known as fiscal agent.

The Federal Farm Loan Bureau is the creature of Congress, and nowhere has Congress delegated authority to change the system or create additional officers. As a matter of fact, Congress has specifically named the list of officials and each year in the Treasury appropriation bill fixes the salaries of all officials of and within the bureau.

(3) Looseness and gross carelessness in the conduct of the affairs of the board, indicating incompetency. As incredible as it may seem, during a period of about six years the board has received and disbursed \$881,000,000 and yet has never provided itself with books of account, its records consisting merely of deposit slips, check stubs, and correspondence. It recently took the Treasury Department, employing 10 accountants and working double shift, from March 12 to about May 1, or nearly seven weeks, to compile a mere statement of receipts

and expenditures from the Farm Board records. Moreover, the accountant in charge of this work testified that he would have been unable to make up the statement from the records afforded him without the aid of the memories of several of the employees of the board.

Mr. COPELAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator mean this year?

Mr. HOWELL. Yes; just recently made.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator said recently.

Mr. HOWELL. It was finished on the 1st day of May.

Mr. COPELAND. 1924?

Mr. HOWELL. Yes. The fourth specification is as follows:

(4) The unlawful withdrawal of funds from the United States Treasury and the disbursement of such funds without the authority of Congress. Between \$65,000 and \$70,000 have been drawn from the Treasury without authority and expended for various purposes. An unofficial opinion of the Comptroller General declares these funds to belong to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Moreover, under date of May 13, 1923, the Undersecretary of the Treasury has called upon the farm loan commissioner for reimbursement of a part, if not all, of this money immediately.

(5) Looseness and neglect in the disbursement of funds. Public moneys have been expended without vouchers or receipts. Mr. Lobdell, the fiscal agent, admitted on the stand that he could not tell to whom money had been paid that had been secured by cashing certain checks. He also admitted that he had received certain sums of money for the expenditure of which he could account only in a general way.

(6) Misapplication of public funds. On September 22, 1922, Mr. Lobdell as farm loan commissioner opened an account with the Franklin National Bank by depositing \$5,000 drawn from the Federal Treasury, part of the \$65,000 to \$70,000 referred to above. From that time down to February 16, 1924, further similar deposits in this bank had been made totaling more than \$37,000. This account was drawn on from time to time by the farm loan commissioner, so that the balance remaining in the bank on the last day indicated—February 16, 1924—was \$86.53. The deposit in this bank was treated as a sort of petty cash fund, except that the expenditures therefrom were made without vouchers or receipts. Presents to employees were made from this fund, likewise what must be considered either loans or advances to employees. In another case one of these nominees had succeeded in drawing some \$2,000 from the Treasury on account of salary for which Congress had made no appropriation. As a consequence he was called upon to put it back—a simple matter—as Farm Loan Commissioner Lobdell gave him a check on this fund.

I have read these statements that I might be explicit, and each and every one of the statements is subject to proof.

I will now take up the first specification of the charges, "violation of a cardinal principle of public policy enunciated in section 6 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting a legislative officer from enjoying the emoluments of any office created during his incumbency."

It should be remembered that the farm loan commissioner from the time of the inception of the Farm Loan Bureau has acted as fiscal agent, and during that period has handled in the neighborhood of \$800,000,000. Judge Lobdell for a number of years has been that fiscal agent. The testimony elicited before the Committee on Banking and Currency was to the effect that some time in the spring of 1922 it was rumored that Judge Lobdell had received a proposition of \$25,000 a year, or such a matter, from some bank in the South. Subsequently in testimony by Judge Lobdell he stated that he did not receive any such proposition at that time. However, that rumor was abroad.

In August, 1922, there was a meeting of the 12 farm-loan presidents together with the Farm Loan Board here in Washington. At that meeting, at which Judge Lobdell was in attendance, a resolution was passed appointing a committee of three to wait upon Judge Lobdell and determine what arrangement might be made that he might be retained in the Farm Loan Bureau. It was testified that he talked with the committee at that time and agreed that he would take no steps toward separating himself from the bureau until he had again discussed the matter with that committee. Remember, this meeting took place in Washington. He was chairman of the board. He was present at that meeting. Therefore there is significance in his subsequent testimony respecting the matter:

Q. As far as the business conduct of the transaction is concerned, I have not questioned that.

Judge LOBDELL. I notice you did not.

Q. I did not refer to that.

Judge LOBDELL. Now, Senator, I think I should not be frank with you if I did not state that I did anticipate that if any proposition were to be made to me by these people—

Referring to this committee—

It would be along those lines. I have told you in perfect frankness all that took place, but I want to say more than that and tell you what I had in mind. It was in my own mind that if they had any proposition to make, if it was any service that I could render, it would be along the lines of general adviser and financial representative.

In other words, when the committee met with him that was the thought in his mind. He was en rapport with the committee. That was in their minds. The committee was continued. Congress met in December of 1922. Legislation was proposed by the Farm Loan Board, but nothing in that legislation concerned the creation of the office of fiscal agent at \$25,000 a year, which, however, was evidently in the minds of the committee and of Judge Lobdell at the time that Congress was in session.

But what took place following that? On May 27 Judge Lobdell called a meeting of the presidents of the farm-loan banks to be held in Washington, at which he and the other members of the Farm Loan Board were present. On the 12th day of June the office of fiscal agent was created with the approval of the Farm Loan Board, at a salary of \$25,000 a year, and on the same day that Judge Lobdell's board approved the creation of the office and the salary the arrangement was made that he should be the fiscal agent. As a consequence, when his resignation took effect 20 days later on the 1st day of July, he stepped out from the office of the farm-loan commissioner and fiscal agent of the farm-loan system at \$10,000 a year and immediately became alone the fiscal agent at \$25,000 a year, with an assistant, clerk, messenger, and an office of his own. These are the facts. They are substantiated by the testimony.

Now, as to the second specification, "unlawful procedure in approving of the creation of a new official for the farm-loan system to be known as fiscal agent." The Farm Loan Bureau is a creature of Congress. Congress has fixed the number and has designated the officials of the Farm Loan Bureau. There is no authority on the part of the Farm Loan Board to create an office or approve the creation of an office. That is the duty and the privilege of Congress alone. Moreover, it will be recalled that every year Congress makes an appropriation or provides for the expenses through an appropriation, the money to be collected from the land banks in proportion to their resources, and fixes the salaries that are to be paid out of that appropriation. Neither the Farm Loan Board nor the presidents of the banks had authority to create an office of this kind. It is provided in the law that the land-bank presidents shall constitute a bond committee, provided consolidated bonds are issued, but consolidated bonds have never been issued. Therefore there was no authority for the creation of this office. The authority to create the office was alone in Congress, and no effort was made by the Farm Loan Board to secure the creation of such an office, because it must have known and did know that Congress would not approve a salary of \$25,000 a year when the rates of salaries now paid to public officials are such as these: Fifteen thousand dollars a year to the Chief Justice of the United States; \$12,000 a year to the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in control of all the great Federal reserve system of the country; \$12,000 a year to the Secretary of the Treasury; \$12,000 a year to the Comptroller of the Currency, who has 8,000 national banks under his supervision.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. May I ask the Senator where the salary of \$25,000 comes from?

Mr. HOWELL. The salary has been paid out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. DIAL. Is it not paid by the separate banks? Does not each separate bank contribute \$1,000 and does not each intermediate credit bank contribute \$1,000 to the salary?

Mr. HOWELL. The 12 Federal banks up to the time of this accounting of which I speak have not contributed \$1 to the payment of Judge Lobdell's salary. It has come from the United States Treasury through the misapplication of funds.

Mr. DIAL. I do not think that is a correct statement. However, I am not prepared to disprove it.

Mr. HOWELL. I will come to that shortly in the order in which I am proceeding.

Mr. DIAL. Very well.

Mr. HOWELL. The third specification is "looseness and gross carelessness in the conduct of the affairs of the board

indicating incompetence." Hearings have taken place before the committee for some time. Finally my attention was challenged by certain statements made before the committee. I went to the office of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau and asked to see their books. I was informed that the Treasury Department kept the books. I then took the matter up with the Treasury Department, and the Treasury Department stated that they kept no books except the record of receipts and disbursements; that they were merely a bank for the Federal Farm Loan Board. Thereupon I discovered what to me was a most startling fact, the most remarkable thing of this character that has come to my attention—that this institution that had handled \$881,000,000 had no books of account. When, in discussing the matter with the Treasury Department, I asked for the source of certain items, they informed me that the only way that the information could be obtained would be by an analysis of this account, which might take three weeks.

I waited a little while, and then I introduced a resolution asking the Secretary of the Treasury to forward the Senate a statement of the receipts and disbursements of the Farm Loan Board, including the source of the funds, and those to whom disbursements were made. Immediately a force was put to work upon the records of the Farm Loan Board, and I think it would be of much interest to the Senators here to consider some of the testimony. I am not going to read the testimony at length. I shall merely read excerpts from the testimony of Maj. Walter O. Woods, who is employed in the office of the Undersecretary of the Treasury, and who was placed in charge of the Treasury's analysis of the Federal Farm Loan Board's account as the result of Senate Resolution No. 190, of March 11, 1924:

Q. Were you directed to analyze some of the accounts of the Farm Loan Board?

Major Woods. Yes, sir.

Q. What were those accounts?

Major Woods. I assume the Senator refers to the resolution of the Senate. When the Senate resolution was passed the Undersecretary directed me to prepare a plan and submit to him for approval. * * *

Q. And you were directed to secure the information requested by that resolution?

Major Woods. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you do in performing this service?

Major Woods. I called on the Farm Loan Board and asked to see the data and consulted them as to what would be the proper procedure. * * *

Q. What was the total amount involved?

Major Woods. About \$881,000,000. I believe. * * *

Q. You visited the Farm Loan Board office, did you?

Major Woods. Yes, sir.

Q. What records did you find in the Farm Loan Board office?

Major Woods. I did not see any ledger account or register of those accounts. I got out their check books and their certificates of deposit. The first step was to get their file of certificates of deposits of money that had been spent in the Treasury, and to learn something of their procedure. * * *

Q. You were then afforded records of the Farm Loan Board as follows: Deposit slips?

Major Woods. Yes, sir; I might say that I first received them from the Treasurer of the United States.

Q. This first form of record that you referred to is deposit slips?

Major Woods. Yes.

Q. Then the check stubs?

Major Woods. Yes, sir.

Q. And then correspondence?

Major Woods. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any other data afforded you?

Major Woods. Well, it was from correspondence that I learned these things and not from books. None were laid before me—no ledgers or registers of account. There was a young lady who had a wide acquaintance with these things in the Farm Loan Board, and I requested that she be sent to my office to assist me by explaining these items. She did so, and worked continuously, and we first determined what the items were and the amount of money involved.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask from what is the Senator from Nebraska reading?

Mr. HOWELL. If the Senator will pardon me, this is the testimony that was taken before the Committee on Banking and Currency respecting the confirmation of these four nominees.

Q. Now, what you were furnished by the Farm Loan Board or secured through them were deposit slips, check stubs, correspondence, and a young woman?

Major Woods. Yes, sir; and, of course, the various officials were there. I discussed the subject with them and requested that they

place the employees at our disposal in order to carry this out, and they responded to it.

Q. Suppose you had simply been afforded the deposit slips, the check stubs, and the correspondence, without any assistance, could you have analyzed those accounts?

Major Woods. No, sir; I do not think I could.

Q. In other words, you had to have somebody with a memory who knew something about what had gone before?

Major Woods. Oh, yes; I had to have somebody explain what those items were for. I could not have done it from data I had before me.

Q. In other words, they had no records from which you would have been able to make an analysis of this account without the aid of human memory?

Major Woods. They did not provide me with books of account from which I could have audited the accounts; no. * * *

Q. In other words, then, the data that they used or you used were this correspondence?

Major Woods. Yes, sir; I would say it was correspondence.

Q. Did you find any set of accounts with each individual bank?

Major Woods. No, sir.

Q. No books of that kind were kept?

Major Woods. I was not provided with them. If there were such, I did not know it. I was not informed of it, and did not see them.

Q. This statement that you have afforded is merely a cash statement, is it not?

Major Woods. Yes, sir; it is not an audited account. * * *

Q. But it is merely a cash statement, is it not?

Major Woods. Yes; that is what it is.

Q. How long did it take you to make this cash statement from these data?

Major Woods. From the 12th of March until about the last of April; about six weeks.

Q. How many people did you have working at it?

Major Woods. The same number were not working all the time. I should judge about 9 or 10.

Q. Did you work double shifts?

Major Woods. Yes, sir.

Q. You did not inquire into the propriety of any of these payments, did you?

Major Woods. No, sir; I did not.

Q. And that was not the nature of your audit?

Major Woods. No, sir.

Q. Your work was simply to analyze and determine where the funds came from and where they went?

Major Woods. Yes, sir; it was simply to comply with the Senate resolution. The Secretary of the Treasury was to provide the Senate with a statement of each item of receipt and disbursement of the Farm Loan Board from its inception down to the 1st of March.

I wish to say here, Mr. President, that in making up excerpts from this testimony I have omitted certain portions of the answers when they were deemed irrelevant.

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

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Did the committee investigating the method of accounting of the Farm Loan Board inquire into it of the members of the board? Were the members of the board asked about that?

Mr. HOWELL. No, sir. I asked that they be put on the stand, but it was decided to close the hearings, and I was not given an opportunity.

Mr. ROBINSON. Was any explanation given of the method of accounting which has been adopted and pursued by the board? Was that developed during the hearings before the committee?

Mr. HOWELL. A remarkable position was taken, for instance, by Farm Loan Commissioner Cooper that he did not see why, if the 12 banks were satisfied with what they got, it was necessary for the board to keep any accounts other than correspondence, check slips, and check stubs.

Mr. ROBINSON. That was what I wanted to direct my inquiry to, namely, whether or not the method of accounting adopted by the board in respect to its dealings with the several banks is an improved system; and if not, the reason for the failure to adopt an approved system of accounting. I want to know the facts about that. It seems to me to be pertinent, particularly in view of the statement the Senator is making.

Mr. HOWELL. I regret very much that after two months of time spent in working up the data the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency only allowed me to interrogate Major Woods and Judge Lobdell; in other words, they closed the hearing in one day after all this work had been done.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

Mr. GLASS. I will say in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Arkansas that the Banking and Currency Committee went fully, in detail, into these accounts, and satisfied itself thoroughly that there had not been a penny of misappropriation of public funds, and satisfied itself thoroughly that there had been full accounting for every penny. At the proper time, Mr. President—

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I allowed an interruption, as I supposed, for a question.

Mr. GLASS. No; I did not care to question the Senator; but the Senator is now speaking in open session about a matter that ought to be discussed in executive session, because it relates to the confirmation of nominees to the Federal Farm Loan Board. I have not sought to make the point of order which clearly lies against this sort of procedure, and do not intend to do it now, but I do not think the Senator ought to be permitted, or ought to be willing, to state in open session for the RECORD circumstances that do not, in my view, properly represent the case; and I was about to say that in executive session when these nominations shall be considered members of the committee will discuss, I think to the entire satisfaction of the Senate itself, all of these transactions and show to the satisfaction of the Senate itself that they were satisfactorily explained to the committee, and that the committee was unanimous in acquitting the members of the board of any misappropriation of funds or any irregularity in the transaction of business.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Virginia if it is not a fact that after the analysis of this account, covering \$881,000,000, I was allowed but five hours to examine witnesses; and is it not a further fact that although I wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee and asked that the members of the Farm Loan Board be present, and that I be allowed to put them on the stand, the committee closed its hearings without giving me an opportunity to examine one of them?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, I venture to say that no committee of any legislative body on the civilized globe ever exhibited the degree and amount of patience that the Banking and Currency Committee has exhibited with respect to this investigation. Since last January the committee has been called into session after session to consider the nominations of these members of the board, and I have sat there session after session and seen the time of the committee consumed in matters that had no earthly relation whatsoever to the fitness of the members of this board. It is true that after the time of the Farm Loan Board for six weeks had been occupied with a perfectly useless investigation of every item of expenditure of the system since its foundation in 1917 up to the present time, we declined to permit the Senator from Nebraska to repeat time after time item after item of identical nature. The committee declined to waste its time any further in that sort of childish transaction.

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

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

Mr. HOWELL. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. President, I wish to state that I was treated with great courtesy by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I had the feeling, however, during the whole period of the hearings that there was a reluctance to go into this matter. The hearings did begin in January, and they occupied 26 hours and 45 minutes—I think that was the period—down to the time when it was developed that the Farm Loan Board had no books and when I put in the Senate resolution. Furthermore, of that 26 hours and 45 minutes I occupied in questions 3 hours and 33 minutes, approximately. Finally certain facts were adduced that indicated that we should go to their records. I attended to the matter. The hearings ceased. For about two months we were investigating the records. The committee allowed one day for hearing afterwards, although involving \$881,000,000 of items. They refused—I say “refused”—rather they did not, as I requested, call the members of the Farm Loan Board to the stand.

I will present for the RECORD a letter from me to the chairman of the committee, indicating the course that I believed this investigation should follow; but after this one day, when I developed the facts that I have read to you here, the committee closed the hearings, only allowing me to ask questions respecting less than 20 items, involving but \$7,000; and I am surprised that the Senator should say that the committee went fully into this matter.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, the Senator is not surprised, because the Senator knows that I, as well as other members of the committee there, avowed our judgment that we had gone fully into the matter, and said to the Senator from Nebraska that if he would ask any new questions, if he would present any evidence that had not time and time again already been traversed, we were willing to sit there and hear him; but it was the same old thing over and over and over again, and we claimed to be men of ordinary intelligence. We do not think our time should be consumed in that sort of fashion—at least, we did not—and the committee unanimously reported these nominees.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. Just a moment, Mr. President. It would seem that there is a difference between the judgment of the senior Senator from Virginia and also that of the committee and my judgment respecting this matter.

Mr. GLASS. Yes; I gather that.

Mr. HOWELL. But, if I may be allowed, I will proceed to present to the Senate further facts that I believe will make it very clear that there was reason to go into these matters—questions which I had asked for the first time and, moreover, that we should have gone further.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if the Senator presents here reasons why we should go further, we will go further. It was his misfortune, and not our fault, that he failed to present to us any reasons why we should go further.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to tell us what was the result of the audit? Did the account balance, or not?

Mr. HOWELL. There was no audit. There was merely an analysis of the account. A mere statement that they had paid out so much money and had received so much money.

Mr. DIAL. Did that balance?

Mr. HOWELL. Why, yes; you can make an account balance very easily. The question is, how did it balance?

Mr. DIAL. I hope the Senator does not mean that they forced a balance?

Mr. HOWELL. No. I should like to make it very plain, Mr. President, that I am not charging dishonesty here; but I want to state this fact:

In response to my first request the Farm Loan Board sent me a statement, and I have it. It would not balance. I sent it back and asked them to balance the statement. It took them two weeks before they could balance that statement. That is the kind of statement that was afforded me.

Mr. DIAL. Then they did balance it to a cent, did they not?

Mr. HOWELL. No. Why, you can balance any account. If you mean that they had a set of double-entry books, and they balanced; no—not in any sense. When a man merely states to you, "I have received so much money and I have spent so much money," it is easy for him to have a balance.

Mr. DIAL. I understand, but I was trying to get at the audit of the account. When the auditor got through with his investigation, did the account balance?

Mr. HOWELL. This was merely a statement of receipts and expenditures, and this statement of receipts and expenditures does balance, but you can not tell why it balanced unless you go into the account.

Mr. DIAL. I just wanted to know whether it balanced.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

Mr. GOODING. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska if he thinks it would have been possible to make it balance and to give an intelligent report without the young lady who had such a remarkable memory?

Mr. HOWELL. In my opinion, absolutely not. It is one of the most remarkable state of affairs that I have ever encountered in a business institution. I was once appointed receiver for an institution, and that is what I found—check stubs, canceled checks, and correspondence. You know what that means in untangling a skein, and that is all this Farm Loan Board had.

Now, Mr. President, I will continue reading the Treasury accountant's testimony, because it goes right to the point:

Q. And that was not the nature of your audit?

As to the propriety of expenditures.

Major Woods. No, sir.

Q. Your work was simply to analyze and determine where the funds came from and where they went?

Major Woods. Yes, sir; it was simply to comply with the Senate resolution. The Secretary of the Treasury was to provide the Senate with a statement of each item of receipt and disbursement of the Farm Loan Board from its inception down to the 1st of March.

Q. In other words, if the Comptroller General had control over the disbursements of the Federal Farm Loan Board he would have compelled them to keep a set of books, would he not?

Major Woods. Yes, sir; he would. He would compel them to state the account once a month or once a quarter, whichever would be the established rule, and the account would be kept on the so-called cash-book, which would be a statement of receipts and disbursements, and the transcript made from that would be submitted with the vouchers—canceled vouchers—to the Comptroller General for compensation.

That is the trouble with this institution—it has no auditor.

Q. Now, Major, as I understand it, it took about six weeks and 10 employees to prepare this analysis in the form of a statement.

Major Woods. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose that you were called upon to set up a set of books such as the Comptroller General required of a department subject to his audit; how long would it take to write up such a set of books, notwithstanding the work which you have done here?

Major Woods. Well, that would involve an audit of the account looking into each item. To check it up, I should say it would take about two months. I do not know; somewhere about that, I should judge. It would depend somewhat upon the number of employees I had to assist me; but if I were to be told to do it I would take about three months.

After all this work, covering nearly two months, it would take him three months more to set up a set of books so that you could find out the state of the account of one of these 12 banks during the time it has been dealing with this institution.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

Mr. GLASS. Does not the Senator know perfectly well that it could be found out in three seconds from one letter from the farm loan commissioner to any given bank? Let me ask the Senator further, with his permission, while I am on my feet, if he is reading all the testimony—the interruptions of members of the committee and the answers of this expert—with respect to the fitness of these nominees whose names we were considering?

Mr. HOWELL. No, sir; I stated here that I was not reading all the testimony. As I have stated, I am reading excerpts from the testimony, but what I am reading is what was testified to.

Mr. GLASS. Yes; but not all that was testified to. I suggest to the Senator that he is proceeding now in open session, contrary to the rules, and inferentially aspersing the integrity and honesty of men high in public life, and he is not giving all of the testimony as he proceeds.

Mr. HOWELL. I am not misrepresenting this testimony in any way. I am reading what was stated.

Mr. GLASS. But not all that was stated.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, more than half the time was taken up by the members of the committee interjecting their views respecting this matter.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean to exaggerate, but nine-tenths of the time was taken up by the Senator himself.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. So that silence may not be taken as concurrence in the view expressed by the Senator from Virginia about this being taken up in public session, if the condition as disclosed is the actual condition existing in this governmental commission, legislation by Congress will be required by Congress to rectify it. I have been thinking of the legislative part of it, rather than of nominations pending, and I supposed that my colleague was addressing himself to a resolution now pending in the Senate asking for an investigation with a view of getting legislation that would remedy what is claimed, at least, to be a lack of efficiency in governmental service. It is proper to discuss that phase of the question in public session, and it ought to be discussed.

Mr. HOWELL. I have a resolution lying on the table to that effect, which I propose to ask to have taken up as soon as I

finish this statement, and that is the reason why I am making the statement at this time.

Mr. GLASS. I understood the very premise of the Senator's remarks to be the statement that there are now pending these four nominations of members of the Federal Land Bank Board, and that what he is presenting he is presenting with the design of convincing the Senate that it should not confirm those nominees.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not hear that statement. I came in just after my colleague had begun, and as I knew that he had such a resolution, I have been going on the theory that he was discussing that resolution.

Mr. GLASS. I am not making any point, because at the proper time all of this matter will be discussed.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I understood the Senator to remark a moment ago that it was his intention to call up a resolution which was on the table at the conclusion of his remarks. I might remind the Senator that there is now pending a motion, which is the business before the Senate, and I had hoped that we might dispose of that motion before taking a recess or adjourning to-night. Of course, in any event, it would not be possible, under parliamentary procedure, to consider the Senator's resolution while that motion is pending.

Mr. HOWELL. I propose to finish shortly, Mr. President. I continue the reading of Major Woods's testimony:

Senator HOWELL. Major, suppose a set of books had been provided in accord with the requirements in other departments by the Comptroller General—had been established at the outset by the Federal Land Bank Board, and this work had been done as he suggested, would it have required any additional help to what they now have?

Major Woods. Let me see if I understand the question. Do you mean in response to the Senate resolution would it require anything additional?

Senator HOWELL. No; I mean suppose they had set up a set of books at the outset as is required by the Comptroller General where he has authority, and that the employees in that office had written up these books every day as each transaction occurred, would it have required any additional help in that office?

Major Woods. I think not. I think they have the employees that are competent and capable to do it. Yes, sir; with what they have I think so.

Mr. DALE. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. DALE. I am very much interested not only in what the Senator from Nebraska is discussing, but I am particularly interested in what the Senator from New Jersey has in mind, and I would like to make this suggestion, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit. Why would it not be convenient for the Senator from Nebraska to let the Senator from New Jersey dispose of this matter? It will not take two minutes. Then the coast will be clear for the matter the Senator from Nebraska is discussing.

Mr. HOWELL. I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. DALE. I do not suggest that the Senator yield the floor, but that he simply yield for the disposition of this matter. There will be no discussion of it—simply a vote—and then it will be ended and out of the way. It seems to me this matter will impede the Senator when he comes to his resolution, because the motion will have the right of way over his resolution.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. Supplementing what the Senator from Vermont has stated, I assure the Senator from Nebraska that a number of Senators wish to go to their offices, and if the motion can be put and settled by the Senate at this time, we will all appreciate it. Under the parliamentary procedure the Senator would be compelled to give up the floor pending action on the motion, but if I secure recognition by the Chair I will gladly yield, and will make no effort to press the bill to-night, so that the Senator can conclude his remarks.

Mr. HOWELL. What is the motion?

Mr. EDGE. The pending motion is that the Senate proceed to consider the Senate bill providing for a reclassification of the salaries of employees in the Postal Service, which has been pending for some time. It is the work of a joint committee of the two Houses after two months' rather laborious consideration. My object, as the chairman of the subcommittee, is simply

to have it disposed of, and before the Senate, as the unfinished business.

Mr. STERLING. Then, if the motion prevails, the Senator from New Jersey will immediately ask to lay aside the bill?

Mr. EDGE. It will be laid aside, permitting the Senator to continue his debate. It is merely a matter of convenience.

Mr. HOWELL. Why could not this be taken up after I finish?

Mr. EDGE. Of course, the Senator has the floor, and it is entirely as the Senator elects. There are a number of Senators who are interested in having it disposed of who simply hope that it may be done at this time.

Mr. HOWELL. I do not wish to be discourteous, and if it would be of any advantage, I will yield. However, I do not wish to give up the floor and be deprived of the opportunity of going on this evening. If I can be assured that—

Mr. EDGE. I can only give the assurance of an individual Senator, that being the proponent of the motion, if I can be recognized, as I assume I will be, after the decision, I will yield the floor at once to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWELL. I think probably I had better go on.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to this fact, that these four nominees have been a majority of the Federal Farm Loan Board for nearly one year; that this condition of affairs has continued during this period; not only were three of these nominees involved in the creation of the office of fiscal agent and the elevation of Judge Lobdell to that office, but that the four members had been in control of the Federal Farm Loan Board for about one year, and this is the condition of affairs in which we find the accounts of that institution.

In my opinion, they have simply been riding. They have taken things as they found them. They have gone on in this loose manner, and they would have continued in this loose manner if this investigation had not taken place.

As a consequence, they are not men who can be said to be familiar with this sort of work, and that is one of the failures of our governmental institutions, the placing of men in positions of this character who are unfamiliar with that sort of activity, and as a consequence, when things are going at loose ends, they do not recognize the fact, and it goes on until the crash comes or a scandal is exposed.

If they did know, self-preservation alone would have dictated an immediate change in their method of handling the affairs of the Farm Loan Board, because anyone who has been concerned in public affairs realizes that whereas one may be careless about his own affairs and the expenditure of his own money, when he is careless in public affairs he takes his reputation and sometimes even his liberty in his hands and risks them.

So the Senate is to be confronted with this question, in view of these facts, of these conditions: Can it afford to put its stamp of approval upon the methods which have been in practice right up to the present time by approving and confirming these four nominees?

The fourth specification is, "Unlawful withdrawal of funds from the United States Treasury and the disbursement of such funds without the authority of Congress." As a result of this analysis and the investigations of the committee it was developed that between \$65,000 and \$70,000 had accrued through the use of Government credit, and that the funds belong to the United States Treasury, and yet the Farm Loan Board drew out these funds and expended them for various purposes. As to the method by which these accruals took place: Suppose they sold \$730,000 worth of Omaha land bank bonds to a customer in Chicago. They would send the bonds, with a draft attached, to Chicago with instructions to collect the face of the bonds, plus the accrued interest, up to, say, the 7th day of June. When the 7th day of June came the customer to whom the bonds had been sold would call for them and pay the face, plus the interest, to the 7th day of June. But, mark you, on the 5th day of June they would ask the Treasury to telegraph the Federal reserve bank in Omaha to pay to the Omaha land bank the face of the bonds, plus accrued interest, only to the 5th day of June. By this method, as the interest upon the bonds would amount to about \$100 a day, the Treasury would collect through the Federal bank in Chicago \$200 more than it was compelled to pay the Federal land bank in Omaha. Through these methods there accrued to the Treasury between \$65,000 and \$70,000 as determined by this analysis, and these funds have been drawn out of the Treasury by the farm loan commissioner and expended for various purposes. In an unofficial opinion from the Comptroller General we learned that he holds that those funds belong to the United States Treasury and should have been included in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. GLASS. May I ask the Senator if he does not know that in an official opinion by the Undersecretary of the Treasury, he contends that they do not belong to the United States Treasury?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I know that on the 13th day of May last the Undersecretary of the Treasury wrote a letter to the farm loan commissioner, and I want to read the closing paragraph of that letter. Speaking of an adjustment of the Treasury's claim for these funds, he said:

When I speak of a proper adjustment I appreciate that the argument can be made that all of the profits should inure to the Treasury, since its facilities made the profits possible. It is my understanding, therefore, that unless the adjustment is made promptly with the Treasury on the basis above outlined, my views shall not prejudice the Treasury's recovery of the full amount of the profits.

Mr. GLASS. Yes; but what are the views "above outlined"?

Mr. HOWELL. The views above outlined are that he is willing to compromise with them on a basis of 2 per cent for the use of the money.

Mr. GLASS. In other words, there is a controversy between the Treasury and the Farm Loan Board as to this particular fund, which the Senator should explain is merely constructive interest. It is what the bankers know as the "float," the constructive interest upon a certain sum of money for which credit is given at this end of the line and which is not collected at the other end of the line for several days. As a matter of fact, the Treasury was never out a dollar in the transaction.

Mr. HOWELL. I must take issue with the Senator from Virginia. Is it not a fact that the Treasury gets interest on its daily balances?

Mr. GLASS. Not altogether. It gets interest on its daily balances in recognized depositories.

Mr. HOWELL. Is it not a fact that all these bonds were delivered through recognized depositories?

Mr. GLASS. After all is said, the Senator is not charging any misappropriation of funds. He is pointing to the fact that the Treasury claims a part interest in the fund and that the Farm Loan Board denies that the Treasury has any interest in it, as I do not think it has, because the United States Government does not own these banks and the banks are not operated for the benefit of the United States Government. The Treasury puts its facilities at hand for the banks, and now it is proposing, through the Senator, to appropriate this constructive interest which accumulated through a system of that sort.

Mr. HOWELL. If I have the use of tremendous amounts of Government funds for two days, of course, I can make money. But consider, those bonds were sent to Chicago for delivery on the 7th day of June. On the 5th day of June the Farm Loan Board prevails upon the Government to pay the party who owns those bonds par value plus accrued interest. As a consequence the farm-loan bank in Omaha gets its money two days before the Government gets its money, and the Government money is used during the two days. Now, what was the situation? The Government had practically owned the bonds during that period of two days and was entitled to the interest accruing during those two days. It was the result of the Government paying that money two days before it is due, therefore the \$200 interest belongs to the United States Treasury. There is no question about that.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, there is a very grave question about it. The Undersecretary himself says there is a question about it, and he wants to compromise it, so grave is the question about it.

Mr. HOWELL. But a few moments ago the Senator suggested that he had stated there was no claim for it.

Mr. GLASS. Was not that the testimony before the committee?

Mr. HOWELL. Absolutely, but I did not intend to bring it up. That letter was written the day before such testimony was given by Chairman Cooper of the board.

Mr. GLASS. I was speaking to the testimony and I have not yet seen the letter from which the Senator quotes.

Mr. HOWELL. I have it here and shall be glad to let the Senator have it. The letter was written on Tuesday, mailed to the Farm Loan Board on that day, and on Wednesday afternoon Governor Cooper made the statement that the Undersecretary of the Treasury had told him that this money did not belong to the United States Treasury. I was amazed at the statement and immediately called up the Treasury. I say immediately, but it was next morning. He said he had made no such statement—he had written Governor Cooper a letter. I said, "Will you send me a copy of that letter?" I have the copy here as a part of this evidence.

Mr. FLETCHER. Who wrote the letter?

Mr. HOWELL. The Undersecretary of the Treasury.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is his name?

Mr. HOWELL. His name is Winston.

Furthermore, I wish to state that the whole question came up last July. It was discussed and the Undersecretary informed the Farm Loan Board that they would no longer pay money in advance of the date of receipt, and there have been no such accruals since July last year. And yet, although these facts were known to the members of the Farm Loan Board, to the four nominees under consideration, they have continued to draw out that money and have spent in the neighborhood of \$30,000 since that time. Their attention was challenged to what they were doing, but the trouble is that the Farm Loan Board has gotten in the habit of doing just exactly as it pleases. It has felt that it can run on as it sees fit. What it needs is control by some auditing authority.

Mr. President, I wonder, in view of these facts, inasmuch as the four nominees have been in control of the board for about one year, if the Senate of the United States can afford to put its stamp of approval upon these transactions by approving these nominations?

I come now to the fifth specification, "Looseness and neglect in the disbursement of funds." Public moneys having been expended without vouchers or receipts.

Take, for instance, Mr. President, the \$65,000 or \$70,000, heretofore referred to, that have been withdrawn from the Treasury without authority and expended without taking a voucher or a receipt. I have never before known of such a procedure in connection with a public enterprise.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. But the expenditure was a proper one, as I understand the Senator?

Mr. HOWELL. Indeed, I am going into that later, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina. First, I am calling attention to the fact that they have expended funds for which they have no vouchers; they can not tell for what the money was expended except as disclosed by stubs of check books and canceled checks; that is as far as they can go.

Take, for instance, Mr. President, the first question that I asked Judge Lobdell before the Committee on Banking and Currency last Wednesday:

Q. Judge Lobdell, who established that Franklin National Bank account?

I wish to state in this connection that for some time they drew on the Treasury for various amounts on the \$65,000 or \$70,000 of which I have spoken until in September, 1922, when they seemed to think it would be handier to have a private bank account in the name of the farm loan commissioner, and at that time they transferred to the Franklin National Bank \$5,000, and from that time on and down until the 16th day of February, 1923, they had transferred some \$37,000 to that account and expended it.

Q. Judge Lobdell, who established that Franklin National Bank account?

Judge LOBDELL. It was established pursuant to a conference of the board when I was farm loan commissioner in the name of the Farm Loan Board and subject to the check of the commissioner or the acting or deputy commissioner.

Q. That was while you were commissioner?

Judge LOBDELL. Yes, sir.

Q. Judge, is that a copy of the statement that was submitted to this committee as representing receipts and expenditures in connection with the Franklin National Bank account [handing paper to Judge Lobdell]?

Judge LOBDELL. Senator, I could not tell at a glance; but a copy of the Franklin account down to a given date was read into the record here, and that record is correct.

Q. That is a copy.

Judge LOBDELL. I assume so.

Q. I just want to identify it; that was all. Judge, I will ask you to refer to your vouchers respecting a check issued on that bank on the 6th day of October, 1922, amounting to \$563.

I might interpolate here that this \$563 was stated in one item in the account rendered, whereas it was represented by two checks, one for \$545 and the other for \$18.

Judge LOBDELL. That was for \$545; Elsie Wilkinson.

Senator HOWELL. \$563.

Senator PEPPER. \$545.

Judge LOBDELL. There is \$545 on the stub book.

Q. Very well. Who was that paid to, Judge?

Judge LOBDELL. The notation here would indicate that Senator HOWELL. Who was the check made payable to?

Judge LOBDELL. Elsie Wilkinson.

Q. Elsie Wilkinson. What was that for?

Judge LOBDELL. The notation here is, "Expenses incidental to bond sale." I could not give you the detailed items that enter into that. It would be some bonuses to employees for overtime, extra work, and other incidental expenditures of a sale that had just taken place.

Q. Who paid the expenses?

Judge LOBDELL. Miss Wilkinson disbursed them upon memoranda furnished by myself.

Q. Who were they disbursed to?

Judge LOBDELL. To employees.

Q. Will you give me the names, please?

Judge LOBDELL. I can not without—I do not know that I could at all. These memoranda were made at the time and were there until the account was audited by the auditing committee of the land bank presidents, which audited the accounts on the occasion of each meeting, and were not in the form of permanent vouchers.

Q. Do you mean to say that a check for \$500, and how much have you got it there, \$45?

Judge LOBDELL. \$45.

Q. Do you mean to say that a check for \$545 was drawn on this account payable to Miss Wilkinson and that you do not know what it was expended for?

Judge LOBDELL. All I can say is that I do not now know what it was expended for, but I did then, and it was properly expended.

Q. And you have no records whatever as to who got that money?

Judge LOBDELL. I would not say that. I could not say that I have had at any time. I can not tell you now, but I know that the record was only on memoranda to collect and disburse so much money to these various people.

Q. I asked you to bring over any data you had in reference to this matter?

Judge LOBDELL. You never asked me to bring anything.

Q. Can you give us something in reference to the expenditure of that money?

Judge LOBDELL. You did not ask me to bring anything.

Q. Well, I called you up over the telephone.

Judge LOBDELL. And I doubt very much if there could be found in the office of the Farm Loan Board now that memorandum which I then made.

Q. Very well. So you can not tell us who got that money?

Judge LOBDELL. No, sir; I can not.

This was the second Franklin National Bank item; \$563 was the amount of these two checks. There is nothing, Judge Lobdell states, in the office of the Farm Loan Board that indicates who got that money; but the money was drawn and paid to a young woman in the office, and she expended it. Judge Lobdell says that he can not tell to whom she gave it. Mr. President, that is an example of the way they have been conducting the affairs of the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

Mr. GLASS. I wonder if the Senator thinks that is exactly a fair statement of that item and that Judge Lobdell did not know, and the Farm Loan Board did not know, what that \$563 was drawn for and what disposition was made of it. Is not this the explicit fact, as testified to there, that periodically the Farm Loan Board, without any statutory obligation upon it but as a matter of service to the system, undertook to sell for the 12 land banks a certain aggregate amount of bonds the proceeds of which would thereafter be distributed to the 12 banks; that periodically when that should happen it was necessary to require the regular force of the Farm Loan Board to work over hours, night and day, because the board had no other facilities for the transaction of this particular business; that these regular employees for a period of 10 days or more would work overtime, night and day; that the chief clerk would keep a memorandum of the persons that were working over hours, night and day, and of the amount of overtime to which they were entitled; and that at the end of the period of bond sales a check would issue to the chief clerk, in the aggregate, and that the chief clerk would pay to the various employees their overtime? So that there was no question and never has been and could not be as to what the money was drawn for and as to the disposition of the money. The fact that Judge Lobdell several years afterwards can not state the names of the persons and in detail the amount that each person received is not of any significance.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, it may be that the distinguished Senator from Virginia thinks that it is perfectly proper

to draw funds from the Public Treasury and disburse them and not take a receipt or a voucher and furthermore be utterly unable to tell who got the money.

Mr. GLASS. Well, the Senator from Virginia does not think that that is a fair statement of the case; that is all.

Mr. HOWELL. That is exactly what took place. Judge Lobdell says he can not tell to whom that money went. But, Mr. President, let me continue further with the testimony of Judge Lobdell respecting this item of \$563:

Q. No, sir; I went there for this purpose, to go into this matter. Now, Judge Lobdell, will you kindly tell this committee how much of that money you got?

Judge LOBDELL. Personally not one cent. Now, it is very possible that in the course of the bond sales I had advanced money to pay for meals for somebody and was reimbursed. I can not answer for that. But for my own account, not one penny ever.

Q. Is it not a fact that you received \$55 of that amount?

Judge LOBDELL. Very probably so, sir, as I have stated.

Q. Do you know what you used that money for?

Judge LOBDELL. If I received it, I had advanced it to Mr. Field, who has charge of the feeding operations, for the purpose of securing meals. Occasionally it became necessary when we had to ship bonds out after the Treasury closed or on Sunday to hire taxicabs and guards to take them to the down-town office. We paid those expenses. I know at different times I did advance money.

Q. Who would you advance it to?

Judge LOBDELL. Ordinarily to O. J. Field.

Q. I asked you to whom you advanced this \$55.

Judge LOBDELL. I do not remember that I got money in that connection. It would be beyond peradventure to whom I did advance it.

Q. Didn't you state to me that you did receive that amount of money?

Judge LOBDELL. Probably so. When I wrote the memorandum it probably was included in the memorandum.

Q. And you can not state what it was used for?

Judge LOBDELL. I say it was advanced for somebody who was paying these expenses and that accrued.

Q. Is that as far as you can go in that explanation?

Judge LOBDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. President, I think I have made it plain in what I have said before that I am not here charging dishonesty. I have only touched the edge of these affairs; but I am here to say that a public official who conducts in this manner the affairs under his trusteeship is subject to the severest criticism. I am not going to tire the Senate with other matters that I went into. There were hundreds of items, and the committee allowed me to go into less than 20, on just one afternoon. Why, the very next item that I had on my list was \$1,000 paid to Judge Lobdell for personal expenses. I only had the opportunity, in these transactions involving \$881,000,000, of asking him about \$7,000 of items.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator has disclosed the fact that out of a total expenditure of \$881,000,000, covering a period of nearly eight years, he wanted the committee to sit there and hear him discuss with Judge Lobdell questions as to whose meal ticket he paid when those bond transactions were in progress.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, when a public official draws money from the Treasury he at least owes it to the public to secure a receipt or a voucher, and when you assume the position that it is unnecessary for him to do so you have taken a tremendously dangerous position in respect to public affairs.

I have been a public official for years. I would not think of expending a dollar without taking a receipt or a voucher. In fact, although I managed the gas, water, and ice plants in Omaha for years, and our income was three and a half million dollars, I would not expend a dollar in actual money. Everything had to be paid by check, with a requisition and voucher. It is the only safe way to proceed.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the logic of the Senator's position is that because Judge Lobdell did not take a receipt for these meal tickets, therefore these four gentlemen are not fit to be confirmed as members of the Federal Land Bank Board.

Mr. HOWELL. Did he take receipts for any of these payments?

Mr. GLASS. I have stated to the Senate just exactly what the process was. The stubs of the checks showed just the aggregate amount that was paid on these occasions. Judge Lobdell stated to the entire satisfaction of the Banking and Currency Committee just exactly what these comparatively trivial amounts were used for—paying regular employees for overtime work, night work, at these occasional periods of excessive activity—and Judge Lobdell, as to his own account, testified to the committee that it frequently occurred that he would advance

a trivial sum out of his own pocket to pay for the meals of these employees after bank hours. I think Judge Lobdell manifested extraordinary self-control and patience when a Senator was pounding the desk and asking him, "What did you do with that \$4.66 three years ago?"

Mr. HOWELL. When I asked the judge such questions, he said: "I did not take a receipt for it and I can not tell you what I did with it, or whether it is in my pocket or not." That is the fact. Judge Lobdell admitted that there had been drawn from that account \$37,000, and that they had no vouchers or receipts; and this \$565 was the second item on the Franklin National Bank account, and the committee only allowed me to go into 20 items all told, and then said, at the close of the afternoon, "We do not think it is a good idea to go on," and closed the hearings.

Mr. GLASS. Were they not 19 repetitions of the first item? Were they not of the same nature exactly?

Mr. HOWELL. I wonder if the Senator thinks that because you find that one item has been treated improperly it is useless to go into other similar items that have been also treated improperly?

Mr. GLASS. Oh, no. What I did think—and the committee agreed with me—was that when we found that one item was treated properly, that there was no imputation whatsoever, implicitly or otherwise, of wrongdoing, we did not want to sit there all day long, day after day, listening to repetition of the same sort of testimony.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, let me make it clear to the Senate again that after spending nearly two months going into these accounts this committee generously gave me one day to present the facts, and that I had the opportunity granted me of asking questions respecting not to exceed 20 items, involving not more than \$7,000 of these tremendous transactions. Then the committee considered that they had had enough.

Mr. GLASS. Just let the Senate for a moment consider this aspect of the case: There we were, called together textually to pass upon the fitness of four nominees as members of the Federal Land Bank Board, and the Senator was traversing thousands upon thousands of cash items that were entered from five to seven years before these gentlemen were nominated to the Senate for positions on this board. If the Senator will tell me what a cash item entered as far back as 1917 had to do with the fitness for membership on this Land Bank Board of four men appointed in 1923, perhaps he may induce me to agree with him.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the trouble is this: These were not new appointees. These men had served for about a year, and these men promoted Judge Lobdell from a position of \$10,000 a year to one of \$25,000 a year.

Mr. GLASS. And the Senator thinks that because these four men who had served a year could not tell what became of a meal ticket seven years theretofore they are unfit to be members of that board.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the statement of the Franklin Bank account. That account alone comprises 212 items. I was allowed to question Judge Lobdell alone—not the farm-loan commissioner or another member of the board—respecting these items. He was the only man; and when we got down to July 1, 1923, Judge Lobdell said: "Well, now, Senator, I can not tell you anything about what occurred after that time, because you know I was not then farm-loan commissioner." Did they put on the stand Governor Cooper, as I had asked? No; they went into executive session and then adjourned. They refused to go further. Did they put these nominees on the stand? No; the committee did not allow me to ask any one of them a question.

Mr. GLASS. I wonder if the Senator thinks he is just accurate there; that we would not go further. Read the record and see what it shows. It shows that I made the motion that unless the Senator had evidence of a new nature to present that we close the hearings. He did not ask that Governor Cooper or any member of the board be put on. He did not venture to say that he had anything of a different nature to prove than that which he had already presented. Had he done that the committee was perfectly willing to go on. That was the very prelude to the motion I made.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, at the opening of this the last hearing, May 14, 1924, I presented a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That letter indicated just whom I wanted to call to the stand, but when the distinguished Senator from Virginia, a member of that committee, proposed to close the hearing, I called the committee's attention again to the letter, and I think you will find that included the last word I said; that I wanted to go on, yet the Senator from Virginia says I had nothing further to show.

Mr. GLASS. I do not say the Senator had nothing further to show.

Mr. HOWELL. That is true. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. GLASS. What I distinctly did say was that if the Senator had anything of a different nature to show, I was willing to sit there and hear him.

Mr. HOWELL. But when I had asked that the other members of the Farm Loan Board be put on the stand, does not that indicate that I must have had something else to show?

Mr. GLASS. That letter had gone in at the first moments of the hearing.

Mr. HOWELL. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. I just offered it the other day when you started—May 14.

Mr. GLASS. As a matter of fact, you mailed it to us. I had a copy of it before the meeting was opened.

Mr. HOWELL. I sent it to the chairman, but as we proceeded I called the attention of the committee to that letter, and asked to have the witnesses there. When the committee decided not to allow me to go any further into the matter, I again called their attention to that letter and indicated my desire to proceed. They stopped me. They were reluctant to proceed. In fact, closed the hearings.

Mr. GLASS. That, Mr. President, I feel compelled to deny. The committee did not stop the Senator. The committee offered the Senator every opportunity in the world to present any new evidence, but the committee was not willing to sit there interminably and listen to a repetition of the meal-ticket proposition, and things of that description.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I regret very much that the testimony taken at these hearings has not yet been printed, but I think my memory is quite accurate with reference to the last thing I said at that hearing. I did insist that I should have the privilege of going on and calling these witnesses to the stand, and the committee refused—I state this now—to go on with that hearing.

Mr. GLASS. If the Senator will recall, his recollection during the hearing was not particularly accurate, because he expressed a willingness to go on the stand and testify under oath that the signature of a young man to a check was affixed within a few days theretofore, since he had originally seen that check, but the young man himself went on the stand and testified that he had indorsed that check months and months ago, perhaps years ago. The Senator will remember that, will he not?

Mr. HOWELL. The Senator is quite right, Mr. President—

Mr. GLASS. If I may intervene right here—

Mr. HOWELL. May I continue just a moment. I have given a great deal of attention to this matter. I could not get at all the records, but there were some few records that I examined. My memory was that certain checks were not in the condition in which they were when I had examined them before, I expressed my doubts at the time. Subsequently, however, I would not say positively, and if the Senator will remember, I said I would not then go any further respecting the checks, that "I will make no statement at this time." I became satisfied afterwards that I was mistaken.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator just said this, in terms; he took the check and examined it, and then he threw it down on the table and said, "I would go on the stand and take oath that that second signature was not on that check when I examined it several days ago."

I had no conception that these matters were to be discussed in the open Senate here. Evidently no other members of the committee had, because no other member of the committee is here. But I ask the Senator to let me insert in the Record, or if the Senator will, to insert in the Record, the letter of the Undersecretary of the Treasury from which he was willing to read only the last sentence a while ago with respect to this accumulated float.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not think the Senator wishes to place me in an improper light. I have had a great deal of territory to cover here, and I did not wish to read the entire letter. I read the latter portion of that letter.

Mr. GLASS. But that did not indicate the true import of the letter. The letter itself sustains my position absolutely, that the Treasury gave its facilities to the Federal Farm Loan Board for these bond transactions. There was no statute that compelled the Treasury to do it. There was nothing to authorize the Farm Loan Board to demand that the Treasury should do it, but the Treasury gave its facilities to the Farm Loan Board. And now, after this float has accumulated, there is a controversy as to the ownership of a part of that fund. I would not think the Senator could have any objection whatsoever to

printing in the RECORD at this point the letter of the Undersecretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HOWELL. Absolutely not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNDERSECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 13, 1924.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR COOPER: Major Woods, who made an analysis of the account of the farm-loan commissioner for the Treasury, which account has been submitted pursuant to a Senate resolution to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, is now preparing for me a statement showing the actual amount of credit given by the Treasury from time to time to the farm-loan commissioner in connection with the sale of farm-loan bonds and intermediate-credit debentures. The original practice of the Treasury was to give the farm-loan commissioner immediate credit when he deposited with the Treasurer of the United States a draft drawn on a purchaser of farm-loan bonds. In the usual course the draft was presented a day or so later and carried with it necessarily the extra day or days' interest on the farm-loan bonds which were being sold. This additional interest increased the farm-loan commissioner's account and was received only because of the immediate credit given by the Treasury. Since July, 1923, this practice of giving immediate credit has been changed, and at present the Treasury's relations with the farm-loan commissioner provide that the credit shall be available only when the draft representing the sale of the bonds is paid, so that since July none of this accretion has come into the accounts of the farm-loan commissioner.

The farm-loan bonds sold carried interest at from 4½ per cent to 4½ per cent per annum, and the accretions to the farm-loan commissioner's funds by reason of the credit given by the Treasury were, therefore, at this rate. The farm-loan bonds, however, at no time belonged to the Treasury, and, in my opinion, the rate of interest that these bonds bore is immaterial. Had the Treasury not given you the immediate credit you could probably have arranged similar credit with commercial banks. The question between the Treasury and you is therefore confined solely to the value of this immediate credit facility which could not exceed what you could have had a similar facility elsewhere for, and in my opinion should not be lower than what the Treasury would have received on bank balances on deposit with commercial banks. Since the Farm Loan Board is one of the Government facilities, the Treasury should make no profit out of transactions between the Treasury and the farm-loan commissioner.

I therefore feel that the proper adjustment between the Treasury and the farm-loan commissioner during the period that immediate credit was given should be interest on the amount of credit extended at the rate of 2 per cent, being the same rate paid on Government deposits by commercial banks, the relation in respect to this immediate credit between the farm-loan commissioner and the Treasury being considered that of banker and customer. When I speak of a proper adjustment I appreciate that the argument can be made that all of the profit should inure to the Treasury, since its facilities made the profit possible. It is my understanding, therefore, that unless the adjustment is made promptly with the Treasury on the basis above outlined, my views shall not prejudice the Treasury's recovery of the full amount of the profit.

Very truly yours,

GARRARD B. WINSTON,
Undersecretary of the Treasury.

Hon. R. A. COOPER,
Farm Loan Commissioner,
Federal Farm Loan Board, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HOWELL. I wish to call the Senator's attention to this fact, that whereas the distinguished Senator from Virginia suggests that this credit was given to the Farm Loan Board, yet the Treasury is now trying to get back part of it, at least.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, yes; but the Undersecretary states precisely there that the facility could have been gotten by the Farm Loan Board, very likely, from the banks of the country, and it was not doing it any very great service to tender the facilities of the Treasury to a newly established credit facility for the relief of the farmers of the country. Because a float has accumulated, somebody has suggested to somebody to put in a claim for a part of the money. I do not think they are entitled to a dollar of it.

During the delivery of Mr. HOWELL's speech,

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6357) for the reorganization and improvement of the foreign service of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6207) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice all that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation which lies in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5325) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DALLINGER, and Mr. HASTINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 to the bill (H. R. 8350) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 22 and 23 to the said bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ORDER FOR THURSDAY EVENING ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nebraska to yield in order to allow me to present a request for unanimous consent and let whatever debate occurs under it be placed either before or after the Senator's remarks.

Mr. HOWELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business on Thursday afternoon next it shall take a recess until 8 o'clock in the evening and that at the evening session, between 8 and 11 o'clock, the calendar shall be taken up under Rule VIII, beginning where we left off at the last call of the calendar, which was, as I recall, Order of Business 464.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. And unobjected bills only to be considered.

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. The Senator left out the reference to unobjected bills.

Mr. CURTIS. To consider only unobjected bills on the calendar.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to say to the Senator that the Committee on Agriculture is meeting at night now, as well as during the day, and I want it understood that there will be no other business transacted.

Mr. CURTIS. I confine my request to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator whether we are likely to have an opportunity for the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there may be objection or which, probably, not being objected to, may require longer debate than can be had under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it was my intention, if we could get through the calendar of unobjected bills on next Thursday night—and I think we can do that—then to ask for an adjournment each evening for several days so that there may be two hours in the morning to take up bills on motion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to say to the Senator and to the Senate that there are two or three bills on the calendar that are quite important. I do not anticipate that there will be objection to them, or that it will be desired to discuss them to any considerable extent, although as to one of them a Senator, while not opposing the bill, wishes to take about a half hour to discuss it. Those bills are of considerable importance, however, and I want to say that I want them considered and acted upon before this session is over.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I will even add, further, that if these unobjected bills are completed I should be willing to ask for a night session to consider bills on the calendar when the committees get through holding their night sessions.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not apply, however, to Thursday?

Mr. CURTIS. No; Thursday night, unobjected bills under the five-minute rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to say just a word further. I do not want to coerce anybody, or anything like that; but there are, as I say, two or three of these bills on the calendar that I am going to insist so far as I can on having disposed of before the Senate quits for the summer.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I want to make this announcement: The Committee on Interstate Commerce has reported a bill which forbids the collection of what is known as the Pullman surcharge. There have been introduced in the body at the other end of the Capitol some 80 or 90 bills, and there have been introduced in this body some 10 or 15 bills to the same effect. I desire to move at the first opportunity that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill if objection is made when it is reached on the calendar under the order that the Senator from Kansas suggests. I have no objection to the request for Thursday evening submitted by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. This is only unobjected bills.

Mr. ROBINSON. Only unobjected bills.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will state frankly that one of the two bills I have in mind is the bill amending a couple of sections of the shipping act, to which I anticipate there will be really no objection, and which I have not had any time with yet. We have not reached it. The other bill is a very important measure relating to the fisheries in Alaska. That bill ought to be passed very, very soon. I shall not object to this request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

The agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business on Thursday afternoon, May 22, 1924, it take a recess until 8 p. m.; that at the evening session the Senate shall consider only unobjected bills on the calendar under Rule VIII, and at not later than 11 p. m. take a recess or adjourn until Friday.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I make the request that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

After Mr. HOWELL had yielded the floor for the day,

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8350) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

W. L. JONES,
CHARLES CURTIS,
H. C. LODGE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

MILTON W. SHREVE,
GEO. HOLDEN TINKHAM,
W. B. OLIVER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is not a complete agreement?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is a complete disagreement, and I am going to ask that the amendments made by the House to the two Senate amendments be agreed to.

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

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the action of the House be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 20, 1924.

Resolved, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 to the bill H. R. 8250, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes," and concurs therein.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22, and concurs therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "each, whose aggregate compensation shall not exceed \$80,000."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 23, and concurs therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by said amendment insert the following: "but the Attorney General may fix the compensation of not to exceed six persons at not to exceed \$10,000 each."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 22 and 23.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator explain briefly the effect of agreeing to his motion?

Mr. JONES of Washington. As the Senate passed the bill we provided for two attorneys, who might be paid only \$10,000 a year. The House inserted an amendment so that the aggregate of the two should not exceed \$30,000.

In the other case the Senate provided for eight; that the Attorney General might fix the salary up to \$10,000. This limits it to six.

Mr. ROBINSON. I see no objection to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator from North Carolina withhold that motion for a moment?

Mr. OVERMAN. I will withhold the motion for a moment.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. EDGE. Is it not entirely parliamentary now for the President to put the motion which is now pending to make Senate bill 1898 the unfinished business? Can not that be done?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion made by the Senator from North Carolina can be made at any time, and it does not disturb the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. I appreciate that my motion is still pending, but I am wondering if we can not call it up to-night, inasmuch as the Senator from North Carolina withholds his motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate can dispose of the motion of the Senator from North Carolina by a vote. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina 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 five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and the Senate (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 21, 1924, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 20, 1924

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1924:

Everett W. Abdill.
Crutchfield Adair.
Reed M. B. Adams.
John L. Allen.
Howell Armore.
Noble W. Abrahams.
Joseph W. Adams, jr.
John F. Addoms.
Rae E. Arison.
Bernard L. Austin.
Leo A. Bachman.
William B. Bailey.
Hanson W. Baldwin.
Frank H. Ball.
Herbert B. Ballinger.
Arthur D. Barnes.
Arthur W. Bass.
Herbert P. Bearce.
Stephen R. Bedford.
Frederick J. Bell.
Donald B. Bennett.
Robert S. Bertschy.
Brainerd N. Bock.
Phillip M. Boltz.
Maurice M. Bradley.
Wilkie H. Brereton.
Laurance L. Browning.

Samuel M. Bailey.
Roland V. Baillie.
John A. Baldwin.
Thomas J. Ball.
Stephen G. Barchet.
Richard S. Baron.
Wallace M. Beakley.
Charles E. Beatty.
Adolph Bednar.
Russell J. Bellerby.
Elmer E. Berthold.
LeRoy E. Blaylock.
Alfred J. Bolton.
Richard J. Bourke, jr.
John W. C. Brand.
William D. Brown.
Paul K. Bryant.
Forrest R. Bunker.
Harry Burris.
Stone E. Bush.
George M. Brydon, jr.
Eugene C. Burchett.
Sherman E. Burroughs, jr.
John W. Buxton.
Joe M. Cabanillas.
Joseph A. Callaghan.
Allen P. Calvert.

Thomas S. Cameron.
 Robert I. Campbell, jr.
 Arthur G. Carney.
 Chester E. Carroll.
 Robley W. Clark.
 Willis E. Cleaves.
 Forrest Close.
 William M. Cole.
 Dewey H. Collins.
 Stockton B. Colt, jr.
 Edward P. Creehan.
 Charles B. Cross, jr.
 Carl E. Cullen.
 Shirley Y. Cutler.
 Allston D. Calhoun, Jr.
 Charles H. Callaway.
 Donald A. Cameron.
 Lee F. Campbell.
 Richard P. Carlson.
 Robert S. Carr.
 Ralph C. Carroll.
 Albert J. Clausen.
 Edward W. Clextion.
 William P. Cochran, jr.
 Lewis E. Coley.
 Howard L. Collins.
 John F. Cooke.
 John P. Cromwell.
 Edward F. Crowe.
 Edmund A. Cunningham.
 James R. Dancy.
 John C. Daniel.
 Frederick A. L. Dartsch.
 Frank R. Davis.
 Douglas T. Day, jr.
 Harold R. Demarest.
 Maurice M. De Wolf.
 Arthur B. Dickie.
 Edward V. Dockweiler.
 Joseph F. Dahlgren.
 Henry C. Daniel.
 Tillman T. Dantzer.
 Edmund B. Dascomb.
 William V. Davis, jr.
 Frank E. Dean.
 William V. Deutermann.
 Walter C. Dey.
 Henry C. Doan.
 Burton L. Doggett.
 William S. Domer.
 Hammond J. Dugan.
 Peter H. H. Dunn.
 Thomas H. Dyer.
 Henry C. Drexler.
 Irving T. Duke.
 William H. Duvall.
 Walter T. Eckberg.
 Louis B. Edwards.
 Arthur B. Elliott.
 Norman W. Ellis.
 William L. Erdmann.
 Robert W. Esmond.
 William A. Evans, jr.
 Kenneth Earl.
 Harold B. Edgar.
 Clarence E. Ekstrom.
 Ezra M. Ellis.
 John T. Engeman, jr.
 Hampton M. Ericsson.
 George W. Evans, jr.
 Joseph A. Farrell, jr.
 Clifford A. Fines.
 William G. Fisher.
 James M. Flynn.
 Joseph W. Fowler.
 Dennis L. Francis.
 Thomas E. Fraser.
 Frederick R. Furth.
 Donald W. Fairbairn.
 Charles A. Ferriter.
 Howell C. Fish.
 Hickory C. Floed.
 Clinton H. F. Folger.
 William C. France.
 Louis P. Frank.
 Archie J. Freels.
 Wayne N. Gamet.
 Francis H. Gardner.
 Herbert K. Gates.
 Robert Goldthwaite.
 Tom Gore, jr.
 Walter M. Graesser.
 George M. Granbery.
 Orville F. Gregor.
 Thomas R. Griffith, jr.
 Edward F. Gallagher.
 Richard G. Ganahl.
 Joseph H. Garvin.
 Edward E. Gminder.
 Henry W. Goodall.
 Marcel E. A. Gouin.
 Paul Graf.
 Francis J. Grandfield.
 Arthur A. Griese.
 Louis H. Gwinn.
 Harrell W. Hall.
 Alvin B. Harmon.
 John C. Harris.
 Albert Handly.
 Dale Harris.
 Henry H. Harrison.
 Frederick C. Hartman, jr.
 Warren W. Harvey.
 Leslie H. Hawkinson.
 John D. Hayes.
 Hubert M. Hayter.
 Truman J. Hedding.
 Lee R. Herring.
 William A. Hickey.
 Charles M. E. Hoffman.
 James B. Hogle.
 John S. Holtzclaw.
 Arthur N. Hooper.
 Hallsted L. Hopping.
 Henry P. Howard, jr.
 Crichton N. Hubbard.
 Edward N. W. Hunter.
 John K. Hyatt.
 Glenn R. Hartwig.
 Robert S. Hatcher.
 John A. Hayes.
 William S. Hays.
 Francis M. Heddens.
 Minor C. Heine.
 Lewis B. Herrington, jr.
 Stuart W. Hill.
 John T. Hogg.
 John A. Holbrook.
 Francis M. Hock.
 Howard V. Hopkins.
 Donald F. Horne.
 Charles S. Hough.
 George F. Howland.
 Thomas A. Huckins.
 Adrian M. Hurst.
 Jere D. Hyde.
 Frederick J. Ilsemann.
 Elijah W. Irish.
 Joseph F. Johnson.
 Robert H. G. Johnson.
 Howell A. Jones.
 Richard F. Johnson, jr.
 Michael I. Kearns.
 Samuel G. Kelly.
 Harry G. Kent.
 George C. King.
 Thomas J. Kirkland, jr.
 Arnold R. Kline.
 Alexander W. Kreiser, jr.
 William A. Kanakanui.
 Robert H. Keliber.
 John M. Kennaday.
 Robert A. Keyer, jr.
 Sidney King.
 Gordon D. Kissam.
 Wendell E. Kraft.
 Alfred T. Krock.
 James S. Laidlaw.
 James C. Landstreet.
 Hugh R. Lamberth.
 Wilfred E. Lankenau.
 Samuel E. Latimer.
 Edwin T. Layton.
 Charles L. Lee.
 Harold M. Leslie.
 Joseph S. Lillard.
 Theodor C. Linthicum.
 Robert G. Lockhart.
 James D. Lovejoy.
 Robert W. Larson.
 Frank C. Layne.
 Walter D. Leach, jr.
 Charles A. Legg.
 Arthur B. Leverett.
 Albert R. Linholm.
 Roy W. Lishness.
 William J. Longfellow.
 Sumner K. MacLean.
 Frank W. MacDonald.
 William R. McCaleb.
 Ralph T. McDaniel.
 Charles E. McDonald.
 Archibald G. W. McFadden.
 Ira C. McKee.
 Donald F. McLean.
 Hugh B. McLean.
 Daniel J. McCallum.
 Charles C. McDonald.
 James F. McDonough.
 James H. McIntosh.
 Alonzo E. McLaughlin.
 Ephraim R. McLean, jr.
 Lawrence J. McPeake.
 Wilbur L. Mellon.
 William N. Mansfield.
 Hugh J. Martin.
 William G. Michelet.
 Ralph E. Mills.
 William J. Mitchell.
 Elliott M. Moore.
 John H. Morrill.
 Elbert M. Murphy.
 Austen V. Magly.
 John A. Marsh.
 Bob O. Mathews.
 Preston V. Mercer.
 Harold B. Miller.
 Robert O. Minter.
 George C. Montgomery.
 Armand M. Morgan.
 Richard S. Moss.
 Edgar T. Neale.
 Bromfield B. Nichol.
 Thomas D. Napier.
 Clyde J. Nesser.
 Louis W. Nuesse.
 Ira H. Nunn.
 Charles W. Oexle.
 John N. Opie, 3d.
 Adolph H. Oswald.
 Solomon F. Oden.
 Gerald B. Ogle.
 William R. Ostertag.
 James R. Pahl.
 Elton C. Parker.
 Richard J. Penny.
 Roger E. Perry.
 George Edmund Peterson.
 Woodward Phelps.
 Roger D. Phillips.
 Claiborne H. Price.
 Herrmann G. Page.
 Elbert A. Palmer, jr.
 George W. Patterson, jr.
 Albert N. Perkins.
 Wallis F. Petersen.
 George Edward Peterson.
 Neill Phillips.
 Richard E. Playter.
 Bertrand D. Quinn.
 Arthur M. Quale.
 Donald J. Ramsey.
 Edward W. Rawlins.
 Claude B. Reese.
 Fitzhugh L. Rhea.
 William L. Richards.
 James B. Ricketts, jr.
 Virginius R. Roane.
 George N. Robillard.
 Louis Roedel.
 John B. Rooney.
 Milton H. Roths.
 John R. Ruhsenberger.
 Thomas C. Ragan.
 Andrew K. Randolph.
 Henry T. Read.
 George Reith, jr.
 Lester K. Rice.
 Henry E. Richter.
 Thomas C. Ritchie.
 Norman K. Roberts.
 Hunter R. Robinson.
 Eugene C. Rook.
 Rufus E. Rose, jr.
 Colby G. Rucker.
 Burnice L. Rutt.
 Herman Sall.
 Merle A. Sawyer.
 John J. Scheibeler.
 Max Schreiner.
 Erskine A. Seay.
 John T. Shannon.
 John R. Sanford, jr.
 Robert E. Sayre.
 Charles A. Schenck, jr.
 Eugene T. Seaward.
 Elliott W. Shanklin.
 Louis D. Sharp, jr.
 Joshua C. Shively.
 Theodore J. Shultz.
 Walter W. Siegrist.
 George A. Sinclair.
 Thomas U. Sisson.
 James W. Smith.
 Harrison B. Southworth.
 Emory W. Stephens.
 William P. Stone.
 George W. Stott.
 Franklin A. Strohecker.
 James E. Sullivan.
 Robert L. Swart.
 Harold M. Sylvester.
 Herbert P. Sheldon.
 Wallace B. Short.
 Paul W. Siegrist.
 William F. Simmons.
 Samuel J. Singer.
 Harold P. Smith.
 Thomas C. Southerland.
 John E. Spahn.
 Gordon M. Stoddard.
 Max C. Stormes.
 Richard F. Stout.
 Charles J. Stuart.
 Robert C. Sutliff.
 John M. Sweeney.
 Edwin J. Taylor, jr.
 Myron S. Teller.
 Thomas H. Templeton.
 Lloyd H. Thomas.
 William B. Thompson.
 Harold H. Tiemroth.
 James R. Topper.
 Arthur M. Townsend.
 Thomas A. Turner, jr.
 William P. Tammany.
 Joseph I. Taylor, jr.
 Harry B. Temple.
 Joseph P. Thew.
 Arthur L. Thompson.
 Murray J. Tichenor.
 Charles T. Tonkin, jr.
 George C. Townner.
 Osgood V. Tracy.
 Walter V. R. Vieweg.
 Aurelius B. Vosseller.
 William E. Verge.
 Robert A. Vos.
 John C. Waldron.
 Audley L. Warburton.

Ethelbert Watts.
 Richard C. Webb, jr.
 Alan Wehr.
 Edmund W. Whitehead.
 Robert T. Wald.
 Raymond R. Waller.
 John T. Warren.
 Paul L. F. Weaver.
 William W. Weeden, jr.
 Homer B. Wheeler.
 David D. Wight.
 Charles W. Wilkins.
 Jack B. Williams.
 Stanley A. Williams.
 Clarence L. Winecoff.
 Edgar L. Witmer.

Arthur C. Wood.
 Joseph J. Woodward.
 Joseph M. Worthington.
 Warren D. Wilkin.
 Edwin R. Wilkinson.
 Roy D. Williams.
 Ralph E. Wilson.
 Cameron M. Winslow, jr.
 Joseph E. Wolowsky.
 Chester C. Wood.
 Edward L. Woodyard.
 Joseph M. P. Wright.
 Elmer E. Yeomans.
 Edward W. Young.
 Rufus C. Young, jr.
 Berndard T. Zelenka.

The following-named midshipmen to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 5th day of June, 1924:

Joe T. Davies.
 George E. Hake.
 Joseph L. Herlihy.
 Malcolm A. Norcross.

William L. Patten.
 Alfred P. Randolph.
 John E. Wymond.

MARINE CORPS

The following-named midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of June, 1924:

Raymond A. Anderson.
 Robert O. Bare.
 Herbert P. Becker.
 George H. Bellinger, jr.
 Theodore Blanchard.
 Arthur G. Blesener.
 Charles F. Cresswell.
 Lawrence W. Dalton.
 Charles L. Fike.
 Floyd M. Fletcher.
 Walter H. French.
 James H. N. Hudnall.
 Alan T. Hunt.

Ralph D. McAfee.
 Charles G. Meints.
 William C. Purple.
 Charles F. Replinger.
 John R. Rhamstine.
 Frank E. Sessions, jr.
 Prentice A. Shiebler.
 Perry K. Smith.
 Gerald H. Steenberg.
 Henry P. Stevens, jr.
 Walter J. Stuart.
 Donald G. Willis.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named citizens of the States indicated opposite their names to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 12th day of May, 1924:

Ora M. Holman of Indiana.
 Clifton A. Young of Pennsylvania.

The following-named citizens of the States indicated opposite their names to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 10th day of June, 1924:

Walter B. Wolfe of Missouri.
 John M. Bachulus of Connecticut.
 David C. Elliott of Ohio.
 Harry D. Templeton of Indiana.
 Cleveland E. Branner of Virginia.
 Charles Stewart of Pennsylvania.
 William H. Turnley of Virginia.
 William A. Strauss of Maryland.
 Walter F. J. Karbach of Texas.
 Charlie H. Ailman of Virginia.
 Elmer T. Cure of Indiana.
 John F. Moriarty of Massachusetts.
 John M. Barnes of District of Columbia.
 Richard B. Talbott of West Virginia.
 Leon D. Carson of Illinois.
 Victor W. Hart of Ohio.
 Arthur J. Hamilton of Michigan.
 George C. Main of Illinois.
 Harold B. Rae of South Dakota.
 Donald E. Dement of California.
 William E. Pinner of Virginia.
 Dwight J. Wharton of Missouri.
 Henry G. Backer of Indiana.
 Merrill R. Fox of Pennsylvania.
 John W. Parent of Maine.
 Arthur P. Morton of Virginia.
 Howard E. Hill of Indiana.
 Oliver R. Nees of Indiana.
 John L. Thornton of Virginia.
 Claude L. Taylor of Pennsylvania.
 Robert E. Baker of Ohio.
 Horace E. Brown of Tennessee.

Harvey E. Robins of West Virginia.
 Robert K. Y. Dusenberre of New York.
 John L. Emenhiser of Indiana.
 Carl D. Middlestadt of Indiana.
 Beryl C. Shearer of Iowa.
 Charles H. Bitner of Pennsylvania.
 Charles C. Yanquell of Ohio.
 John Q. Owsley, jr., of Tennessee.
 John F. Luten of Tennessee.
 Roy L. Mullins of Virginia.
 Arra B. Chessner of Indiana.
 Lloyd R. Newhouser of Indiana.
 Joseph I. Porter of Utah.
 Israel Levin of Pennsylvania.
 Henry M. Weber of Maryland.
 Harold E. List of Indiana.
 Francis J. Vurpillat of Illinois.
 Max E. Wonders of Nebraska.
 John R. Smith of Ohio.
 Henry J. Winkler of West Virginia.
 Harold D. Fritzk of Ohio.
 Thomas F. Cooper of Missouri.
 John M. Beall of Louisiana.
 Walter A. Hornaday of Indiana.
 George C. Thomas of Pennsylvania.
 Leonard L. Wilson of North Carolina.
 John M. Woodward of Tennessee.
 David W. Truscott of Pennsylvania.
 Fay H. Falconer of California.
 Wilbur J. Cox of Indiana.
 Harold W. Gillen of Indiana.
 John R. Lynas of Indiana.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20, 1924

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Arthur Rogers to be United States marshal, western district of Tennessee.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Hugh H. Dale, Camden.
 Louie W. Vaughan, Cuba.
 Griffin G. Guest, Fort Payne.
 Howard F. Little, Linden.
 William L. Jones, Parrish.
 Annie L. Pittman, Shawmut.
 Guy Walker, Somerville.
 Samuel J. Tucker, Springville.
 Andrew J. Bass, jr., Trussville.
 Alden M. Wallace, Tuskegee.

ILLINOIS

Lottie M. Jones, Antioch.
 Francis W. Craig, Apple River.
 Edwin C. O'Brien, Barry.
 Frank G. Robinson, El Paso.
 John H. Stolle, Evansville.
 Andrew R. Tarbox, Gibson City.
 Jessie A. Livingston, Livingston.
 Anna J. Arthur, Lovejoy.
 August Kaibitz, Red Bud.
 Harry Hutchins, Rockton.
 Henry H. Pierce, Royalton.
 Christian Andres, Tinley Park.
 Simon K. Lewis, Utica.
 Laura A. Gregory, Willisville.
 Harry L. Dean, Witt.

INDIANA

Clara A. Salla, Denham.
 Walter C. Farrell, Middletown.
 Iva D. Myers, Millersburg.
 Warren B. Johnson, Owensville.

IOWA

Clyde C. Sheaffer, Alden.
 William M. Young, Defiance.
 Howard B. Gillespie, Guthrie Center.
 Frank T. Best, Pomeroy.

KANSAS

Henry M. Highland, McCune.
 Ulysses G. Stewart, Rossville.
 Susie J. Gibbons, St. Paul.

MAINE

Fred E. Jones, Brownville.
Perley M. Hanson, East Millinocket.
Frank G. Thompson, Milo.

MASSACHUSETTS

William P. Lovejoy, Barnstable.
James E. Sullivan, Gilbertville.
John A. Bell, Leicester.

MINNESOTA

Henry O. Halverson, Gonvick.
Egbert J. Hasbrouck, Graceville.
Hans P. Becken, Hanska.

MONTANA

Charles W. Allison, Bainville.
George C. Core, Choteau.
Avory W. Dehnert, Denton.
George W. Patterson, Havre.
Robert T. Richardson, Missoula.
Hugh C. Walker, Poplar.
Claude C. Alexander, Stanford.
Robert Parsons, Sweetgrass.
Thomas E. Devore, Whitehall.

NEBRASKA

Jesse R. Teagarden, Bethany.
Minnie L. Smith, Blue Springs.
Oscar M. Fenstermacher, Cedar Bluffs.
Henry V. Ingram, Exeter.
Frank W. Fuhlrott, Fremont.
Archie L. Smith, Imperial.

NORTH CAROLINA

John E. Corbitt, Sunbury.
Thomas A. Kennedy, Troutmans.

NORTH DAKOTA

Benjamin L. Anderson, Grenora.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William R. Amoo, Morrirstown.

TENNESSEE

James M. Gresham, Smyrna.

WYOMING

Frank G. Brown, Fort Laramie.
Neletta P. Howard, Manville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God of mercy and forgiveness, do Thou hear the unexpressed voices of our breasts and accept us again as Thy needful children. May we strive to become worthy, even in some little way, of Thy countless blessings. Imbue us thoroughly with a lasting devotion to all the essential needs of our country. Come from behind the clouds of uncertainty and unwisdom and be the beacon light on our pathways. If either stress, strain, or storm is our portion may we realize that God is good and blessed forevermore. In the name of Jesus our Savior we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 2327. An act to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded in pursuance of the Constitution to reconsider the bill (H. R. 7959) entitled "An act to provide adjusted compensation for the veterans of the World War, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, with his objections, and passed by the House on a reconsideration of the same, it was passed, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

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 House to the bill (S. 2169) to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 2327. An act to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2928. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept certain lands in the vicinity of Pensacola, Fla., to assure a suitable water supply for the United States Naval Air Station at Pensacola; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 933. An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 588. An act for the relief of Daniel A. Spaight and others; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 95. A joint resolution to authorize the American National Red Cross to continue the use of temporary buildings now erected on square numbered 172, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 830. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Wooten; to the Committee on War Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GELLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire leave of absence for the day to undergo a slight medical operation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted. There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference report on the bill (H. R. 8350) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

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

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8350) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

MILTON W. SHREVE,
GEO. HOLDEN TINKHAM,
W. B. OLIVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES,
CHARLES CURTIS,
H. C. LODGE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
WM. J. HARRIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8350) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, submit the following statement:

Senate amendments Nos. 21, 22, and 23, upon which the two Houses have not agreed and upon which the committee of conference have not agreed, relate to the number and salaries of attorneys under the appropriation for the investigation and prosecution of war frauds.

MILTON W. SHREVE,
W. B. OLIVER,
GEO. HOLDEN TINKHAM,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur on amendment No. 21.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House recede and concur on amendment No. 21—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, let it be reported, please.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 5, strike out the words "one person," and insert in lieu thereof "two persons."

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman withhold that, please?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I can not withhold anything, brother, unless it is a personal matter. I will withhold anything that is personal.

Mr. SHREVE. We desire very much to get these conference reports out of the way, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I know; but we could have done that last night. Unless it is a personal request I will have to make the point.

Mr. SHREVE. Then I will make it personal, and I am sure the gentleman will grant me that courtesy.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I will if you make it personal.

Mr. SHREVE. I will make it a personal matter.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask indefinite leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. PERLMAN, on account of illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted. The Chair would suggest that when gentlemen wish to request leave of absence, it is better to put it in writing.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I call up amendment No. 22. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 7, after the word "annum," insert the word "each."

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHREVE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "each, whose aggregate compensation will not exceed \$30,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The next amendment in disagreement is No. 23, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 7, amendment No. 23: Strike out "Provided further, That the compensation agreed to be paid to any person by the Department of Justice shall be definitely fixed at the time of employment" and insert "But the Attorney General may fix the compensation of not to exceed eight persons at not to exceed \$10,000 each."

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman grant me two minutes on that?

The SPEAKER. The clerk will first report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHREVE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "But the Attorney General may fix the compensation of not to exceed six persons at not to exceed \$10,000 each."

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas two minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we have in the Department of Justice former colleagues who are some of the ablest lawyers in the United States. They served their country well here in the House at a salary of \$7,500, but now you are arranging for this big army of lawyers in the Department of Justice to be

continued on and permit salaries to be continued at outrageous sums. This ought not to be allowed. There is no necessity for the six at \$10,000 a year. There is no chance to beat it; it is going to be passed. If there were any chance on earth to stop it I would do everything possible, but I realize there is no way to stop it. You are going to pass it, but I could not let it pass without my protest.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the conference committee have worked along the line suggested by the gentleman from Texas. We have reduced the number from eight to six, and I hope another year we may be able to make another reduction.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. At the present time they are employing 10 and we have reduced the number to 6.

Mr. McKEOWN. Are these special assistants for the Attorney General?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; they are employed in the fraud cases.

Mr. McKEOWN. What salary do the regular assistants to the Attorney General get?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Seven thousand five hundred dollars a year.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman think that the regular assistants do more hard work than any special assistants?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; but the special assistants are called in only for a short time and may not be occupied during the year.

Mr. McKEOWN. At the rate of \$10,000 a year instead of a lump sum?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. What has been done in respect to the assistant attorneys general and employees whose compensation is to be fixed?

Mr. SHREVE. They are to be paid not exceeding \$10,000.

Mr. WATKINS. None of them to get over that?

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. WATKINS. What has been done in respect to fixing the compensation at the time of employment?

Mr. SHREVE. It must be fixed on the date of the employment.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the conference report if he will yield me five minutes to speak out of order. I will state to the gentleman what I have in mind. I have here a statement from an ex-service man—

Mr. SHREVE. I will yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to speak out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there is always a time in every man's life when he is called on to take stock or make a mental trial balance for the purpose of seeing whether or not his conscience approves his conduct in the past. I am told that in less than a stone's throw from the United States Capitol there is a great building which is used by our Government to house one of its departments, that was given back to our Nation by a man while on his deathbed because he had stolen the material from the Government and constructed this building therefrom. Realizing that he was soon to die, and fearing to meet old St. Peter with the knowledge that he had defrauded the Government, he decided that the time for him to take stock had arrived and he deeded the same back to the United States Government.

Out in western Oklahoma, in the district which I have the honor to represent, lives a country boy who, while traveling about in the Army waiting for his salary check, took advantage of the absence of the man in charge and yielded to the temptation of taking some of the canteen funds. He was broke; without some of the necessities of life; and did not feel that this act would wrong any person.

The war was concluded and he returned to his home. Later he got religion and then he wrote me a letter calling attention to the fact that he had wrongfully taken this money while in the Army. He stated that his conscience hurt him so badly that he could not sleep, and he wanted to know what to do in order to right the wrong. I hold in my hand a postal money order for \$25. In his letter he asks that I take this and put it in the right place, so he can have peace of mind in the future.

I think any lad who is willing to voluntarily do that which is right, and more especially when no individual has been wronged, must have a case of real religion, and I am glad to pay tribute to this young farmer boy by calling his way of making amends

to the attention of the United States Congress, as I feel his attitude is commendable from every standpoint.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my attention was called this morning to a letter which came in the mail from some firm in New York, and especially the last paragraph, which is addressed to the President of the United States, as follows:

For Congress to pass this bonus bill on top of the Veterans' Bureau scandal, in my judgment, would be adding one scandal to another. I have no doubt the voters will make their sentiments known when the time comes, and you will profit at the expense of the Members of Congress. Many a man has paid the penalty of treason for a less offense against the country than this bonus bill constitutes.

The writer of this letter disguises his business and no one can tell by his stationery whether or not he follows an honorable occupation. The fact that his address is in the principal business part of New York City is sufficient to class him with the plutocrats, and I am not surprised that he is against doing anything for the men who fought for this Nation while there was a class of profiteers who systematically robbed the fathers and mothers of these same soldiers during the war. I want to say to this Congress, if the great horde of high financiers who profited, defrauded, and robbed the American people during the war would follow the example of this poor, honest, ex-service man who got religion, and pay back into the conscience fund of our Government the money that had been wrongfully taken from our people, it would not be necessary for anyone to complain of the cost of bonus legislation, for the reason there would be sufficient money to take care of the same without adding to the taxpayers of the Nation an extra burden. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, before that vote is taken I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the return to the Hall of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN], he be given five minutes in which to give me the name, which he promised to give me, of some one man in a penitentiary of the United States, sent there as the result of the \$6,000,000 which we have appropriated for the prosecution of war grafters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 8262) to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government.

REORGANIZATION OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6357) for the reorganization and improvement of the foreign service of the United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts calls up the bill providing for the reorganization of the foreign service, with Senate amendments thereto, and asks unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "as ambassador or minister" and insert "to some other position in the Government service."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 19, after the word "gathering" insert: "Provided further, That the Secretary of State is authorized to prescribe a per diem allowance not exceeding \$6, in lieu of subsistence for foreign service officers on special duty or foreign service inspectors."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 22, strike out the figures "50" and insert the figures "75."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 17, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 22. The titles 'Second Assistant Secretary of State' and 'Third Assistant Secretary of State' shall hereafter be known as 'Assistant Secretary of State' without numerical distinction of rank; but the change of title shall in no way impair the commissions, salaries, and duties of the present incumbents.

"There is hereby established in the Department of State an additional 'Assistant Secretary of State,' who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be entitled to compensation at the rate of \$7,500 per annum.

"The position of Director of the Consular Service is abolished and the salary provided for that office is hereby made available for the salary of the additional Assistant Secretary of State herein authorized."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand the gentleman's contention is that the effect of this amendment is to make the former chief of the Consular Service Assistant Secretary of State, and to raise his salary. I understand the gentleman contends that his salary has already been in effect raised by the reclassification act.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The salary has already been raised, beginning July 1 next, in accordance with the method laid down by the classification act. The conference report on the State Department appropriation bill, which the House has just adopted, also has the effect of fixing Mr. Carr's salary at \$7,500.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And the only real effect of this amendment is to change the designation of his office?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. The change here proposed is necessary in order to comply with the other provisions of this act.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. From that of chief of the Consular Service to that of Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. That is the effect and the sole effect of this Senate amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What does the wording mean that the salary provided heretofore for the Director of the Consular Service shall be available for the salary of the additional Assistant Secretary of State, after we have already provided a salary of \$7,500?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is on the theory that this bill may become a law after the State Department appropriation bill becomes a law.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That will only necessitate the appropriation of an additional \$3,000?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Which appropriation the House and Senate have already provided. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 7, strike out the figures "22" and insert "23."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report for printing under the rules on the bill S. 2169, to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes.

CLAIMS OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW INDIANS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5325) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adju-

dicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5325, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DALLINGER, and Mr. HASTINGS.

FORT LEAVENWORTH MILITARY RESERVATION

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6207) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice all that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation which lies in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6207, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the same. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

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

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7877) making appropriations for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Army appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Kansas whether we can arrive at some understanding as to separate votes that we may be permitted to have when the conference report comes back here?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman I do not know of any matter in the bill in which there is the desire on my part or the part of any of the conferees to foreclose the judgment of the House upon, and I would be willing to give the gentleman every reasonable opportunity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. With that understanding I do not object.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether the Senate struck out the provision of the House bill relating to the enlistment of minors?

Mr. ANTHONY. They have stricken out that language and proposed new language which modifies it to some extent, but to what extent I am unable to say, as I have not given it careful study.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is the gentleman prepared to say that the House will have an opportunity to vote on the concrete question before the conferees agree to surrender the House provision in reference to that matter?

Mr. ANTHONY. It would be my idea to adhere to the language adopted by the House, and we will certainly give the House an opportunity to express itself.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And vote on the same proposition in the bill as when it left the House before they agree in conference to the Senate amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think so.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not want any think so; I want to know.

Mr. ANTHONY. I told the gentleman—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Unless the gentleman will do that, I shall object.

Mr. ANTHONY. I have told the gentleman there is nothing in the bill upon which I would want to foreclose judgment of the House and would give the gentleman from Kentucky or any Member of the House every reasonable opportunity to get the sentiment of the House.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I know the gentleman said reasonable opportunities and reasonable so and so, but the concrete question is that I want to know if the gentleman will bring back that particular provision and give this House a chance to vote on it before the conferees agree to surrender entirely the position of the House on that matter. The gentleman knows whether he will do that, and if he does I think he ought to say so.

Mr. ANTHONY. I have told the gentleman in pretty broad language.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit, the conferees on the naval bill were informed, the gentleman from Texas has been consulted, with regard to the amendment agreed upon, which we were informed was entirely satisfactory to the gentleman from Texas and in conformity with the amendment offered to the military bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will give the gentleman every reasonable opportunity to get the expression of the House on any language agreed upon in conference.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does not the gentleman think my request is reasonable?

Mr. ANTHONY. What does the gentleman want?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Before the conferees agree to the Senate amendment, to come back and give the House a chance to vote on that matter.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think the conferees ought to come back and consult the House—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I did not think the gentleman felt so, therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill H. R. 6355 and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6355) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue certificate of citizenship to Indians.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he is not willing to let this go over for a day or two?

Mr. SNYDER. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know there will be any objection, but I would like to look into a phase of it.

Mr. SNYDER. On the request of the gentleman from Tennessee I am perfectly willing.

CONFERENCE REPORT—NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6820, the naval appropriation bill, and ask for its consideration. I would like to have the report read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6820) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 10, 18, 21, 32, 41, 46, 47, 49, and 64.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 26, 27, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, and 61, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$3,409,826; for aviation material, equipment, fuel, and rental of hangars, \$320,174; in all, \$3,900,000, not more than \$1,242,289 of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$62,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for maintaining in commission, exclusive of vessels of other types, more than four cargo ships, two transports, and one ammunition ship unless, in case of emergency, the President should otherwise direct. Nothing in this proviso shall be construed to hinder the return of any vessel to the port where it will be decommissioned"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "plant appliances as now defined by the 'Navy Classification of Accounts'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "And provided further, That in computing for any purpose the length of service of any officer of the Navy, of the Marine Corps, of the Coast Guard, of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or of the Public Health Service who was appointed to the United States Naval Academy or to the United States Military Academy after March 4, 1913, the time spent at either academy shall not be counted"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "in all, \$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "No officer of the Navy or Marine Corps, while on leave of absence engaged in a service other than that of the Government of the United States, shall be entitled to any pay or allowances for a period in excess of that for which he is entitled to full pay, unless the President otherwise directs"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,911,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,911,800" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and limiting the number of officers and enlisted men"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and that no part of the moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or herein made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards or arsenals of the United States when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of

the Secretary of the Navy, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 8, 25, 28, 30, 31, 40, 43, 44, 45, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, and 60.

BURTON L. FRENCH,
GUY U. HARDY,
JOHN TABER,
JAMES F. BYRNES

(Not in agreement with action on amendment No. 64),

W. B. OLIVER

(Not in agreement with action on amendment No. 64),

Managers on the part of the House.

FREDERICK HALE,
LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON

(Not in agreement with Senate amendment No. 64, which I insisted upon),

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6820) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report, as to each of said amendments, namely:

On Nos. 1 and 2, relating to the appropriation "Pay, miscellaneous": Increases the limitation on account of communication expenditures from \$175,000, as proposed by the House, to \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$2,550,000, instead of \$2,500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,800,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 3: Strikes out the provision proposed by the House prohibiting the payment of compensation to officers of the Navy attached to the office of Chief of Naval Operations and engaged upon work not specifically assigned by law to such office.

On Nos. 4 and 5, relating to naval training stations: Appropriates \$250,000 for Newport, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$215,000, as proposed by the House, and appropriates \$260,000 for Hampton Roads, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$215,000, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 6 and 7, relating to the Naval Reserve Force: Appropriates \$3,900,000 instead of \$3,570,000, as proposed by the House, and \$4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; makes specific provision for reserve aviation and limits the amount which may be expended for maintenance, operation, and repair of vessels and aircraft.

On Nos. 9, 10, and 11, relating to the Naval War College: Appropriates \$100,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$130,000, as proposed by the Senate, and fixes the limitation on expenditures for classified employees at \$62,500, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the House, and \$70,278.56, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 12 to 17, inclusive, relating to the Naval Home: Appropriates \$1,200 for the superintendent of grounds, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,080, as proposed by the House; strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, a store laborer at \$660 and a matron and office assistant at \$720; appropriates for a seamstress at \$360, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$600 and \$540 for two assistant cooks, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$540 and \$480, respectively, as proposed by the House, and appropriates \$600 for head waitress, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$480, as proposed by the House.

On No. 18: Appropriates \$300,000 for personal services in the Hydrographic Office, as proposed by the House, instead of \$311,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 19, 20, and 21, relating to the appropriation "Engineering": Appropriates \$17,550,000 for "Engineering," instead of \$18,012,300, as proposed by the House, and \$16,550,000, as proposed by the Senate; makes available immediately \$2,100,000, instead of \$2,562,300, as proposed by the House, and \$1,100,000, as proposed by the Senate, and makes \$600,000 available for developing and testing submarine motive power, as proposed by the House.

On No. 22: Restores the limitation proposed by the House with respect to the number of cargo ships, transports, and ammunition ships which may be maintained in commission,

amended so as to permit the return of any greater number of such vessels to the port of decommissioning.

On No. 23: Appropriates \$313,000 for personal services in the Bureau of Construction and Repair, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$305,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 24: Makes the appropriation "Ordnance and ordnance stores" available specifically for the acquirement of plant appliances, as proposed by the Senate, amended to restrict such appliances to those at present defined by the "Navy classification of accounts."

On No. 26: Appropriates \$850,000 for the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 27: Provides for an allowance of two midshipmen from Porto Rico appointed on nomination of the Resident Commissioner, as proposed by the Senate, instead of one midshipman, as proposed by the House.

On No. 29: Denies counting time spent at the Naval or Military Academies after March 4, 1913, in computing for any purpose the length of service of any officer of the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, in language as proposed by the Senate, instead of as proposed by the House.

On No. 32: Strikes out the amendment proposed by the Senate changing the punctuation of the appropriation "Care of the dead."

On Nos. 33 to 39, inclusive, relating to public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks: Appropriates \$10,000 for circulating pumps for heating system, navy yard, Portsmouth, N. H., as proposed by the Senate; changes the designation of the foundry building to be reroofed at the navy yard, Boston, Mass., as proposed by the Senate; strikes out under the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa., the appropriations proposed by the House and Senate, respectively, of \$22,000 for acetylene gas plant, extension and remodeling, and \$30,000 for continuing paving; appropriates \$50,000 for replacing caisson, Dry Dock No. 1, navy yard, Norfolk, Va., as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, for dredging at the navy yard, Charleston, S. C.; and appropriates \$57,500, as proposed by the Senate, for plant renewals, naval coal depot, Tiburon, Calif.

On No. 41: Strikes out the appropriation of \$15,000, proposed by the Senate, for certain reroofing work at the Naval Academy.

On No. 42: Appropriates \$14,000 for fresh-water tank at the naval station, Guantanamo, Cuba, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 46: Strikes out the appropriation of \$200,000, proposed by the Senate, on account of the submarine and destroyer base, Columbia River, Oreg.

On No. 47: Strikes out the appropriation of \$100,000 proposed by the Senate for extending the distributing systems, submarine base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

On No. 49: Strikes out the appropriation of \$15,000 proposed by the Senate for paint and oil storehouse, naval base, San Diego, Calif.

On No. 56: Restores the provision proposed by the House denying pay or allowances to officers of the Navy or Marine Corps while on leave of absence in excess of accrued leave, amended so as to apply only where the absence is on account of the absentee being engaged in a service other than that of the Government of the United States.

On Nos. 57 and 58, relating to the Marine Corps: Appropriates \$1,385,000 for clothing for enlisted men instead of \$1,325,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,450,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 61 and 62: Extends the provision with respect to another conference on the limitation of naval armament to include such other Governments besides Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, as the President may deem proper, as proposed by the Senate, and also to include within the scope of the conference the question of limiting the number of officers and men, instead of men only, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 63: Retains the provision proposed by the House with respect to having work performed in navy yards instead of by private contractors, when a money saving would result, amended (1) so as to provide that Government arsenals, as well as navy yards, shall be taken into account, (2) by partly defining the work embraced by the provision, (3) by making the provision subject to the availability of time and facilities, and (4) by providing, in lieu of the condition that there should be a money saving, that an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, would not be involved.

On No. 64: Strikes out the paragraph proposed by the Senate with respect to former officers of the Navy or Marine Corps

who joined or left such services in order to join the Confederate forces.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 8: Relating to the Volunteer Naval Reserve and the Naval Militia.

On No. 25: Relating to the care and operation of schools built at ordnance stations.

On No. 28: Relating to enlistments under the age of 21 years.

On No. 30: Relating to the establishment of a special working fund to finance miscellaneous transactions.

On No. 31: Providing for reimbursement on account of issues made for relief of sufferers in Japan following the earthquake which occurred September 1, 1923.

On No. 40: Appropriating \$400,000 for certain public works at the Puget Sound Navy Yard.

On No. 43: Appropriating \$55,000 for certain public works at the naval station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

On No. 44: Appropriating \$77,000 for certain public works at the naval station, Tutuila, Samoa.

On No. 45: Appropriating \$60,000 for storage for war heads at the naval fuel depot, San Diego, Calif.

On No. 48: Appropriating \$175,000 for certain public works at the naval station, San Diego, Calif.

On No. 50: Appropriating \$500,000 for constructing a building for use as a supply depot of the Marine Corps at San Francisco, Calif.

On No. 51: Appropriating \$560,000 for public works at certain naval air stations.

On No. 52: Providing for the settlement of damage claims growing out of the operation of naval aircraft.

On No. 53: Providing for the acceptance, without cost to the United States, of lands required for providing a water supply for the naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.

On No. 54: Relating to civilian professors or instructors at the Naval Academy.

On No. 55: Relating to the transportation on foreign vessels of naval and civil personnel.

On Nos. 59 and 60: Relating to the construction of a submarine.

BURTON L. FRENCH,
GUY U. HARDY,
JOHN TABER,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
W. B. OLIVER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, a very short statement I think will explain the effect of the Senate amendments to the naval appropriation bill and the effect of the conference report. Let me say that the Senate was very generous toward the action of the House on this bill, and, while numerous amendments were made, generally speaking, the bill was not markedly different in most respects when it passed the Senate from what it was when it passed the House. As the bill passed the House it carried \$272,012,867, and as it passed the Senate it carried \$274,941,067, a Senate increase of \$2,928,200. The Senate placed 64 amendments on the bill, 29 of which affected the amounts of money carried in the bill. As to these money amendments the House conferees have receded either outright or for a reduced amount on 21, involving an increase over the bill as passed by the House of \$535,200. The action which I shall propose with respect to the remaining eight amendments will add to the bill as passed by the House the further sum of \$2,557,000, so that, if the proposals which I shall make are agreed to, the bill will carry \$3,092,200 above what it carried as passed by the House, but, even with this increase, the bill will carry \$19,351,461 less of direct appropriations than the appropriation act for the current fiscal year. It will be observed that the increases that the House conferees have agreed to, and those which I shall propose exceed, in the aggregate, the Senate increases by \$164,000.

This is because the Senate actually added to the bill \$4,412,500 and at the same time proposed reductions totaling \$1,484,300, making a net increase of \$2,928,200. Of the reductions proposed by the Senate, the House conferees insisted on and the Senate conferees agreed to the restoration of \$1,000,000, so that, as a matter of fact, leaving out of consideration the reductions proposed by the Senate, the Senate conferees have agreed to yield back \$836,000 of the increases which the Senate put into the bill.

The major items comprising the total increases over the House bill, as agreed to in conference including amendments brought back for disposition, are as follows:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Naval Reserve Force | \$330,000 |
| Purchase and manufacture of torpedoes | 350,000 |
| Repair and fitting out pier, Puget Sound | 250,000 |
| Storage for torpedoes, naval station, San Diego | 140,000 |
| Supply depot, Marine Corps, San Francisco, Calif. | 500,000 |
| Public works, aviation | 580,000 |
| Increase of the Navy | 950,000 |

If, then, the conference report and the proposals I shall make shall be agreed to, the naval bill for 1925 will carry \$275,105,067 of direct appropriations, and indirect appropriations of \$22,500,000, making a grand total of authorizations in the bill of \$297,605,067.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any provision in this bill for money to repair the warships and cruisers which we are told are in such bad shape and needing necessary repairs at the present time?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me say to the gentleman that the current law provides appropriations under which three of the battleships will be put into better shape than they were when they left for Panama. There is pending in the House at this time a bill providing for radical changes in the engine power of these several battleships, and it was thought on the part of the committee that we ought not to provide for changes that would exceed in cost \$300,000 each. That is the limit under which we have been operating. More than that the department has not during the last three years called for an amount from our committee for any ship in excess of \$300,000.

Mr. SNELL. Is that the law or a rule of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. FRENCH. The House has never construed it so, and the committee has never construed it; but on the other hand we did not feel we should bring in an item for a battleship in excess of that amount, except in pursuance of a specific estimate of appropriation. For the six battleships in most serious condition we have reported approximately \$200,000 each. The estimates did not contemplate the provision of a larger sum. I think that we have carried in the bill an ample amount for the ordinary upkeep of the several ships to which the gentleman refers, barring only the rehabilitation of the ships to the extent of replacing coal burners by either new coal burners or oil burners if that shall be directed by the Congress. This authorization is embodied in a bill pending in the House from a naval legislative committee.

Mr. SNELL. You do not think we could make all the repairs necessary to put those ships in shape without special legislation at this time?

Mr. FRENCH. Not in the best shape. We could put them into workable shape, but not into the best shape, as the department would like to have them.

Mr. SNELL. Do you not think it is incumbent on the Navy to keep the ships in the very best shape possible?

Mr. FRENCH. That is my judgment, and that is the judgment of the members of our committee. When we reported the bill to the House we brought in an amount of \$1,962,000 for general improvements of the ships of the Navy in excess of the amount recommended by the Budget; and the full committee, as well as this House, looked upon that item as a very wise expenditure of money, and in the light of developments during the last several weeks my judgment in the matter is confirmed.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Will the Speaker be kind enough to inform me whether the proceeding now in the hands of the House is superior to the proceeding ordered by the Rules Committee to consider the Agricultural bill at this hour?

The SPEAKER. This report is of the highest privilege.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. It is of the highest privilege?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. In my judgment it will not take us long to dispose of the several items in the bill.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Agriculture can wait. That is all right.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an inquiry? On the Pacific coast 900 miles are unprotected, especially the mouth of the Columbia River. I want to ask the gentleman whether any appropriation or anything at all has been done to take care of Tongue Point base, or is it left to float alone for another year? Or did the House agree to the Senate amendment providing for an appropriation? What was done with that?

Mr. FRENCH. The Senate added an amendment to the bill providing \$200,000 for further improvements and development

work at Tongue Point, to which the House conferees were not able to agree, and the Senate conferees receded.

Mr. WATKINS. So that this Tongue Point base will not have any appropriation or anything to maintain it for another year?

Mr. FRENCH. There is no specific appropriation.

Mr. WATKINS. No specific appropriations; none at all. There is none at all, is there?

Mr. FRENCH. The general appropriation for maintenance of yards and docks would have regard for the station at Tongue Point as well as other stations, and therefore there would be to some extent moneys expended at that point.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. In order to protect the cause of agriculture I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. FRENCH. Will not the gentleman withhold that point of order until we dispose of this bill? I think this House can dispose of it very shortly.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. The gentleman from Nebraska will always yield on personal request, but you have got to give me specifications. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FRENCH. Will not the gentleman withhold it until we get through with this bill?

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. The gentleman is not helping agriculture by his action.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I want agriculture to have a run for its white alley, and it is not getting any.

Mr. FRENCH. Will not my friend from Nebraska withhold his point of order until we dispose of this bill?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I yield, Mr. Speaker, at the request of a gentleman; but I serve notice that I did not come here to be bulldozed or browbeaten by anybody on any side of the House, and I refrain from taking personal action now, but I make no promises for the future.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I have already yielded. I withdraw the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman from Idaho yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I have endeavored to listen to the colloquy that went on between the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] about appropriations to put the fleet in good condition. If I mistake not, I saw a statement in the press a few days ago from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, in which he said that under the arms limitation treaty and under the present condition of the Navy the navies of the world ranked 5-4-3—Great Britain 5, the United States 4, and Japan 3. Now, if that is true—and it comes from the Navy Department—I want to know why the Naval Committee or the Appropriations Committee does not appropriate sufficient funds to bring our fleet up to an equality with that of Great Britain and recondition any of the battleships that need reconditioning in order to make the fleet effective. Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, in my judgment the Congress has appropriated constantly money adequate to maintain the Navy of the United States in the ratio which was assigned to it by the Limitation of Armaments Conference. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy a few days ago issued a statement in response to a general criticism by Mr. W. B. Shearer, in the New York Times, wherein Mr. Shearer stated that the ratio had been reduced from 5-5-3, with the United States one of the major factors, to 5-3-1, with the United States the 1. The statement of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy characterizes the estimate of Mr. Shearer as "greatly exaggerated." Without attempting to read the Assistant Secretary's whole statement, let me call your attention to about four lines in which Assistant Secretary Roosevelt referred to battleships. Secretary Roosevelt says this:

The battleships *Florida*, *Utah*, *Wyoming*, and *Arkansas* required boiler repairs in order to maintain their speed. Until this could be done the speed of these four ships was reduced and they had to drop out of the battle line. This reduced the ratio to 5-4-3.

The Assistant Secretary referred to the breaking down of machinery in four of our battleships some four months ago, which temporarily has taken them to the navy yards for repairs.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Who was this Mr. Shearer?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, Mr. Shearer is a man who is represented as an engineering expert, an inventor, and a torpedo expert.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Represented by whom? Represented by himself?

Mr. FRENCH. Probably so.

Mr. LONGWORTH. On what authority does he speak?

Mr. FRENCH. He speaks, as I understand, with no other authority than his own judgment. He is not connected with the Navy.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He admits he is an expert and he is the only person who does.

Mr. FRENCH. Well, I do not like to be critical. The statements of Mr. Shearer are so exaggerated that they fall of their own weight in large degree. I understand Mr. Shearer to be a designer and inventor of mechanical devices having to do with appliances of the Navy—particularly torpedoes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman mean the selling of appliances to the Navy?

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

Mr. FRENCH. In just a moment. In response to the query of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] let me say I understand that Mr. Shearer is an inventor. I do not care to say anything that would reflect upon him; but he seems to speak for those who are engaged at this time in propaganda to inflate the size of the Navy, the direct result of which would mean the purchase of more equipment, the expenditure of incalculable millions of dollars, the building of multiplied types of machinery, of ships, and of munitions of all kinds in another wild race for competition in world armaments. I want to say this, further, with regard to Mr. Shearer: His statement that the United States occupies the ratio of 1 to 5 with respect to Great Britain and 1 to 3 with respect to Japan is thoroughly unfounded, thoroughly ungrounded, and has just as much to substantiate it as though he had said that we occupy the ratio of 3 to 5 with France upon the sea, because it happens that from the standpoint of airplanes alone the French Government has to-day five times as many airplanes as has the United States.

The fact is Mr. Shearer has limited himself to a few factors. You have got to take into consideration a multitude of factors to arrive at the ratio. That is precisely what was done by the gentlemen at the Limitation of Armament Conference. They did not count on battleships alone, they did not count on cruisers alone, they did not count on oil supply alone, they did not count on bases alone, they did not count alone on submarines or upon destroyers, but they took into consideration the entire establishment, ships and guns, bases and supplies, munitions and facility to mobilize—in fact, all the facilities of the United States in comparison with those of Great Britain and those of Japan, in some of which we are outranked by Great Britain, in some of which we are outranked by Japan, but in all of which we measure up to what we ought to measure up—the ratio of 5-5-3. [Applause.]

I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, in addition to what my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations has said, that after Shearer made the statement that the United States has one unit in some things connected with the Navy against five units of other nations, when you go to check that up you find that we have five of those units and the other nations have one. Is not that true, for example, in storage space for oils and fuel?

Mr. FRENCH. You find the comparisons adverse to them in some cases. For instance, take it in submarines; we have the strength of the combined submarine forces of both Great Britain and Japan, and the same is true of destroyers.

Mr. MADDEN. And in the matter of storage space for the fuel supply we have five times the storage space of any other nation, have we not?

Mr. FRENCH. No; I would not put it that strong. I do not think that is quite an accurate statement when applied to storage owned by the Government; but, on the other hand, private interests own vast storage facilities which in event of war would be at the command of the United States. Let me say that the United States is a compact, great Nation. The heart of the British nation is in the British Isles. Great Britain needs storage there. If the home storage should be cut off or if the isles should be cut off from the outlying possessions, Great Britain would be on her back, and the same is true of Japan. The United States, however, compact as she is, with her immense resources of fuel and fuel oil at home, with the storage capacity of private institutions along both our coasts and in the interior, is incomparably rich from the stand-

point of fuel oil in comparison with either Great Britain or Japan.

Mr. MADDEN. And the statement which Shearer made was absolutely untrue in respect of all those things.

Mr. FRENCH. It is untrue and it is misleading.

Mr. LAZARO and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. FRENCH. I yield first to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO].

Mr. LAZARO. Does the gentleman know that upon the recommendation of the Navy Department we appropriated \$6,500,000 to raise the elevation of the guns on certain battleships of our fleet? Why was this money returned to the Treasury and why was not the range of these guns increased to meet the range of other ships of other nations?

Mr. FRENCH. I made a statement on that point during the general consideration of the bill and I will repeat it briefly. When the representations were made by the department to the committee, upon which the Congress a year ago appropriated \$6,500,000, it was with the understanding on the part of the Navy Department that the guns of the British Navy would outshoot our guns 5 or 6 miles, and further it was understood that the British had made changes in gun elevations following the armament conference. After the appropriation had been made the Navy Department discovered that the statements just referred to and upon which it thought it had the right to rely were not accurate; that no alterations in gun elevations had been made subsequent to the conference, and that although some of the guns could outshoot some of our guns to the extent of 2 or 3 miles, the situation was not as extreme as it had been represented. The Navy Department did not expend the money, and the Secretary said that he did not propose to expend it without coming to the Congress and receiving a fresh authorization upon the basis of the best information they had before them.

Mr. LAZARO. Then you admit they have a range of between 2 and 3 miles more than our guns, do you not?

Mr. FRENCH. Some of their guns; yes. Five of our ships have a superior range to the British ships, while, on the other hand, they outrange us on 15.

Mr. LAZARO. Why should that be the case?

Mr. FRENCH. Were that the only factor, it should not be. They had that range prior to the Limitation of Armament Conference. That was one of the factors that we must assume was not overlooked by those who were members of the conference commission that drafted the treaty.

Mr. LAZARO. Is it not true that some of the battleships are coal burners and lack the speed that the other ships have?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; we have six coal burners; but let me also remind the gentleman that from the standpoint of battleships a few of the British ships probably outclass ours, but the bulk of ours outclass the British battleships; and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Roosevelt, when he was before our committee made the statement to us that on the whole he regarded the battleships of the United States as superior to the battleships of Great Britain.

Mr. LAZARO. What about plane carriers? How many have we?

Mr. FRENCH. We have one plane carrier completed. We have two others in course of construction.

Mr. LAZARO. Suppose we should divide the fleet between the Atlantic and the Pacific. You would only have one plane carrier.

Mr. FRENCH. We have two that are being built.

Mr. LAZARO. They are being built; yes.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me refer further, if the gentleman will permit, to a statement quoted by Colonel Roosevelt to our committee referring to the state of our battleships in comparison with the battleships of Great Britain. I asked Colonel Roosevelt this question:

Mr. FRENCH. Is it true that on an average our capital ships are more modern and are a better ship in every way than the British ship?

Colonel ROOSEVELT. Yes; on an average.

Quoting Colonel Roosevelt further:

I remember the expression used by Admiral Chatfield (British officer) at the time we were talking about that. He said: "The tail of your column is not as good as the tail of our column, but the body of your column and the head of your column are very much better than any of the rest of our column."

And if the gentleman will go further and if he will read the judgment of experts on the British side, those experts will insist that we got the better of the bargain in the arrangement that was made. Gentlemen must remember that there are these

in Great Britain who are urging larger and still larger naval budgets. British critics contend that on an equal parity with the United States as to ships and munitions and fuel the United States would be twice as strong as Great Britain, because she is far flung and we are compact.

Mr. LAZARO. I will be frank; I will say that we got the little end of it in the Conference on the Limitation of Armament.

Mr. FRENCH. Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I ask this question not in any sense of criticism of Colonel Roosevelt. I do not believe this man Shearer—I do not know him and do not care anything about him. My statement is directed to the fact that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy had given a public statement that the ratio of the navies at the present time were 5 for Great Britain, 4 for the United States, and 3 for Japan. Now, I want to know whether that fact is attributable to the fault of the Navy Department or to the fault of the Appropriations Committee of this House in not making appropriations. I, for one, took some little part in urging the disarmament conference being called. Now that we have a treaty, I want to see the United States Navy maintained at the highest possible efficiency under that treaty. I want to know why it is—whether through the Department of the Navy, the Appropriations Committee, or Congress—we have permitted the Navy to deteriorate until it occupies a place of 4 to Great Britain's 5.

The gentleman from Idaho said a moment ago that the Assistant Secretary said it was true as to battleships. Well, we all know that Japan and Great Britain both excel us in the number and quality of cruisers, so that if we are deficient in fast cruisers and only occupy a place of 5-4-3 in battleships our Navy can not be equal to that of Great Britain. That is my only interest. I am not trying to make capital out of this matter. I think we should keep the Navy up to the highest point of efficiency, and Great Britain or Japan or no other country ought to be permitted to maintain a Navy superior to ours, because that is the whole theory of the disarmament conference. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from Texas does not differ from the members of the Appropriations Committee in that regard.

The fact is that Congress has appropriated money to maintain the ratio as provided. I quoted Colonel Roosevelt awhile ago when he referred to the breakdown of the four battleships, and after he had discussed that he said "this reduces the ratio to 5-4," or, in other words, by taking the four battleships out of the line.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does that mean that it is going to be corrected?

Mr. FRENCH. Surely; and it is being corrected. The money is in the Treasury for the repair of three battleships which will be in line by the 1st of July. As to the other one, the *Florida*, the repairs are being postponed until we can see whether or not the Congress will pass the bill reported from the legislative committee, in order that we may not spend money in bringing the ship back into condition when within six months we may have to tear out the machinery and replace it again with oil burners or coal burners, as the case may be. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I wish to make a brief statement in reference to the bill now under consideration, and to read some excerpts from the hearings which the committee held on the 1924 naval appropriation bill. As to the bill before us the subcommittee went out of its way in search of information as to what money was needed to put the fleet in condition over and above the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Inquiry of Admiral Robinson discloses that additional funds were necessary, and you will recall that the House approved the action of the committee in recommending an appropriation in excess of the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for ship repairs. In preparing the appropriation bill for 1924—the present year—the committee likewise were very careful to inquire of the Secretary of the Navy, when he appeared before the committee with the heads of the different department bureaus, whether any additional funds were needed to put the fleet in condition, and I invite your careful attention to some questions which I asked the Secretary at that time, and which you will find on pages 10 to 14, inclusive, as reported in the printed hearings on the 1924 bill. Let me here read some of the questions asked the Secretary at that time and the substance of his replies:

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Secretary, in your general statement you referred to the fact that while you acquiesced in the Budget estimates, yet perhaps you had reluctantly acquiesced, and I recall that press reports indicated that your reluctance might have been interpreted as being somewhat of a protest at the time you had the discussion. Now, I am interested to know what special items in the estimates you feel are really too small in order for the Navy to be maintained on an efficient basis.

Secretary DENBY. Well, I should hate to endeavor to give that, because there would be a considerable number of items. There were certain items involving policy which, while reluctant to see go, I acquiesced in eliminating. I do not want to have you understand that my reluctance went to the extent of actual failure to meet the mind of the Director of the Budget. I did meet his mind and acquiesced in this bill because of the very great pressure from all sides to economize to the utmost extent possible, otherwise I certainly should not have acquiesced in the report of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I did acquiesce in it for the reason that the country seemed to be so very, very deficient in money, and from this committee and from other sources there has come the stern demand that the Navy, as well as other departments of the Government, should cut down.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that, of course, is entirely commendable and proper; but I was interested to know if, in your judgment, there were any items on which you did finally yield about which you entertained very grave doubts as to the propriety of your having yielded from the standpoint of naval efficiency during the coming year.

To this question his reply was "no," and he made some objection to the word "propriety" included in the question.

In using the word "propriety" in my question I intended to have it carry the significance of wisdom, whether or not it was wise to acquiesce in that, and I was led to ask you these questions simply because of repeated statements in the press. I do not know to what extent they were authorized or justified, but they said there was a disposition on the part of the Secretary, as well as the heads of the bureaus, to indicate that acquiescence in some of the cuts made by the Budget officer would really work serious hurt to the Navy, in all probability, and if that is correct and grave doubts are entertained as to the wisdom of acquiescence in some of the insistencies on the part of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I felt the committee would like to know it.

He replied there was not. I then asked him this question:

So far as you now feel, there were no reservations to the acquiescence you gave to the Budget estimates that were sufficiently potent and strong as to make it necessary to reopen matters in the Senate after we pass the bill in the House?

His reply was in the negative.

Then the following further questions were asked:

Mr. OLIVER. I had no desire by my questions to reopen any matters that had been agreed on between you and the Director of the Budget unless you or the officers who are your coadvisers feel that some matters should be brought directly to the attention of the committee. As I said a few minutes ago, I was led to make my inquiries because of repeated assertions that there had been some unwise yielding, and that is why I want the committee at least to have the benefit of any information you feel should be communicated to it.

Now, I want to ask this pointed question: Is there anything known to the Navy Department as to the new construction program of any of the other powers that would now suggest the wisdom of appropriating for new construction in our Navy, for any particular devices on the ships, or for any particular service?

Secretary DENBY. Personally, I do not know that there is; but remember, Mr. OLIVER, that the statement applies only to this year.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as you now feel, there were no reservations to the acquiescence you gave to the Budget estimate that were sufficiently potent and strong as to make it necessary to reopen certain matters in the Senate after we pass the bill in the House?

Secretary DENBY. No.

Mr. WATKINS. I have not yet heard an answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas, and that is whether the purport of the interview of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy was true, that the ratio now is 5-4-3 instead of 5-5-3. Is that true or not?

The question of the relative strength of our fleet with that of England and Japan will be fully discussed when the legislative bill which seeks to authorize further construction of vessels is taken up in the House. I understand that the bill will probably come before the House next week. You will find that many misleading and inaccurate statements have been made as to the size and strength of our own Navy. You will also find a wide divergence of opinion among both experts and nonexperts as to what our Navy now most urgently needs. It is not a well-rounded Navy, and there is sharp difference

of opinion in and out of the service as to the relative value of present-day types of naval weapons. The need of the fleet for certain types of ships is admitted, and the legislative committee will probably urge that Congress authorize the building of modern cruisers within the limits of the treaty, and which, you will be pleased to find—though carrying only 8-inch guns with a 10,000-tonnage displacement—are very powerful vessels and superior to some of the battleships probably that we now have. If this claim be true, you will find it due largely to the rapid advance in marine engineering.

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I want the gentleman's judgment as to what is the ratio of the three navies measured by their cruiser strength.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Unquestionably, both England and Japan are stronger. As the gentleman knows, when the peace treaty was agreed to, we had building six modern battle cruisers. No country in the world had ever designed such efficient and powerful weapons of that type. The cruisers would have had a speed of about 35 knots, would have carried 16-inch guns, and were conceded to be the most powerful battle cruisers ever designed for the navy of any country. The American conferees agreed to scrap all of these six cruisers.

Mr. WINGO. What conferees?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The peace conferees.

Mr. WINGO. That was at the Limitation of Armaments Conference?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; and as you recall, we were authorized to convert two of the battle cruisers into airplane carriers, but were limited to small guns being placed thereon.

Mr. WINGO. Is this true, that from the viewpoint of those who hold that the modern battle cruiser is really the backbone of the fleet, the ratio maintained is such that we are third instead of equal?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The legislative committee recognize that we need additional modern cruisers, with speed and wide radius of action, and for that reason are asking Congress to authorize the building of 10 cruisers of that type. It is to correct the deficiency which the gentleman calls attention to.

Mr. WINGO. I have asked about battle cruisers. Take the battleships, the submarines, and the air service. What is the ratio on each of those, in the gentleman's judgment?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] has just made an interesting statement as to the relative strength of the battleships. As to destroyers and submarines, we are stronger than either England or Japan, and when the aircraft carriers are completed we will have added greatly to the strength of our fleet. Then you must remember that we are modernizing our battleships and some of our cruisers and destroyers by providing them with aircraft.

Mr. WINGO. We are not equal to Japan and England in aircraft, are we?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I would say that we are stronger than Japan but not equal to Great Britain.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman just stated that experts, some at least, take the position that the modern 10,000-ton scout cruiser will be equivalent to battleships with 12-inch guns. I wish the gentleman would enlighten the committee as to what experts, what naval officers, have testified that a 10,000-ton cruiser with 8-inch guns is as effective as a twenty or thirty thousand ton battleship with 12-inch guns.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I refer the gentleman to a statement by the Secretary before the committee on December 19, 1923, in which he discusses the fighting efficiency of the modern 8-inch gun scout cruiser. Naval officers were present with the Secretary, and I assume acquiesced in the statement that he then made and which you will find on page 6 of the hearings.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman further knows that Great Britain has 35 scout cruisers and Japan 28 scout cruisers. The United States, including those that are building, has only 10 scout cruisers.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And, therefore, we are far below the other nations in regard to scout cruisers.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman has read to us from the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Did not the Secretary admit in the hearing before the committee that he had not asked Congress for the appropriations that he thought were really necessary to maintain the fleet properly because the Budget Bureau, this expert in naval affairs, had asked him not to do it?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. He did not go so far as that.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Did he not say that he yielded to the Budget Bureau?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; in the interest of economy, he stated, he had yielded some demands which otherwise he would have made.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is a matter of policy. It is a matter of policy whether you will maintain the fleet up to the 5-5-3 ratio, and the effect of the Secretary's testimony is that he permitted the Budget Bureau to override the Navy Department on a matter of policy.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The House will probably be interested in knowing that our Navy is composed to-day of the following principal combatant units:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Battleships, first line..... | 18 |
| Cruisers, second line..... | 11 |
| Light cruisers, first line..... | 10 |
| Light cruisers, second line..... | 10 |
| Aircraft carrier, second line..... | 1 |
| Mine layer, second line..... | 1 |
| Destroyers, first line..... | 281 |
| Destroyers, second line..... | 21 |
| Light mine layers (formerly destroyers)..... | 14 |
| Submarines, first line..... | 93 |
| Submarines, second line..... | 27 |
| Fleet submarines, first line (building)..... | 6 |

In addition there are numerous patrol vessels, destroyer tenders, submarine tenders, aircraft tenders, repair ships, store ships, colliers, oilers, ammunition ships, cargo ships, transports, hospital ships, tugs, mine sweepers, naval district and navy-yard craft, which I will not here enumerate, but which will be enumerated in the hearings by the Chief of Naval Operations.

The 10 light cruisers of the second line are obsolete vessels, and practically we consider them fit only for duty in time of peace, to serve as special service squadrons, for instance, for carrying the flag, policing, and so forth. Strictly speaking, they lack speed and they lack armor. They are not modern vessels and they are not really effective cruisers. They would not be effective in battle.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen here who are burning up with anxiety will possess themselves in patience until to-morrow, one week, we will give them a chance to show how much nerve they have and how much they care for the national defense.

Then we will ask you to vote an appropriation of \$150,000,000 to bring our fleet up; we will ask you to vote eight ships of 10,000 tons each, costing when completed by 1930, \$15,000,000 apiece, unless the price goes up, and then we will ask you to give \$18,000,000 for the purpose of bringing up six of our big ships, and then we will have 5-5-3.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Then we are not 5-5-3 now?

Mr. BUTLER. We are 5 and a fraction above 4.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am not opposing—

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman never has been opposed to the national defense. He and I have had friendly discussion in this place; he has never been opposed to it; but I will tell the gentleman he can get a complete answer in detail if he will come to the committee room of the Committee on Naval Affairs. However, I desire to say that to-morrow week we will ask the House to bring our Navy up to 5-5-3, whereas we are now 5 and a fraction above 4-3.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken, and the conference report was adopted.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, there are several amendments that we have brought back to have voted on by the House which were agreed to in the conference committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHENDBLOM). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 8, page 13, after line 25, insert: "Provided further, That members of the Volunteer Naval Reserve may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be issued such articles of uniform as may

be required for their drills and training, the value thereof not to exceed that authorized to be issued to other classes of the Naval Reserve Force and to be charged against the clothing and small-stores fund: *Provided further*, That until June 30, 1925, of the Organized Militia as provided by law, such part as may be duly prescribed in any State, Territory, or for the District of Columbia shall constitute a Naval Militia; and until June 30, 1925, such of the Naval Militia as now is in existence, and as now organized and prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of the act of Congress approved February 16, 1914, shall be a part of the Naval Reserve Force, and the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to maintain and provide for said Naval Militia as provided in said act: *Provided further*, That upon their enrollment in the Naval Reserve Force, and not otherwise until June 30, 1925, the members of said Naval Militia shall have all the benefits, gratuities, privileges, and emoluments provided by law for other members of the Naval Reserve Force; and that, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, duty performed in the Naval Militia may be counted as active service for the maintenance of efficiency required by law for members of the Naval Reserve Force."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FRENCH moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "that," insert the following: "until June 30, 1925."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25, page 25, line 14, after the word "schools," strike out "built at ordnance stations pursuant to authority contained in the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to provide housing facilities for war needs, approved May 16, 1918,'" and insert: "At ordnance stations at Indianhead, Md., Dahlgren, Va., and South Charleston, W. Va."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the beginning of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "During the fiscal year 1925."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? That does not change the \$9,000,000?

Mr. FRENCH. No; it is limited to the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BLANTON. That is all that it could be limited to anyway. This is an appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state the amount is not in dispute. The Clerk inadvertently read the amount.

Mr. BLANTON. That amount was not put in by the conferees?

Mr. FRENCH. No; that amount is not in dispute at all.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a Senate amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes. The Senate amendment limits the expenditure to the three places mentioned.

Mr. BLANTON. It was not put in by the House. In other words, the conferees agreed on it?

Mr. FRENCH. No; the House put in substantially that, but referred to it by referring to the act of May 16, 1918.

Mr. BLANTON. But did not authorize the expenditure of \$9,000,000?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes. But let me say to the gentleman the effect of the Senate amendment is to limit it to these three places. If the Senate amendment had not been included, while members of the committee did not think the Navy Department would abuse the appropriation, the Senate felt that it should be tied down specifically to the three places.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to ask the gentleman a very pertinent question: After the ideas of the House conferees are carried like they want them carried in respect to this conference, how much more will there have been added to this bill by the Senate?

Mr. FRENCH. One hundred and sixty-four thousand dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. One hundred and sixty-four thousand dollars?

Mr. FRENCH. Above the amount as passed by the Senate.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about the amount as passed by the House. How many million dollars have been added to

this bill by the Senate in addition to the amount which it carried when it passed the House?

Mr. FRENCH. Three million ninety-two thousand two hundred dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. And that is about the case with respect to every bill that is sent from the Senate.

Mr. FRENCH. Well, let me say this: The Senate was very generous to the House naval appropriation bill and did not increase the items that some had feared the Senate might.

Mr. BLANTON. It increased it nearly three and a half million dollars.

Mr. FRENCH. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a small item, a mere bagatelle, and is not worthy of consideration.

Mr. FRENCH. It is not a mere bagatelle; but, on the other hand, the Senate is a coordinate branch of the machinery of our Government.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. The gentleman has repudiated the expert standing of Mr. Shearer, who was quoted on the floor here as a naval authority, and has accepted the authority of some foreign officer on the condition of our Navy. Has the conference added to the amount in this bill all it could to bring our Navy up to the condition which it should be in, based on the strictures made upon our own Navy by our own admiral, Admiral Coontz?

Mr. FRENCH. The conferees did not have legislative authority. What we had to do was to consider the bill with respect to the action of the two Houses.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Did you do all you could under your authority to meet the criticism of Admiral Coontz?

Mr. FRENCH. We could have allowed items to stay in that were put in by the Senate, and the Senate could have permitted items that we put in to remain, but which they struck out. That would have modified the sum total. But I have no doubt the conferees carried out substantially the ideas of both Houses. But as to discrediting the statement of Mr. Shearer, I did not discredit him; he discredited himself in making the wild and extravagant statements that he made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28; Page 29, line 2, strike out "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be utilized for the pay of any officer or man who may recruit or enlist any boy under the age of 21 years without the written consent of the parent or guardian, if any, of such boy for such enlistment."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That hereafter upon the presentation of satisfactory evidence as to his age and upon application for discharge by his parent or guardian presented to the Secretary of the Navy within 60 days after the date of his enlistment any man enlisted after July 1, 1924, in the naval service or Marine Corps under 21 years of age, who was enlisted without the written consent of his parent or guardian, if any, shall be discharged for his own convenience."

Mr. FRENCH. The effect of the amendment is to provide that hereafter, upon satisfactory evidence as to his age, upon application for discharge of a young man under 21 years of age, if made by his parent or guardian and presented to the Secretary of the Navy within 60 days of enlistment in either the Navy or Marine Corps, he shall be discharged by the Navy Department.

Let me say that this language is the language which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], together with the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. BYRNS], and myself worked out, with the exception of the words "July 1, 1924," and also the words "the Marine Corps." Those two minor provisions of the bill I submitted at a later date to the gentleman from Texas, as I think he will recall, and I understood they met his approval.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Why put in those words "July 1, 1924"?

Mr. FRENCH. There are some 65 different enlistment stations of the Navy throughout the country and a number of Marine Corps enlistment stations, and some 600 or 700 officers and men engaged in recruiting work. The time between now and July 1 is very short, and the Navy felt that from the standpoint of the service the time would be inadequate within which to prepare forms and instructions for the government of the service, and that a definite date to begin would be more satisfactory.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And this bill, of course, applies to the fiscal year 1925, and the fiscal year begins on July 1, 1924.

Mr. BLANTON. I move to strike out the words "July 1, 1924."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON to the amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH—

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I did not yield to the gentleman to offer an amendment. I yielded to him for a remark that I thought he wanted to make.

Mr. BLANTON. There are 435 Members here. Does the gentleman intend to preclude us from offering amendments? We have a right to be heard as well as the gentleman. We have as much responsibility as he has as a Member of Congress. I presumed when he yielded to me he yielded to me for all purposes. I do not believe in filibustering, and I am not going to waste any time. If the gentleman does not want this amendment all right.

Mr. FRENCH. I am glad to have it voted on, but I am anxious to hurry on with the bill. That is all.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his motion. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the author of the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you will recall when this bill was originally before the House I offered an amendment which was adopted, providing that no part of these funds should be used to enlist boys under 21 years of age. The effect of that amendment was to continue simply for one year. It was only given as a limitation on the appropriation. It would expire on July 1, 1925, and then we would have to go through that process each year to put on that limitation.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And it would apply only after July 1 this year.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes; it would apply only after July 1 of this year, because this bill is only effective after July 1. The bill went into conference, and the conferees came back and talked to me, I suppose, because I had offered the amendment. I know of no other reason. They asked if we could get together on the proposition. We agreed among ourselves that if we could adopt an amendment making this permanent law, so that we would not have to make a fight each year, we would be willing to concede something to the Senate. So the result of that conference was that this amendment was proposed, which provides that any boy under 21 years of age who enlists without his parents' consent can be discharged upon the application of his parents and furnishing evidence in proof of his age, providing the application for discharge was made within 60 days.

Now, that is a very short time, it is true, but these recruits, after they have spent about 60 days in training, are sent to their ships and may be sent to sea, and it would hardly be practicable for the Government to enlist a boy, train him, and then send him over to Europe, have him discharged in Europe and sent back home at the Government's expense. So I rather reluctantly agreed to the 60-day policy. But on the whole I believe this is a good amendment, and since it makes it permanent law, I think the House should agree to it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand the gentleman's interest in it, but the trouble is that a lot of these youngsters run away from home at 17 and 18, and I have had cases where the families did not know about their being in the Navy in 60 days.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is the difficulty, and I realize it, but on account of having to get an agreement with the Senate, I thought it would be better to accept it and amend it sometime later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30, page 33, after line 15, insert: "The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer from the naval supply account fund an amount not exceeding \$100,000 for the establishment of a permanent special working fund, which shall be charged with the net proceeds of all sales of surplus and condemned stores, with refunds to bidders at sales and to special depositors, and with all labor, overhead, material, and services incident to work done not chargeable to naval appropriations, and which shall be credited with all funds received as payment or advances for surplus stores, for condemned stores, and for all expenses incident to work not chargeable to naval appropriations."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 31, page 34 of the bill: "The Paymaster General of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to expend from the naval supply account, without reimbursement to the naval supply account fund, issues made by order of the Secretary of the Navy pursuant to the directions of the President for the relief of sufferers in Japan following the earthquake which occurred September 1, 1923."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 40, page 30 of the bill, after line 23, insert: "Quay wall extension (limit of cost, \$300,000), \$150,000; repair and fitting out pier (limit of cost, \$1,190,000), \$250,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Repair and fitting out pier (limit of cost \$1,190,000), \$250,000; in all, \$350,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 43, page 40, line 11: Marine railway accessories house, \$20,000; roads and walks, extension, \$35,000; in all, \$233,000.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Marine railway accessories house, \$20,000; in all, \$198,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 44, page 40, after line 14: Rebuilding power and refrigerating plant, \$65,000; rebuilding station wharf, \$12,000; in all, \$87,000.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 45, page 41, after line 12, insert: Naval fuel depot, San Diego, Calif.: Storage for war heads, \$60,000.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 48, page 41, line 25: Dock gear and paint shop, \$35,000; storage for torpedoes, \$140,000; in all, \$190,000.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Storage for torpedoes, \$140,000; in all, \$155,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 50, page 42, after line 4, insert: "Supply depot, Marine Corps, San Francisco, Calif.: Construction of building, including grading of site, \$500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to transfer to the Navy Department a tract of land situated in the city of San Francisco, Calif., consisting of four 50-vara lots fronting 275 feet on the north side of Harrison Street, and extending back, bounded by Spear and Main Streets 275 feet, for use as a site for the building herein authorized."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Supply depot, Marine Corps, San Francisco, Calif.: Construction of extensible building, including grading of site, \$500,000, no part of such sum to be obligated until the Secretary of the Navy shall have determined that it is adequate completely to construct, equip, and otherwise make said building ready for occupancy and use, including the preparation and final conditioning of site: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to transfer to the Navy Department a tract of land situated in the city of San Francisco, Calif., consisting of four 50-vara lots fronting 275 feet on the north side of Harrison Street, and extending back, bounded by Spear and Main Streets 275 feet, for use as a site for the building herein authorized."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51, page 43, strike out "in all, \$14,590,000" and insert: "For new construction, buildings, and improvements at air stations at a total cost not to exceed \$410,000, as follows: Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$173,000; Coco Solo, Canal Zone, \$237,000; Pensacola, Fla., \$150,000; in all, \$15,150,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$410,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$560,000."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the purport of that amendment.

Mr. FRENCH. The purport of the amendment is to provide for a water-supply system at Pensacola.

It includes the item of \$150,000 in the total of \$560,000; it corrects an error, that is all.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman leaves the item as to the air station at Pearl Harbor the same as it is.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; and at Coco Solo.

Mr. RAKER. That is not changed.

Mr. FRENCH. No; and I would say that as to Pensacola a little later on, either in the next amendment or the subsequent one, we shall offer certain limitations that we feel ought to be attached to the expenditure.

Mr. RAKER. I did not understand that last statement. The Pearl Harbor improvement, as I understand it, is left as it is.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; and the same thing is true at Coco Solo.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand the change, you merge the principal item into another item.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; to correct the total and to include in the total the Pensacola item.

Mr. WINGO. The substance of it is the same as the Senate amendment.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; as a matter of fact, it is the correction of an error.

Mr. WINGO. Yes. In other words, the proposal is agreed to and you perfect the language and put on restrictions and limitations that are thought necessary.

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman been informed that this House will be asked to authorize the appointment of a select committee to consider a joint air service? Does the gentleman know where he is drifting? Does the gentleman know it is thought desirable to have the question of a joint air service between the Army and the Navy inquired into? How much money does the amendment appropriate for Coco Solo?

Mr. FRENCH. For Coco Solo, \$237,000.

Mr. BUTLER. What are they going to do with that there? I think they could get along with less money there. We heard a lot of testimony on it and upon the development of these air fields.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. BUTLER. I have not any time. The time belongs to others.

The gentleman is always very careful, but a good many of us have it in our heads that there might be a very, very great saving if we could have a joint operating service between the Army and the Navy at several of these points, and this is one of them, and now if you are going to spend a lot of money down there, we might as well abandon the whole thing. Therefore it is desirable always, I would suggest, for us to keep in touch with each other. I sat for three or four or five days and listened to a discussion of this matter and now it comes in and is to be disposed of in a few minutes. I am through with the whole business.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. BUTLER. We have been trying to save some money so we can get some ships and get this Navy off of the land, and now the gentleman's committee comes in here with these great big appropriations to put the Navy on the land. If we listen to them and concede to them all they ask, we will have this whole Navy on the land and they will put the ships on the land before they get through with it. I want ships that will float and not these big naval stations. We have been listening and listening for 45 days to a discussion upon one station. I want the money for the ships.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me first refer to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the naval legislative committee. The conferees did not have authority to consider the matter to which the gentleman directed attention. The question is raised at this point and projected into the problem by reason of the fact that both the Army and the Navy have air stations that are adjacent.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; and we are endeavoring to learn whether we can not join them. The Army wants four or five

or six million dollars there, and we want to know whether it is not possible to have a select committee appointed to sit perhaps during the vacation period to determine how we can save money by having joint operation, not joint control; we are not having anything to do with that. I only want to suggest to my friend that there is no use having these naval officials coming here and detaining us for days listening to testimony and then going to the gentleman's subcommittee and detaining them for days and then going over to the Senate and having these things put into the bill. They can go to the Senate first hereafter, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. In just a moment. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the conferees on the part of the House proposed that this money should not be expended either at Coco Solo or at Pearl Harbor unless and upon an arrangement agreeable to the President of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that.

Mr. FRENCH. We did that in the absence of the very arrangement to which the gentleman refers and which he would like to see worked out. I am with him. I think we ought to have a working understanding so that we can expend whatever money is to be expended most economically, most efficiently, and so there will not be duplication or overlapping of services.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman, who works very, very hard and is just as economical as I would like to be, in my judgment, the time has come when we should make an examination of these different places. The Navy now has more than 700 pieces of ground that they either own or rent, and the time has come when we should select these fields in connection with the Army and have joint operation and save a lot of the expense that we are now subjected to for the Navy on the land when we need ships so badly. But I am not raising any question about it. Pearl Harbor will have to be built. It is our outward defense, but we spent days and days listening to the evidence, and now it is all wiped out by going to the Senate and getting the appropriation. I only want to repeat what I have already stated, that hereafter when anything is asked of the committee over which I now preside I shall direct them to go to the Senate and go at once.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman asked a moment ago how the money for Coco Solo and Pearl Harbor is to be expended. I have the itemization here. For Coco Solo the amount asked for is \$237,000, allocated as follows: Seaplane hangar, \$147,000; concrete runway, bulkhead, and beach improvements, \$30,000; hydraulic fill, \$50,000; and for water, sewage, and electric distribution system, \$10,000.

For Pearl Harbor the total asked for is \$173,000, allocated as follows: Seaplane hangar, \$140,000; beach improvements and runway, \$33,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What the gentleman from Pennsylvania says is absolutely correct. The mistakes we have been making since the war is to appropriate funds for aviation for the Army and to appropriate for aviation for the Navy, and as long as we continue to appropriate for them we are getting nowhere. The trouble is that if we continue to appropriate for the Air Service in this way a great many officers seated in comfortable chairs in their office will not take the air. They do not want to do that. I suggest that we stop appropriating until they get together and develop an Air Service for the good of the country and not for the comfort of the present officers.

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

Mr. FRENCH. I will though I am anxious to get through.

Mr. RAKER. Referring to the air situation at Pearl Harbor, it is on an island. The Navy and the Army are on the same island with only a dividing imaginary line between them. The discussion that they should be combined is a good deal of imagination; they use the entire equipment for the efficiency of the Army and for efficiency of the Navy, and the only question is whether we should keep both so that we can have a good Air Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment 52, line 17, after the word "aeroplanes" insert: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval air-

craft, where such claim does not exceed the sum of \$250: Provided further, That all claims adjusted under this authority during the fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FRENCH moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: After the word "Provided," in the first line of said amendment, insert "further."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment 53: On page 44, at the top of the page insert: "The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, when directed by the President, to accept on behalf of the United States, free from encumbrances and without cost to the United States, the title to such lands as he may deem necessary or desirable in the vicinity of Pensacola, Fla., for use as a site and right of way for the construction and maintenance of a pumping station, wells, and pipe line to provide a suitable water supply for the United States naval air station, Pensacola, Fla."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FRENCH moved to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: After the word "Florida," in the last line of said amendment, insert the following: a semicolon, "and such additional water supply is hereby authorized: Provided, That the sum of \$150,000 hereinbefore appropriated for new construction buildings and improvements at the air station, Pensacola, Fla., shall not be available until the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that in his judgment a water system capable of furnishing an adequate supply of water for such station can be completed within the limit of the funds herein provided, and until the Secretary of the Navy, at the direction of the President, has accepted the conveyance of land and rights of way as herein authorized."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Idaho: Can the gentleman determine how much in the end this is going to cost?

Mr. FRENCH. We have fixed the limit at \$150,000.

Mr. BUTLER. I know, but the gentleman knows that we can raise the limit.

Mr. FRENCH. We have directed that none of it shall be expended until it is determined.

Mr. BUTLER. Did you learn how much they would like to have?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; this was figured on the amount they asked for, and it was the judgment of the conferees that it was a very liberal figure. We figured it on the basis of material, of boring the wells, of putting in the power plant, and from the several angles we could not see how it could approach the amount asked for, and yet we thought we were justified in leaving it at the figures we have attached to the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to say to the House that you might as well abolish the legislative Naval Affairs Committee. This bill is packed full of limitations, and here comes another. I did not vote for the rule that took the authority away from the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. FRENCH. This is a limitation rather than legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho to recede and concur with an amendment.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITHWICK] may proceed and speak on the amendment we have just adopted.

Mr. WINGO. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 54: After line 18, on page 44, insert: "No part of any sum in this act appropriated shall be expended in the pay or allowances of any commissioned officer of the Navy detailed for duty as professor or instructor at the United States Naval Academy to perform the duties which were performed by civilian professors or instructors on January 1, 1922, whenever the number of civilian professors

or instructors employed in such duties shall be less than 65, exclusive of masters and instructors in swordsmanship and physical training: *Provided*, That in reducing the number of civilian professors no existing contract shall be violated: *Provided further*, That no civilian professor, associate or assistant professor, or instructor shall be dismissed, except for sufficient cause, without six months' notice to him that his services will be no longer needed."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FRENCH moves to recede and concur with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Until June 30, 1925, if for any cause the number of civilian professors or instructors employed in the United States Naval Academy, on January 1, 1924, shall be reduced, after such latter date no commissioned officers of the Navy shall be detailed or allowed to teach the subject or subjects theretofore taught by said civilian professors or instructors whose service in connection with the academy may have been so terminated: *Provided*, That in reducing the number of civilian professors no existing contract shall be violated: *Provided further*, That no civilian professor, associate or assistant professor, or instructor shall be dismissed, except for sufficient cause, without six months' notice to him that his services will be no longer needed."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho to recede and concur with an amendment.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman please explain the effect of the amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. In brief, the effect of the amendment is to modify the first paragraph of the language inserted by the Senate, which carries the requirement touching the employment of officer members of the faculty in lieu of civilian members of the faculty after January 1, 1922. We felt that that was incongruous. We felt that the date ought to be brought up to January 1, 1924; and I think the language employed is perhaps a little happier than the language in the current law, used by the Senate. In substance, I have indicated the only change which was made in the amendment.

Mr. DENISON. As I heard it read, there is no limitation at all upon the number that can be dismissed up to January, 1925.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, yes. We did not fix the number in the amendment for this reason: The academy will need to operate on a smaller basis—a less number of midshipmen during the year 1925. There will be probably 400 less midshipmen next year than this. That adjudication can not be made satisfactorily unless the faculty may be reduced, and we have provided in this amendment that no officer shall be placed on the faculty to take the place of a civilian in work done on January 1, 1924. The gentleman would not want to keep civilians or officer members of the faculty there when their services were not needed.

Mr. DENISON. Certainly not.

Mr. FRENCH. Therefore we felt that we ought not to fix in the bill a limit as to number of faculty members such as was in the bill last year.

Mr. DENISON. The effect of the amendment proposed by the gentleman is that no naval officer shall be detailed to take the place of any civilian professor who is discharged or let out at any time?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; that states the proposition.

Mr. DENISON. Then, taking the number of civilian professors that were there on the 1st of January this year, they can not be replaced by any naval officer?

Mr. FRENCH. They may be reduced if their work is not needed, but they may not be replaced.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee the same question that I asked him when the bill was originally before the House for consideration, and to which he gave a very definite and clear answer. At that time the chairman of the subcommittee stated that there was nothing in this bill to indicate any intention to remove the graduate school from the Naval Academy to any other place. Does that same situation exist to-day, or does the Senate attempt some change in that regard?

Mr. FRENCH. No; the Senate has not modified the bill in that respect.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. As far as the chairman of the subcommittee knows, from this bill, there is no intention to remove the graduate school from the Naval Academy to any place else?

Mr. FRENCH. No; and the Navy Department assured me that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, would be notified of any report of the commission studying the situation before any action is taken.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am very glad to hear that. That is entirely in the interest of efficiency and economy. If this school were removed, it would be against efficiency and economy.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As I understand the report of the commission appointed with reference to this postgraduate school, it has already been made to the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. It may have been made to the Secretary, but it has not come up in any definite way where action is contemplated, else they would have notified our subcommittee.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I understand that the report has already been made.

Mr. FRENCH. It may have been submitted to the Secretary.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I note that the bill provides that no civilian professor shall be replaced by an officer after January 1, 1924, for work being performed by a civilian officer on January 1, 1924. Have any civilian professors been replaced by officers since January 1, 1924?

Mr. FRENCH. I think not. I have not heard that statement made, and the law under which the Navy is operating the Naval Academy limits the replacement to the work that was done by those other than civilians on January 1, 1922.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The point I am trying to make is that it might have been possible that a certain number of civilian professors had been dropped since January 1, 1924, and officers appointed in their places, which would continue under this bill.

Mr. FRENCH. It has not been brought to our attention, and I think we would have heard of it if such had taken place.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And if any condition such as the gentleman suggests is true this would correct it.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Is this postgraduate school established by authority of law at Annapolis?

Mr. FRENCH. There is general authority in law for carrying forward this type of postgraduate work. The law itself does not fix the work at Annapolis or any other particular place. As the gentleman will probably recall, there are those who are experts or interested in certain lines who are sent to various technical schools for training. Even a limited number are sent abroad for training, but wherever work can be done efficiently at places like the graduate school at Annapolis the department endeavors to administer the funds available so that training can be had there instead of through paying for tuition for these men in professional or technical schools elsewhere.

Mr. DENISON. My question was preliminary to this one: Can the Navy Department move this school from Annapolis without an act of Congress authorizing it?

Mr. FRENCH. My judgment—

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will answer the gentleman that that is in the power of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. I have no doubt that is true, but let me say that is the point I had in mind when I asked the department to notify our subcommittee in the event any such action was contemplated and we were assured that that would be done.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The committee by the appropriations which they have made for that purpose have in effect indicated it is not the purpose or the desire of Congress that it shall be removed.

Mr. FRENCH. The appropriation is made, of course, on that understanding. We can not write into law every understanding or you would have in this bill a volume that would be an inch thick, so we have these understandings with the department and I am sure that, generally speaking, they are respected.

Mr. RAKER. Have the civilian professors and inspectors been increased or diminished by this provision?

Mr. FRENCH. Not by this provision. The amount carried in the bill is less than for the current year for the reason that we are decreasing for next year the number of midshipmen by about 400.

Mr. RAKER. Does the effect of this provision increase them or decrease them?

Mr. FRENCH. The effect of the limitation?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. The effect of the limitation is not either to increase or decrease, but prevents the ratio from being changed. You might say it is to prevent the substituting of official instructors or teachers for civilian instructors and teachers.

Mr. RAKER. Is that the purpose to keep out as many official instructors or commissioned officers as possible?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; but the thought for years has been that there should be a limited number of civilian instructors and professors there, and a few years ago it was felt that probably it was swinging too much toward the officers, and the House put in a limitation. The committee in reporting the bill to the House struck out the limitation, and it was restated on the Senate side. Now, we have brought in an amendment which is a compromise and much more workable than the Senate amendment but carrying out the general thought.

Mr. RAKER. Equalizing the situation now between the commissioned officers and civilian professors and instructors. Is that about right?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; that would be a way of expressing it. It prevents substituting officers for civilian instructors.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman at his fingers' end the number of civilian professors and instructors at the academy now?

Mr. FRENCH. Approximately 87. That includes certain athletic instructors, 15.

Mr. RAKER. How many commissioned officers?

Mr. FRENCH. Approximately 120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 55: On page 50 of the bill, after line 23, insert: "No money appropriated by this act shall be expended for transportation on foreign vessels of officers, enlisted men, or employees under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department without a certificate from the Secretary of the Navy or other official authority designated by him that there are no American vessels then available for the transportation of such officers, enlisted men, or employees."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to know if the committee had before it the figures indicating the amount of money expended on this kind of travel on foreign ships by officers or employees of the Navy Department?

Mr. FRENCH. This was a Senate amendment, and the House committee did not have those figures.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will say to the gentleman, I am very glad this limitation is being carried on an appropriation bill. It should have been in effect a long time ago, because it has been the custom not only of naval officers but of ambassadors and ministers and commercial attachés to travel on first-line foreign ships for reasons best known to themselves when on the same day or in a day or two they could have taken American ships. It might not have been as sporty a one or as classy as the French or British ships, but they were not paying their own fare, the Government was paying it; and I think a limitation of this kind should be carried on every appropriation affecting travel, and I am very glad to see it on this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the members of the committee to be patient for a minute. I want to ask the gentleman, because he is well informed—let us turn back to amendment No. 51. I am thinking pretty keenly of what has been done there. Will the gentleman please tell this committee what kind of buildings you have provided for \$410,000, and how much these buildings are going to cost? I would like to know the character of these buildings. We have had a little experience—

Mr. YOUNG. Does the gentleman think it is too much or too little?

Mr. BUTLER. Fierce! What kind of buildings are they—officers' houses and quarters?

Mr. FRENCH. No; most of the money will be expended for hangars.

Mr. BUTLER. If for hangars, all right; but if they are going to start officers' houses costing \$40,000 for a captain of the Navy, you leave it here and I am going to make some fuss. We have been up against that frequently over here, and we have endeavored to limit it house by house.

Mr. FRENCH. I have the data right at hand here.

Mr. BUTLER. When the gentleman revises his statement let him add the buildings, so that we may know hereafter how the appropriations are made.

Mr. FRENCH. I will put it in. [See p. 9010.]

Mr. BUTLER. Very well.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit me, it might be due to Admiral Wilson that I make this statement, that this will be in line with what he stated to the committee would be his policy. There were Members of the Senate who called attention to the fact that he might not be there longer

than February next year, and they wanted to be assured that his policy would be strictly adhered to, and they wished that what they were given to understand would be the policy should be inserted in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 54, line 19, strike out "\$7,500,000" and insert "\$8,450,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 55, line 2, after the word "treaty" insert "toward the construction of one submarine authorized by the naval act of August 29, 1916."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves to recede and concur with an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "toward the construction of one fleet submarine (mine-laying type) heretofore authorized, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, and to cost not to exceed \$5,300,000 for construction and machinery and \$850,000 for armor, armament, and ammunition, and the Secretary of the Navy shall have prepared plans and estimates of cost of a scouting submarine and a submarine capable of accompanying the fleet, each to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, such plans and estimates to be in readiness for submission to Congress on the first day of the next regular session."

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

Mr. FRENCH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Was this recommended by the legislative committee?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; in 1916.

Mr. FRENCH. This is part of the 1916 program, and the submarine that the Senate provided for is to be a submarine of the mine-laying type, that does not require propulsion necessary for the wider-ranged fleet submarine. We are providing for the construction of one mine-laying submarine under the provisions of the Senate amendment, together with the experimentation looking to the development of an engine adequate for a cruiser type of fleet submarine as provided for by the House.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FOSTER DWIGHT COBURN

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record with reference to the death of a great Kansan, Foster Dwight Coburn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Associated Press announced the death of Foster Dwight Coburn, of Topeka, Kans. Inasmuch as none of the distinguished Representatives from Kansas has called attention to the home-going of this outstanding citizen, I desire here and now to speak

into the records of this House a few words in recognition and appreciation of this man, who was really great, according to all the standards by which true merit and real greatness are measured. He was not of my State nor of my political faith. But for 20 years he has been an outstanding figure in the realm of American agriculture. I and thousands of others have learned from him wholesome facts in relation to agriculture and animal industry.

Perchance he did not achieve greatness as the world understands that term, but no one who is familiar with his long and useful life will deny that he made a valuable and lasting contribution to those forces that promote the public good and spell the betterment of mankind. As the head of the Kansas State Department of Agriculture, as a dirt farmer, as a writer on agricultural subjects, as a farseeing agricultural expert and seer, and as a militant crusader in commendable agricultural activities and to establish agriculture on a sound economic basis, F. D. Coburn has earned the gratitude of millions to whose welfare his life was dedicated and to whose betterment he has so materially contributed.

In seasons of calamity and distress he gave wise counsel and sympathetic encouragement. In times of prosperity he advised moderation and conservatism, and cautioned against impulsive speculation and ill-considered activities.

His unflinching storehouse of wisdom and common sense was available at all times to the people of Kansas and the great West. He was the great agricultural emancipator of Kansas. His crusade for diversified farming, for alfalfa culture, for increased dairying and poultry production, for better livestock, for simple and sensible marketing systems, not only transformed and rehabilitated the agriculture of Kansas, but overstepped State lines and wholesomely altered and influenced the agricultural activities of the Nation.

F. D. Coburn was the one great outstanding apostle of alfalfa, by the ever-increasing culture of which millions have been added to the wealth of our Nation. This valuable forage plant, a native of Asia, was cultivated in Europe long before the song of the angels echoed over the Judean hills. Alfalfa was introduced into South America by the Spaniards. Its first cultivation in the United States was in California prior to the Civil War. Probably Mr. Coburn did more than any dozen other men to demonstrate the usefulness and value of this plant to the American farmer.

Though born in Wisconsin and residing for a brief season in Missouri, his active life was largely spent in Kansas, to the upbuilding of which State he materially contributed. Kansas did not and could not monopolize the valuable services he rendered to the age in which he lived. Measured by real achievements and enduring accomplishments, Foster Dwight Coburn was the outstanding Kansan of the present generation.

WORK OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by having printed the speech made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] before the American Merchant Marine Association as to the work of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the last 12 years—his own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted I insert the following speech by Hon. GEORGE W. EDMONDS, of Pennsylvania, before the American Merchant Marine Association, at New York, May 15, 1924, on the work of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House during the past 12 years, and suggestions for the future operation of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation:

BANQUET OF AMERICAN MARINE ASSOCIATION, MAY 15, NEW YORK

As this is probably the last opportunity I shall have for addressing a body of shipping men as a Member of Congress, I am constrained to trespass upon your time a little to review the past 12 or 13 years' work of the Congress along the lines of interest to you and to ask your indulgence while I give my views of what should be done in the future to retain the hold we have on our export and import trade, thrown into our hands through the exigencies of the World War.

It was in 1911 to 1913 that the Merchant Marine Committee of the House made what is probably one of the most complete investigations of the shipping business ever made by Congress. An investigation directed more at the basic and underlying reasons for the decadence of the American merchant marine than at the actual physical cost of operations. The outstanding result of this investigation was the recognition of conferences and agreements between lines as a necessity in order to control destructive competition, give good service, and to prevent monopoly.

Soon after the war started in Europe, spurred by necessity for shipping facilities, the Merchant Marine Committee prepared and brought into the law the shipping act of 1916, the principal features of which were:

1. Creation of the Shipping Board.
2. Creation of a corporation or corporations to operate merchant vessels.
3. Defined the investigating powers of the Shipping Board, and directed investigation in all lines of endeavor connected with shipping.
4. Recognized conferences and agreements between shipping operations, but arranged for such publicity and restrictions as were deemed necessary to protect the shipping public from discriminations.
5. Prohibited what were termed fighting ships.
6. Provided conditions to govern shipping during war and other emergencies.
7. Provided penalties for foreign shipping who, by agreement or by other methods, discriminated against American shipping.

Following the passage of this act, owing to the peculiar conditions prevailing during the war, Congress through its Merchant Marine Committee in the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate took upon itself the task of assisting in investigating and legislating upon some of the subjects delegated to the Shipping Board by the shipping act of 1916. There were quite a few subjects touched upon, one of the most important being the marine insurance. This investigation led to the arrangement between all the marine insurance companies in the United States to prepare syndicated policies covering the hull risks, and which I hope some day to see extended to cargo risks. Conditions prevailing, with the London Salvage Co. in practical control of repairs and Lloyd's Bureau in the same position regarding surveys, lend to the committee encouragement of the American bureau of shipping and the American bureau of salvage, both of which institutions now occupy a commanding position among the world's institutions of their kind.

The creation of a secured mortgage which would attract investment also had the attention of the committee, also the advisability of load-line legislation. All of this work was carried on by the committee, besides the numerous questions raised by the war necessities, and many minor subjects which were demanding continual attention.

In 1920 the Merchant Marine Committee of the House prepared the basis of what is now known as the "Jones Act," which was intended to clean up the chaotic condition created by the war and to declare our policy as to the many merchant marine ships now in possession of the Government. The constructive features of this bill were as follows:

1. Declaration of intent to build up a privately owned merchant marine.
2. Port facilities and development investigation ordered.
3. Provided a construction fund to be used to build up such ships as were necessary to balance the fleet for either commercial or war purposes.
4. Placed the Philippine Islands under the coastwise laws when proper facilities were adequate to handle the business.
5. Arranged for tax deductions to meet changed conditions.
6. Arranged for the use of the mail service to build up American-flag shipping.
7. Allowed cargo vessels to carry a limited number of passengers under certain conditions.
8. Recognized the syndicate form of marine insurance.
9. Arranged for a new type of ship mortgages known as "preferred mortgages."
10. Arranged when proper facilities existed that special import and export rates of American railroads should apply to American-flag vessels only.

11. Arranged for the abolishing of treaties which prevented the use of discriminating duties in favor of American vessels.

During this same session of Congress the important suits in admiralty act was prepared and passed, and since that time many different subjects have occupied the attention of the committee, many of which were included in the subsidy bill which, unfortunately, failed, carrying down with it the other proposed aids which would have been so valuable as assistance even without the subsidy.

Recently the attention of the committee has been brought to the pilferage evil, and the necessity of Federal attention to this subject, and also to the world's movement for a uniform and simplified bill of lading, both of which subjects are of great importance to successful ship operation. The destruction of American cargo owing to improper packing and lack of knowledge of this subject, lead at the request of the Merchant Marine Committee to an appropriation to the Department of Commerce for a full investigation of this subject, the results of which will be made public in a few weeks by a very complete book of instructions covering commodities and facilities. Recently, and as a result of investigation, there was passed by the House, and is now before the Senate, the bill which when made a law should provide for our having from 60 to 100 motor ships, the last word in economical operation.

During this period the committee has also made three separate investigations of the subject of radio communication, a general bill now being before Congress which carefully protects all the different interests affected.

It has been a source of great disappointment to us all that the material aids contained in the Jones bill and looked forward to so hopefully by us, of the discriminating duties, expansion of coastwise law to the Philippines, and the application of the import and export rates of railroads to American ships have not been placed in operation, and yet when we consider the disturbed conditions in the world and the impossibility of securing the abrogation of 22 or 24 treaties, containing many different subjects, many of which would lead to disturbing consequences if abrogated without being replaced immediately, we can readily realize that the matter needs careful handling and much consideration by our diplomatic authorities, and diplomatic work of this character is very slow in its consummation.

As to the application of the coastwise laws to the Philippines, owing to the present demand of the Filipinos for independence, it would be exceedingly unwise and possibly costly to press a subject which of necessity would imply to them sovereignty.

The real available aid to our American shipping contained in the Jones Act is the application of important export railroad rates to American bottoms; there could be no question of its application almost immediately had the sections in the subsidy bill for the coordination of rail and water shipping been passed. As it is to-day, section 28 stands without the machinery prepared to put it into operation. Let us hope that this defect will be cured and this substantial benefit to American shipping will be given to it.

This subject of preferential railroad rates applied to shipping was considered at the Geneva conference by a convention held for the regulation of maritime ports throughout the world, and was condemned by them as unjustly discriminating, which view was vigorously upheld by the Italian and Japanese delegations and strongly supported by Sir H. L. Smith, head of the British delegation. So strongly did they believe in this doctrine that they signed up at once for their respective countries. But we have yet to hear that the discriminatory customs duties levied against American goods shipped in American ships from American ports in favor of American goods shipped in Canadian ships and railroads by Australia have been removed; and as for the Japanese, we have yet to hear that the preferential rates on Japanese railroads for Japanese ships have been abrogated. Here is a cablegram just received from Manila, dated April 30: "Now here for conference, brings information from reliable source, Dairen, that Japanese vessels are given flat rate of 55 sen per ton for inward and outward cargo, whereas foreign vessels are charged 65 sen inward and 70 sen outward."

Nor, again, do we hear that the Italian Government has in any way modified her regulations regarding emigration or immigration. So I feel that those gentlemen who so deeply fear discriminations had better look into the many small and devious methods used by them and clean up their own house before criticizing their neighbors.

Britain boasts of her championship of the freedom of commerce between nations, of her desire to see the ships of all nations treated equally in all ports, of her freedom of limiting her coastwise trade to her own nationals, and yet uses discriminatory export duties in her colonies to keep the trade well in hand for herself; even the mandatories she received as an outcome of the Great War have acquired this habit under her guidance.

Leaving the past, what should Congress do in the future to benefit and place this great industry and national necessity upon a stable basis? Passing over the legislation which common business sense should dictate, like the uniform bill of lading proposition, there are three great legislative measures, separate and distinct from each other, which should have its attention. The first is to pass a bill—which should need but little discussion—containing the aids outside of the subsidy but contained in the subsidy bill. It would include such subjects as 50 per cent of the immigration in American vessels, Army and Navy transport of both officials and freight to be done in private vessels, Federal supervision of pilferage, load lines for vessels in the foreign trade, necessary changes in the preferred mortgage bill, a definition of the home port of a vessel, the necessary legislation to make section 28 of the Jones Act effective, and a union of all of the departments having to do with shipping, now scattered through the various governmental agencies, under one head in the Department of Commerce.

Second, urge the completion of the revision of the navigation laws now under way in the Shipping Board, and investigate the proposed changes carefully and as rapidly as possible, and then pass them into permanent law as quickly as possible.

Third, divorce as nearly as practicable the Shipping Board from the Emergency Fleet Corporation; leave the Shipping Board all the powers necessary under the various acts to supervise and advance the interests of the American merchant marine—and, believe me, there is much constructive work for them to do and many good reasons why, when acting for the advancement of the whole merchant marine, they should not have their opinions biased because of their participation in ship operations. I have never felt that the Shipping Board's position

was good from a business standpoint when they were endeavoring to both supervise shipping and they themselves operators.

I am not in favor of abolishing the Shipping Board. They have just as much place in our national business as the Interstate Commerce Commission, and when properly functioning will have mostly semi-judicial work to do which can not fairly be delegated to one man or a department, nor would the decisions of one man be favorably received by contestants in shipping matters. As for the Emergency Fleet Corporation, it should be organized as a separate corporation entirely from the board under a proper name. It should be given the power to form subsidiary corporations; to invite into those corporations the participation of outside capital, as minority holdings, with a view of ultimate purchase of the lines; to make up the deficit in the operations of such lines, as long as the line is desirable; and to dispose of the line, if successful, to the minority holders, or to others, upon favorable terms. While under Government control they should be subject to fair and equitable treatment, giving the utmost freedom of management to these subsidiary companies consistent with good business. This should lead to a considerable reduction in the expense which Government operation, with its cumbersome system, entails, and should lead to the disposal of these companies at an earlier date, with considerable saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

NO QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a quorum present. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

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

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Anderson | Dominick | Kurtz | Quayle |
| Anthony | Drane | Langley | Reed, W. Va. |
| Bacharach | Dyer | Larson | Salmon |
| Begg | Edmonds | Lea, Calif. | Sanders, N. Y. |
| Bixler | Fish | Lilly | Steagall |
| Bloom | Fitzgerald | Lindsay | Stenge |
| Boies | Fleetwood | Little | Sullivan |
| Bowling | Fredericks | McFadden | Summers, Tex. |
| Browne, Wis. | Freeman | MacGregor | Swoope |
| Buckley | Garrett, Tenn. | Magee, Pa. | Taylor, Colo. |
| Burdick | Geran | Manlove | Temple |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Gibson | Martin | Upshaw |
| Cable | Gifford | Miller, Ill. | Vare |
| Campbell | Graham, Pa. | Mills | Ward, N. C. |
| Casey | Graham, Ill. | Mooney | Wason |
| Celler | Green, Iowa | Moore, Ill. | Watres |
| Clark, Fla. | Griffin | Moore, Va. | Watson |
| Collier | Hayden | Morin | Weller |
| Collins | Howard, Okla. | Mudd | White, Me. |
| Connolly, Pa. | Hull, Tenn. | O'Brien | Williams, Tex. |
| Cramton | Hull, William E. | O'Connor, N. Y. | Wursbach |
| Crowther | Jeffers | Oliver, N. Y. | Wyant |
| Cummings | Kahn | Park, Ga. | Yates |
| Curry | Keller | Patterson | Zihlman |
| Davey | Kiss | Peavy | |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kunz | Perlman | |
| Dickstein | | Phillips | |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-eight Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The doors were reopened.

HOUSE OF MEETING

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I object.

HAUGEN-M'NARY BILL

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] calls up a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 317

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 9033, entitled "A bill declaring an emergency in respect of certain agri-

cultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes."

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 15 hours, and during the general debate the House shall recess each day from 6 o'clock p. m. until 8 o'clock p. m., the time to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of H. R. 9033, entitled "A bill declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes," or what is generally known as the McNary-Haugen bill. The rule also provides for 15 hours of general debate, and it provides that the House shall recess each night during the general debate from 6 o'clock to 8 o'clock. It is expected to run to-night until 11 o'clock and run again on Thursday night until the final conclusion of general debate, in order that we may take up the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule on Friday morning.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. It is now 3 o'clock. If the rule were passed and we were required to meet Thursday at 8 o'clock p. m. and complete the debate we would have to run until about 1 or 2 o'clock Friday morning.

Mr. SNELL. The final completion of general debate is not absolutely provided for. We expected to get in to-day a little after 12 o'clock, and if we had done so, general debate could easily have been completed Thursday night, but it may be that we shall not quite finish general debate Thursday night. We tried to get unanimous consent to begin at 11 o'clock Thursday morning in order to permit the passage of the bill, and perhaps we may be able to accomplish that yet.

I will say for the benefit of the House that this rule comes without any objection from the members of the Rules Committee, although it may not necessarily meet the individual views of all the members of that committee. However, we fully appreciate the fact that this is important legislation and that it affects a large part of the citizenship of this country. Anything that is for the benefit of the farming communities we feel should have careful and considerate attention by the Members of this House. We know that the prosperity of the whole country depends very largely on the prosperity of our people, and a proposition in which nearly 30 per cent of the people are engaged is very important to the people of the country, and for that reason we feel this bill should be considered at this time and that the House should have ample and full time to take it up, discuss it, and bring all of its provisions before the House and before the people of the whole country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Some two or three days ago, in answer to an inquiry, the gentleman from New York said that the disabled service men's hospitalization bill, authorizing additional appropriations of \$6,500,000, would be brought up under a special rule within a day or two. Those days have passed, and in the meantime the committee comes in with this rule, which will bring up for consideration a bill that will take about one week's time. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York when the House may expect the bringing in of a rule which will make that important hospitalization bill in order? We have in Minnesota wholly inadequate facilities for both neuropsychiatric cases and tubercular cases, and we are anxious to get to work upon that program.

Mr. SNELL. I will say in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota that unfortunately the "gentleman from New York" can not always control the actions of the House. As far as the "gentleman from New York" is concerned, he intended to bring up that bill last Friday or Saturday, but other business intervened so that it was impossible to do so. This was fixed by agreement as the order of business to-day, and I think we should follow that agreement.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The situation is this: That bill is on the Consent Calendar and we can not consider consent business because of the Barkley-Howell bill, and now it seems to be tied up by putting ahead of it rules making other legislation in order.

Mr. SNELL. It was not intended to have this rule considered ahead of the other one, but we got into a situation we could not control.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman this question? Can we expect reasonably to follow the consideration of this bill with a rule for the hospitalization bill?

Mr. SNELL. I think that probably will be the next rule considered. I am not absolutely certain of it, but I can assure the gentleman it will be brought up in the very near future, but I can not tell definitely when we can do it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is a rule for that bill now.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; there is a rule for it.

HOURLY MEETING ON THURSDAY

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from North Carolina pardon me, and will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. SNELL. I yield a moment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. By inadvertence, Mr. Speaker, when I preferred my request for unanimous consent, I said to-morrow when I meant Thursday. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet Thursday at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HAUGEN-M'NARY BILL

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, may I say just this word in addition, with the consent of the gentleman from North Carolina: This rule provides 15 hours of general debate. Of course that argues that if we attempt to close general debate in two days it will be necessary for the House to sit pretty late. I think it is very advisable that we should have Friday and Saturday for the consideration of the bill itself. I merely want to express the hope that gentlemen will be willing to remain later than usual to-night and Thursday night in order to conclude the general debate.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. In case of several roll calls, what then?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would anticipate there would be no roll calls on the adoption of the rule.

Mr. ASWELL. I mean during the next two days.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And I assume no gentleman, under the circumstances, would raise the point of no quorum.

Mr. SNELL. It does not seem that that should be necessary.

Mr. ASWELL. That assumption would not be guaranteed.

Mr. SNELL. I do not know of anybody who is going to filibuster against the consideration of this bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I merely express the hope that gentlemen will not raise the point of no quorum and there will be no roll calls necessary.

Mr. ASWELL. I did not refer to the gentleman from Louisiana, but it is not unlikely that may happen.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I am glad there is a disposition to consider legislation having for its purpose the relief of the agricultural depression in the great Northwest and West. I regret that under the rule only the so-called McNary-Haugen bill can be considered. There is at least one other measure which might well have consideration at this time. I have talked with quite a number of gentlemen, and my belief is the minority is willing to stay here until October, if necessary, in order to give farm-relief legislation a fair chance to be enacted into law. For one I do not think Congress ought to adjourn without making an honest effort to solve this problem. You can not read a paper without seeing accounts of bank failures caused by the disaster to agriculture, yet the talk is we must adjourn by the 7th of June. Of course, it is perfectly futile to talk about dealing with any great subject within that length of time. And I say this Congress has no moral right to adjourn until a sincere, honest effort has been put forth to give some measure of relief to agricultural producers who are forced to accept a market price admittedly less than the cost of production.

The Democratic minority is willing to stay in session until some sane and adequate measure becomes a law. Without any effort to play politics, without any effort to gain any advantage, we are willing to stay here as long as it is necessary in order to deal with this nation-wide subject.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that a large part of my district in Virginia is agricultural. My farmers, like your farmers, need help, and I would welcome an opportunity—in fact, I would embrace an opportunity—to really vote for some sensible, economically sound legislation that might help the farmers. But I have read this bill, Mr.

Speaker, and I have tried to study the report of the majority of the committee, and I have read the minority report, and I do say, frankly and candidly, that I would not vote for this bill if it was a question of retaining my seat in Congress, and I should like to retain it for a while longer.

I regard it as the most revolutionizing piece of legislation I have ever undertaken to read and tried to comprehend. [Applause.] I believe it would be a national calamity if by any possible chance it could ever become a law. I am confident there is not a farmer in my district or in my State who would favor the enactment of this bill if he understood it.

NEED FOR FARM RELIEF

That there is urgent need for farm-relief legislation none will deny. One has but to go out among the farms and their owners and to survey the conditions as he finds them to realize the acute distress existing in certain lines of agriculture. This condition is brought about from a number of concurring causes—inequalities in prices between agricultural products and other commodities, overproduction in certain lines of agriculture, labor conditions, lack of uniform and cooperative systems of marketing, and so forth.

Many and varied proposals have been made in the form of bills introduced which seek to bring relief to the farmer. A score or more of such bills have been considered by the Committee on Agriculture, many of them proposals of real merit. However, by a divided committee, we are called upon to pass upon this bill and given to understand that it is to take this or nothing. Personally I should heartily welcome an opportunity to vote for some sensible and economically sound bill that would help the farmer, but I can not swallow this one.

The Republican Party in its platform in 1920 declared for farm relief. Some of its eloquent utterances are interesting when considered in the light of the present legislation they have brought here for our consideration. In bombastic tones they called for—

an end of unnecessary price fixing and ill-considered efforts.

The President in his recent message to the present Congress had something to say upon the subject:

No complicated scheme of relief, no plan for Government fixing of prices, no resort to the Public Treasury will be of any permanent value in establishing agriculture.

A statesmanlike utterance which was generously applauded by both sides of the Chamber. But, lo, things have changed! The Republican Party is smarting under the blows delivered one after another by the insurgent group from the West; election time is nearing; third-party talk is disturbing; ominous sounds are drifting in from the great West; Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin must be pacified and pleased, so what is a few platform pledges and presidential utterances in such serious circumstances? Or do they plan to play the game both ways by having Congress pass this monstrosity and thus please the farmer, and then have the President veto it and thus please the opponents? And all the while the farmer is the goat.

OBJECTIONS TO THE BILL

I am firmly convinced that it would be little short of a great national calamity if this measure should become a law.

It is the most gigantic, the most stupendous, and far-reaching legislation offered to Congress in a decade. Its revolutionizing influences upon agriculture, as well as industry, are almost beyond conception.

The bill proposes a great governmental agency in the form of a corporation financed by the Government to the extent of \$200,000,000, and power to borrow more, which shall undertake to establish and maintain the prices of certain products, namely, wheat, flour, rice, corn, wool, cattle, sheep, swine, or any food product of cattle, sheep, or swine, and so forth.

It is a price-fixing measure pure and simple.

While the purpose of the bill is to bring relief to the farmer, yet let us look at others it would benefit, and see if therein does not lie the secret of its presentation. I quote from the report of the minority of the Committee on Agriculture (p. 4):

A COLOSSAL GIFT TO NONPRODUCERS

When this bill takes effect, as to wheat, the price of dollar wheat will instantly rise to over \$1.50. The elevator man, merchants, millers, and speculators who have wheat on hand will suddenly be made richer by operation of law. If the emergency is declared, as it probably will be, before the wheat season, nearly all the wheat available for market will be in the hands of these men, and not in the hands of the farmers. The same applies to rice and corn, the profit, of course, being smaller. It may be that on some of this equalization fee can be collected, but if sold for feed or seed there is no fee. If the fee on \$1.50 wheat is 20 cents per bushel, the law has increased

the value to the holders 30 cents per bushel, which must be paid for by the farmers and consumers. Every merchant or wholesaler who has flour on hand will find himself enriched overnight, and under the terms of the bill no equalization fee can be collected. If an emergency is declared on cattle, hogs, and sheep, every head will instantly rise in value, whether in the hands of farmers or others. The hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of pork, beef, and mutton in the hands of the Big Five and about 200 smaller packers would instantly rise in value. On this item alone there would be a sheer gift to the meat packers of this country of from \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 to be paid for by the consumers of the country. The packers would have to pay an equalization fee providing an emergency were declared on their products, but that would only be a fraction of their gain.

All meat stocks in the hands of meat dealers who had bought them from packers would likewise rise, and from them no equalization fee could be collected. The millers of the country holding wheat or flour would make millions overnight, to be paid for by the consumers. If an emergency should ever be declared on wool, every clothing manufacturer, clothing dealer, etc., would be enriched, and no fee could be collected from them. When the packer legislation and grain futures act were before the committee there were swarms of packers and millers and high-priced attorneys making all manner of objections. These gentlemen did not put in an appearance when this bill was being considered and no doubt they are praying for its passage. The total gift to nonproducers would easily amount to \$500,000,000. There has been no such gift "since salvation was made free to the human race."

WAYSIDE MARKETING OR TRUCKING DESTROYED

Fancy, for instance, a farmer in my district favoring such a proposition as the following minority report of committee (p. 11):

A system of wayside marketing is developing in the country wherever good roads are being built. It is often pointed out as a partial solution of the farmer's difficulties. Let us assume it is the roasting-ear season, and the farmer starts out on his "wayside marketing" expedition with a supply of this commodity to be sold to his customers. An emergency has been declared in corn. It will be necessary for him to make a report of every sale he makes, and in all probability a separate report, no matter whether he sells a half dozen ears at a time or more or less than that. In order that there may be a proper system of checks and balances, the purchaser in all probability will also be required to make a report. Both reports, of course, ought to be verified by oath, in order to safeguard the Government. Before the farmer makes a sale, he will be compelled to ascertain what the equalization fee is for that month, and by some sort of rules the corporation will regulate each of these sales of corn by prescribing some method of weight or measurement which will fit in with the plan of this bill. When the farmer has ascertained the equalization fee, he is in a position to deliver. After his customer has paid for the corn he will have something to do himself. He must at his peril ascertain what the equalization fee is and he will have to procure a receipt from the corporation for the fee and turn the receipt over to the farmer. The purchaser might also be compelled to make a "return," and this return must in all probability be verified by oath. This will, of course, necessitate fees for officers who administer oaths. In certain cases it may be necessary for the buyer and seller to keep books for inspection by Government inspectors. Buyer and seller must conduct their transactions correctly. If the purchaser fails to furnish the receipt, or fails to pay, or attempts to evade the collection of the fee, he is liable to be fined in the Federal court not more than \$5,000, or imprisonment not more than a year, or both, and, of course, if the producer is a party to any failure of this character, he is liable to the same penalties. There are other penalties in the bill.

What about the expense of operating this great corporation? It has been estimated that it will require an army of 50,000 employees added to the already overburdened pay rolls of the Government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the bill. It is a subsidy for the wheat growers of the West. It is not claimed that it would be of the slightest benefit to the farmers of the South. It is class legislation of the rankest sort. It is a colossal raid upon the Treasury of the Government for a favored few. It, however, is in keeping with other measures jammed through this Congress. I recall a few of them: Ten million dollars for Germany; rebate of six million to China; a million dollars for the farmers of New Mexico; eleven and a half million for the Cape Cod Canal to reimburse the stockholders of a defunct private enterprise. And on and on, always raiding the Treasury for some chosen few. I have consistently opposed all such legislation and shall vote against the pending bill.

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

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] [Applause.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, President Coolidge in his veto message of the soldiers' bonus bill states that this humane measure is class legislation. The old soldier pension bill is of the same class. This is the first time since George Washington was President of the United States that any President has classed pension legislation for the benefit of soldiers of the Republic as "class legislation."

When George Washington was awarded 15,000 acres of land by Virginia in the Kenahwah Valley on account of his services during the Revolutionary War, it was not regarded as class legislation. Why, because General Washington's services in the seven years' war was not for a class or a clan, but for all the people of the 13 colonies. When North Carolina gave to each brigadier general of the Revolutionary War 12,000 acres of land; 7,200 acres to every colonel, and 3,200 acres to every captain, it was not regarded as "class legislation."

Why, because the patriots of North Carolina held that the soldiers of North Carolina did not suffer the perils and hardships and tragedies of the seven years' war for North Carolina alone, but for all the immortal principles in the Declaration of Independence. Hence this generous donation of land was not "class legislation."

When North Carolina gave to General Greene 25,000 acres of land, worth at the time \$500,000, it was not regarded as "class legislation." When Georgia, after the war gave General Greene \$22,500 in money it was regarded as real patriotism, and when South Carolina gave General Greene \$45,000 for his services it was regarded as a patriotic gift and there is no record that even a Tory claimed that this money gift was "class legislation"; or that the grateful officials of South Carolina had commercialized patriotism.

According to the veto message of President Coolidge, patriotism has no commendable attributes but lip service. The Congress of the United States has always, up to recent date, thought differently. And every President from George Washington down to Calvin Coolidge—a good ways down—have never proclaimed such atrocious sentiments.

When General LaFayette returned from France, after the war, Congress voted him over \$100,000 in money and a whole township of land in Louisiana. This gift was never mentioned as "class legislation."

Let me remind President Coolidge that patriotism or love of country may have a practical element of value, even in this utilitarian age. On the 4th of March, 1865, I stood within 10 feet of Abraham Lincoln and heard him deliver his last inaugural address—his last official message to the American people. I believe I am the only person in official life to-day who heard that address. I heard him say:

With malice towards none and with charity for all, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphans.

[Applause.]

Not a man or woman in the Republic at that time ever thought for one moment that Lincoln only meant "lip service" for the soldiers or for the soldiers' widows or his orphans. Neither did the party of Abraham Lincoln so regard it. The Republican National convention of 1868 (the first after the war), which met in Chicago May 20, passed a resolution unanimously that "to the brave soldiers who imperiled their lives in the service of their country the bounties and pensions provided for these brave defenders are obligations never to be forgotten." The Republican National convention of 1872, which met in Philadelphia June 5, unanimously adopted a resolution that—

No act of ours shall ever detract from their justly earned fame or their reward.

All down the years since the war the party of Lincoln has never until President Coolidge ever claimed that patriotism consists only of "lip service" and that humane legislation for the soldiers of the Republic is class legislation.

Evidently the benign spirit of Lincoln dwells no longer in the White House.

President Coolidge claims his veto message is based upon economic consideration. Let us see:

Let us remind the President that his Secretary of the Navy and his Secretary of War and all his Cabinet with his approval have indorsed an Army and Navy appropriation this year which calls for about \$285,000,000 more money than the entire appropriations in 1916, when we were getting ready for the World War.

Lest we forget, I will give the figures:

In 1916 we appropriated for the Army \$119,530,829; we appropriated for the Navy \$150,526,634; a total of \$270,057,464. This year Congress has appropriated for the Army \$300,000,000 and for the Navy almost \$255,000,000, approximating \$555,000,000.

Let us remind the President that his Secretary of the Navy and his Secretary of War and all his Cabinet, with his approval, have indorsed an Army and Navy appropriation of \$285,000,000 more money than the entire appropriations in 1916, when we were getting ready for the World War.

In view of this damning record of extravagance and waste in the Army and Navy appropriations, the President's claim that he vetoed the old soldiers' pension bill on the ground of economy is a false pretense and a cruel deceit.

Only a few days ago we had a petty illustration of class legislation and the kind of economy we are now realizing. The Cape Cod Canal, of Buzzards Bay, Mass., a project that has been in debate in Congress for 10, these many years, was put through the House of Representatives on a record vote of yeas 149 and nays 131, not voting 146. This project, as estimated, will eventually cost the taxpayers of the United States over \$20,000,000.

The project was an administration scheme, recommended by a Massachusetts Secretary of War, approved, apparently, by a Massachusetts President, put through the House of Representatives by a Massachusetts committee chairman, and presided over with great dignity and ability by a Massachusetts Speaker of the House, and for the benefit of an originally organized Massachusetts corporation. [Laughter and applause.] This looks more like class legislation than the old soldiers' pension bill.

The President vetoed the old soldiers' pension bill on the grounds of economy. In the meantime he evidently indorses the Cape Cod Canal project, to cost some \$20,000,000. He recommends the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River, and is carrying forward a project that will cost the taxpayers of the United States over \$20,000,000 building a fleet of war vessels to chase the rancorous rum runners on the Atlantic Ocean. These three projects, all either ornamental or useless, will cost the taxpayers a million dollars more than the old soldiers' pension bill which the President vetoed.

A number of friends I know back home are anxious to know how President Coolidge can claim to be an economist when he is making so large a drain on the Federal Treasury for his own pleasure and delectation. I am reminded of the fact that in 1873, when General Grant was President, the total appropriation for the President, including his salary and the upkeep of the White House, was \$43,000. This year the President and his executive clerks and the upkeep of the White House and his recreation factors are costing the taxpayers over \$500,000. Let me mention some of the items: President's salary, \$75,000; traveling expenses, \$25,000; President's secretary, \$7,500; personal services, clerks, and so forth, \$89,520; contingent expenses—who knows what that is—\$37,000; printing and binding, \$2,900; ordinary care and repair of White House, \$48,240; for heating the greenhouses, \$11,000; for care of greenhouses, \$9,000; for repair of President's greenhouses, \$9,830; for improvement of White House grounds, \$10,000; for lighting grounds and back yard, \$8,600; White House police, including 30 privates and several sergeants, \$55,540; for uniforms for White House police, \$3,350; total, \$375,630; the *Mayflower*, fun boat, exclusively for the President's pleasure, \$125,000; grand total, \$500,630. Sad to tell, the President takes his cruel pen in hand and vetoes a pension for the old soldiers of the Republic now tottering to near-by graves.

By this act the last survivors of the war for the Union, now over 81 years old, are denied the solace of a Nation's gratitude and compelled to spend the last days of their weary, worn-out lives in biting want and cold neglect.

Gettysburg, Vicksburg, Atlanta, Franklin, and Nashville can speak to us no more with tongues of lurid flame. They are silent for all the coming ages; but their silence is more eloquent of national destiny than all the hoggish oracles of monopoly and greed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

We should keep the air of the National Capitol wholesome and pure and seek to aid by our official conduct that all-absorbing patriotism that characterized the great masters of national destiny who set this Republic on its career.

We can not recall the valiant dead who sleep in 70 national cemeteries and in Flanders fields, but we can make a heroic effort to revive the patriotic spirit and show by official acts of generosity and gratitude that this Nation has not forgotten her vows. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBY].

Mr. RUBEX. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want first to indorse the opening remarks of the chairman of the Rules Committee, who called your attention to the fact that we have before us to-day a bill that affects the agricultural interests throughout the length and breadth of the country. The importance of this legislation is apparent to everybody within the sound of my voice. I am not going at this time to take up the discussion of the bill. I want to say to you, however, that I have in my hand a document of 750 pages that represents the hearings held on this bill. We began its consideration about the middle of January. We have kept it up daily until two weeks ago, when the bill was reported. Men came before that committee from every part of this country—North, South, East, and West. This bill which we present to you to-day has been given the most careful and painstaking consideration of any measure that has to my knowledge ever come before our Agricultural Committee. We have done something with this bill that I do not think has ever been done before. We went over it again and again, and four confidential prints of the bill were made before it was finally reported. The gentleman from Virginia—and I am not going to talk about what he says except to say that his characterization of the measure—but I will not even discuss that at this time.

It seems to me, however, that it would have been well if the gentleman from Virginia had withheld his remarks and his opinion on the bill until he had had opportunity to hear the 15 hours of discussion that he might have been informed of some things in the bill, and some provisions which are not in the bill, and which he probably thinks are provided for in the measure.

I have read editorials in the great daily press; I have read pamphlets sent out by the boards of trade; I have read arguments made by Members of this House, sent out to their districts, that contain statements and arguments that are not warranted by anything that is in the measure. I am for this bill. I want the membership of this House to listen to this debate, and give to it very careful consideration and then make up their minds. If it is their opinion that it is a bad bill, then of course they will vote against it. But if they think it is a good bill, that it will help the American farmer and put him on his feet, again, we want you to help us put it into law. I am for it; I believe it is the most important measure that has come before Congress during this present session. We want your help.

To-day as I stand here probably somewhere in this great Nation a bank is closing its doors on account of agricultural conditions. Within the last six months more banks have failed in agricultural districts than ever before in a like period in this country. [Applause.]

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

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am satisfied that every true and conscientious friend of the American farmer wants to do something in the way of legislation that will help him most. I know that there is no Member of this House who is more sincere in wanting to vote for legislation that will really be for the benefit of the American farmer than I am. I am not going to discuss the merits of the bill now, because I hope to later, but after three months' hearings on this bill I am thoroughly convinced that it is going to hurt the farmer more than it will help him, and I want to do something for the American farmer and not something to the American farmer.

I believe you will agree with me when you shall have heard all the arguments in the case that this bill is fraught with more possible complexities, both national and international, for the safety, welfare, and happiness and prosperity of our country than any bill that has been before the House for a century. Knowing the importance of it, knowing the honest disagreement of members of the agricultural committee, regardless of politics, it seems to me that we are making a great mistake, and that the Rules Committee has made a great mistake, in only allowing 15 hours' general debate on the bill. If we had the 15 hours' general debate on the bill with nights excluded, then if necessary we could at least have the nights in addition, it would be all right, but you and I know what effect debate on a bill has at night with a small attendance here, and I hope that the chairman of the Rules Committee can yet see his way clear to strike out the night provision.

There are other important bills intended to assist agriculture pending before the great Agricultural Committee. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] has a bill known as the Curtis-Aswell bill. He went before the Rules Committee

and made an earnest appeal to make that bill in order for consideration at the same time this bill is.

That is a great cooperative marketing bill the principles of which in my judgment will do something permanently for the farmer. Why should not this House have an opportunity to consider that bill along with this bill? Why should we be in the attitude of saying that this is the only panacea for the American farmer, and why should we say to this House that it has to take this bill or nothing? Yet the Rules Committee comes here and says that we have either to take this bill or none, when we could have had the consideration of the Curtis-Aswell bill before the House.

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

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman think that is quite a fair statement?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am talking about the action, and I do not know anything about the intention.

Mr. SNELL. The Rules Committee, so far as I have known, and during the time that I have been a member of it, has never reported a measure to this floor that did not have the backing of a committee which had had consideration of the legislation. This request for the consideration of the Aswell bill did not come as a request from the committee, but it came as a request from an individual, and the Rules Committee has never violated that rule since I have been a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I say that this McNary-Haugen bill is not the sense of the entire Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SNELL. As far as I know, it came from that committee.

Mr. KINCHELOE. There are other members of the Committee on Agriculture who are just as anxious to do something for the American farmer as those who signed the majority report. I am not talking about the intention, but I am talking about the effect of the action of the gentleman's committee, that this House is barred from the consideration of that bill, and the only alternative that we have is to swallow this bill or take nothing. That is the point I make, and it is not fair to the membership of this House. I hope that we will be able to vote down the previous question in order that we may amend this rule so that we may have 15 hours of debate and have the night sessions included.

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

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], stated that this legislation concerned a large percentage of the population of the United States. That is true and much more. This legislation concerns every individual in the United States. It concerns the people in the cities as much as those in the country. Every member of the Committee on Agriculture is vitally concerned, eagerly concerned, to bring legislation to the House that will be effectively helpful to the American farmer. I went before the Committee on Rules and urged that four other bills in addition to the McNary-Haugen bill might be considered by this House. The McNary-Haugen bill I shall discuss later in the day. It has the name of our distinguished chairman attached to it. It was not proper for other gentlemen on that committee to force action upon their individual bills by the committee until the Haugen bill was out of the way.

That is the truth of the situation, and for four months all of us who had bills pending in that committee have stood back out of the chairman's way. I am not criticizing, but that is the fact of the case. So now the plan is to bring to this House the McNary-Haugen bill only in an effort to make gentlemen fear that if they do not vote for this bill they will have no other chance to vote for any agricultural bill. That is the policy, that is the strategy, that is the scheme. This proposal to have part of this debate through the nighttime is absurd, as the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, knows. If he and the other gentlemen on the Committee on Rules will agree to give 15 hours of general debate and say nothing with reference to night sessions, then we will give justice to this body of men. Under the agreement I am to control one-fourth of the time, and I have had over 30 requests for time. I have had requests in opposition to this bill that would cover the whole 15 hours; if I had them at my control. There are 21 members of the committee, and 20 of them will likely speak on the bill. It is a bill of such vast intricacy, it is a bill of such wild-eyed theories, of such intricate and interminable phraseology, with such statistical contradictions as will confound and confuse and lead men who try to explain it into a maze of mystery and despair, that it

is impossible to discuss the bill in a short time. You can not discuss this bill properly without having one hour in which to make a statement and another hour in which to answer questions. It is utterly impossible if you want to study the bill with effect and intelligence, and so, Mr. Speaker, I pause here to ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules this simple question: Will he agree that I may have unanimous consent rather than to fight the rule in an effort to vote down the previous question, and strike out any reference to night sessions?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I will say in answer to the gentleman that I have had more fault found with me on account of giving so much time to the consideration of this bill than on any other rule that we have ever brought in this session.

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

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent that it be so amended?

Mr. SNELL. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. If we vote down the motion for the previous question, can we not amend the rule, change it?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, this bill that the Rules Committee provides for the consideration of is an emergency measure. It is introduced at any rate and reported by the committee as an emergency measure. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] that the Committee on Agriculture has never been known to give more serious consideration to any measure before it than it has to this measure. It is not fair to criticize the Committee on Rules for not bringing in a rule making the bill of the gentleman from Louisiana germane to this bill, because the gentleman from Louisiana himself has stated in my presence and in the presence of the committee that his bill is not an emergency measure, and while it is calculated to help agriculture in the future it bears no relation whatever to this measure. Besides, the Committee on Agriculture decided during our hearings that we would not be bound by any rule, and that the public might have the benefit of everything that happened in that committee room. The gentleman's bill was offered as a substitute in an effort to defeat the McNary-Haugen bill being reported out, and by an overwhelming majority the Committee on Agriculture refused to adopt it as a substitute.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not a fact that that was at the end of the session, and without any consideration of the bill, because it has never been read by the committee and no attention has been paid to it?

Mr. TINCHER. Certainly. The gentleman himself stated it was not an emergency measure, and it was voted down almost unanimously. The Rules Committee could have done nothing that would have been more outrageous than to have brought in a rule making that bill in order at this time. Now we propose—

Mr. ASWELL. May I ask—

Mr. TINCHER. The friends of agriculture on that committee propose that we have 15 hours' debate and the McNary-Haugen bill will be debated and amended. If any man has in mind an emergency proposition better than that, let him offer it as an amendment. There never was a more systematic propaganda or a better lobby against a measure than has been in Washington this winter against this farm legislation, and sometimes when men announce their opposition to this measure now we recognize the language. How can a Member of Congress who says he is a friend to the farmer when he knows he is going to have a chance to offer an amendment that will make good if it is not, how can he announce that he is going to vote against the measure? We are not thin-skinned about this measure. A good many members of the committee realize it is a hard proposition to work out anything that is economically sound and will accomplish the result, but it is a subject that ought to be debated and the—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TINCHER. Two more minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. TINCHER. Another proposition I want to mention is that it was heralded through the press of this country and a member of the Agricultural Committee was quoted as having said to the Rules Committee that this bill was bolshevik, socialistic, and soviet. Now, that is a question of fact as to whether it is true or not. It is not true. There is not any-

thing socialistic or bolshevik about it. There is only one answer to that argument against the bill, and that is that the argument is false. As to the man who differs with me on this bill as to its being economically sound and economically a governmental proposition I have regard. That is a matter of opinion concerning which we may differ and debate, but the other statement is propaganda furnished by the people who want to keep the farmers of America with their noses to the grindstone, and is false. [Applause.] There is no room for argument about it. I yield back what time may remain. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL].

FARM RELIEF

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a systematic effort on the part of a certain class in this country, exemplified by the Wall Street Journal, to build up and foster the impression that the farmer is a faultfinder who exaggerates his troubles, "a malcontent who loafed into bankruptcy with one-crop farming." This is a heartless, willful misjudgment of the class who work hardest with most hours of labor and least return. Wall Street should not begrudge the farmer a chance to pay his debts. It is enough to make him "see red." All over the country receipts from the farms have not been enough to pay the taxes. The farmer's confidence has been destroyed with false gestures of help. His suspicions have been aroused. He has been so numbed by a series of knockout blows that he has almost ceased to hope. He asks for a chance to break even, and we give him more credit. Extension of credit is no help. He has too many mortgages now. The farmer can hardly trust anything that comes to him in the guise of relief, he has been gold-bricked so many times. Judging by its enemies and their howl this ought to be a good measure. It is of vital concern to the farmer of the Northwest.

In August, 1923, a bushel of wheat brought 84 cents. Let us compare the prices of 10 years ago. In 1913 a suit of clothes cost 21 bushels of wheat; in 1923, 31 bushels of wheat bought a suit of clothes. In 1913 a wagon cost 103 bushels of wheat; in 1923 it took 166 bushels. In 1923 he sells a hide for 80 cents and buys back a pair of shoes for \$4.50. All commodities except agricultural have gone up 60 per cent on an average, while agricultural commodities, left to the mercy of demoralized, war-ruined world conditions, have gone up 17 per cent. To neglect the farmer any longer, to attack this bill as vicious and class legislation is cloudy thinking and stupid prejudice. Six million farmers make a fair proportion of our population, almost too many to label legislation in their behalf as "class." It is not special privilege. It is justice. Industry has been given the highest protection. Transportation has been given aid and comfort.

The reason for the depression is that the farmer buys in a highly protected market, rising all the time, and sells in an open market in competition with lower-paid workers. Take, for example, the dairy industry in Minnesota. This industry has sprung up in response to the propaganda for diversified farming. Our State has by intensive effort brought cooperation to a higher point of efficiency than anywhere else in the United States. We make the finest quality of butter, command the highest prices, and haul down the highest awards and medals. But Minnesota has to compete with the labor of Denmark, where the dairyman pays his hired man \$14 to \$16 a month. In Minnesota the wage is \$50 to \$70 a month and board. Our men are in competition with 23 foreign nations to-day, in none of which are the wages and labor conditions on a par with the United States. The result is that it takes the life right out of the cooperative idea. When in an effort to control markets a surplus is shifted away from an overglutted market like New York and distributed around to less oversupplied markets in order to avoid a disastrous drop in price, what does New York do? It buys a shipload or two of Danish butter where, in addition to their advantage over our farmer on the labor end of it, they can make 40 cents on each dollar of American money, due to the difference in exchange, and butter drops 20 cents in price and threatens to go still lower. In January the farmer got a creamery check for \$120. In April \$100, and in May it will be \$80. The matter of the drop in creamery checks is of vital moment to every farmer in the State. They all get their creamery check, and they all feel the pinch. It is the last line of defense for the farmer. If his dairying enterprise fails, he is ruined.

The farmer does not expect protection from internal competition. He is willing to breast the struggle for existence and let the fittest survive. What he can not understand is why foreign industries should fatten at his expense, why he should suffer the competition of foreign markets. It will ruin the Nation. Already if you look over the keyboards at the leading

hotels you will note that travel is way below normal. Traveling men are not being sent out through the rural districts. Little shops are not stocking up. The farmer has no money to buy. The small bankers are failing. We are right up to our necks in panic for the grim, tragic condition of the farmer; the ravaging effects of his economic distress has a direct bearing on all business. Industry must not consider agriculture as its hated rival, nor view with jealous eye measures looking to its stability, for they are interwoven; and when the farmer, through no fault of his own, sees the work of a lifetime swept away, no matter how frugal and efficient he may have been, it is not a condition for business to look upon with an indifferent eye. Agriculture is the source of our wealth. This is axiomatic. Eastern prosperity can not continue without it. It is to their interest to cooperate and avert a complete panic—to at least make it possible that the farmer can lift his mortgages, pay his bills, and keep up his purchasing power.

During the war Congress set a price for the farmers' wheat, of \$2.26, I think it was, then organized a Grain Corporation, wherein they bought wheat and resold it to foreign markets at \$3 and \$4 and \$5 a bushel. After all expenses were paid—and they were enormous, the chairman, Julius Barnes, putting his brother-in-law and other business associates in at a salary from \$30,000 to \$50,000 a year—there was still left over \$70,000,000. This money came directly out of the pockets of the farmers.

This bill only asks that the Government be sponsor for its credit with which to buy grain. This grain when resold will take care of itself and take care of the cost of the proposition. While the Government will have to guarantee it, in the end it will cost the Government nothing; and if it did, the \$70,000,000 the farmers have been robbed of will more than take care of any deficiency. It is our duty.

People say we can not set the price. Trusts and combinations of the country have, by using the protection of the tariff, been setting prices right and left. It would be a strange thing if farmers can not even get the protection of tariff they are entitled to in comparison with other basic industries. By taking up the exportable surplus the price of grain would range accordingly.

The bill would operate like this: The wheat crop is, roughly, 800,000,000 bushels, of which our consumption is 600,000,000. The surplus, 200,000,000 bushels, we export. If the farmer is to get \$1.50 for his wheat and the exportable surplus is worth about \$1, the loss on the exportable 200,000,000 would be \$100,000,000. If the farmers were paid \$1.50 for the 800,000,000 bushels consumed at home and this 600,000,000 were sold to consumers here for \$1.75, a profit of \$150,000,000 would pile up, enough to take care of the \$100,000,000 loss on the exportable surplus and leave \$50,000,000 for expenses.

This bill gives power to place such duty as will prohibit the foreign competition, which will be, in effect, an embargo on farm products that come in competition. [Applause.]

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the criticisms leveled against the Committee on Rules for not granting more time for debate on this proposition, I am sure we appreciate that this is an important measure, and for that reason we have granted 15 hours for debate, which is the longest time granted for general debate in a special rule, I think, in the last two Congresses. The reason why we provided for night sessions is that some of us are trying to clean up legislation so that this Congress can adjourn early in June, and also give fair and decent consideration to the important measures that should be considered by this House at this time.

Now, in reply to the other question asked by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], why his measure was not made in order, I will say this: Personally I am more in favor of his measure than of the measure before the House; but the Rules Committee is not a legislative committee. We try as far as possible to help, so as to make out a program; and so far as I know in the history of the Committee on Rules never have we taken up legislation and put it on the program unless it had the backing of some committee which had jurisdiction over that legislation and asked us to do it. That is the only reason why we did not make the bill of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] in order in the consideration of the Haugen-McNary bill. That would complicate the matter and cause trouble, and

we have plenty of troubles at the present time without looking for any new ones.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves the previous question on the rule.

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

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 114, noes 26.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is evident that there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of ordering the previous question will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 271, nays 47, answered "present" 2, not voting 113, as follows:

| YEAS—271 | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Abernethy | Fredericks | McKeown | Schall |
| Ackerman | Free | McLaughlin, Mich. | Schneider |
| Aldrich | French | McLaughlin, Nebr. | Scott |
| Allen | Fulbright | McNulty | Sears, Fla. |
| Allgood | Fuller | McReynolds | Sears, Nebr. |
| Almon | Fulmer | McSwain | Seger |
| Andrew | Funk | McSweeney | Shallenberger |
| Arnold | Garber | MacGregor | Sherwood |
| Ayres | Gardner, Ind. | MacLafferty | Shreve |
| Bacharach | Gasque | Magee, N. Y. | Simmons |
| Bacon | Gilbert | Major, Ill. | Sinclair |
| Bankhead | Glatfelter | Major, Mo. | Snmitt |
| Barbour | Greene, Mass. | Manlove | Sites |
| Barkley | Greenwood | Mansfield | Smithwick |
| Beck | Hadley | Mapes | Snell |
| Beers | Hammer | Mead | Speaks |
| Berger | Hardy | Merritt | Sproul, Ill. |
| Black, N. Y. | Harrison | Michaelson | Sproul, Kans. |
| Black, Tex. | Hastings | Michener | Stalker |
| Bloom | Haugen | Miller, Wash. | Steagall |
| Brand, Ga. | Hayden | Miligan | Stedman |
| Brand, Ohio | Hersey | Minahan | Stephens |
| Britten | Hickey | Montague | Strong, Kans. |
| Browne, Wis. | Hill, Md. | Moore, Ga. | Summers, Wash. |
| Browning | Hill, Wash. | Moore, Ohio | Summers, Tex. |
| Burtness | Hoch | Moore, Ind. | Swank |
| Burton | Holaday | Moorehead | Swoope |
| Butler | Howard, Nebr. | Morgan | Taber |
| Canfield | Huddleston | Morris | Taylor, Colo. |
| Cannon | Hudson | Morrow | Taylor, Tenn. |
| Carter | Hudspeth | Murphy | Taylor, W. Va. |
| Casey | Hull, Iowa | Nelson, Me. | Thatcher |
| Chindblom | Jacobstein | Nelson, Wis. | Thomas, Ky. |
| Christopherson | James | Newton, Minn. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Clague | Jeffers | Newton, Mo. | Thompson |
| Clarke, N. Y. | Johnson, Ky. | Nolan | Tilman |
| Cleary | Johnson, S. Dak. | O'Connell, R. I. | Tilson |
| Cole, Iowa | Johnson, Tex. | O'Sullivan | Timberlake |
| Cole, Ohio | Johnson, Wash. | Oldfield | Tincher |
| Colton | Johnson, W. Va. | Oliver, Ala. | Tinkham |
| Connally, Tex. | Jones | Paige | Treadway |
| Connery | Kearns | Parker | Tucker |
| Cook | Kelly | Parks, Ark. | Underbill |
| Cooper, Ohio | Kent | Peery | Underwood |
| Cooper, Wis. | Kerr | Phillips | Upshaw |
| Crisp | Ketcham | Fou | Vaile |
| Croll | King | Prall | Vestal |
| Crowther | Knutson | Purnell | Vincent, Mich. |
| Cullen | Kopp | Quin | Vinson, Ga. |
| Cummings | Kvale | Ragon | Vinson, Ky. |
| Dallinger | LaGuardia | Rainey | Voigt |
| Davey | Lampert | Raker | Ward, N. Y. |
| Davis, Minn. | Lankford | Ramseyer | Watkins |
| Davis, Tenn. | Larsen, Ga. | Rankin | Wefald |
| Denison | Leatherwood | Ransley | Welsh |
| Dickinson, Iowa | Leavitt | Rathbone | White, Kans. |
| Dickinson, Mo. | Lee, Ga. | Richards | Williams, Ill. |
| Dowell | Lehlbach | Roach | Williams, Mich. |
| Eagan | Lilly | Robinson, Iowa | Williamson |
| Elliott | Lineberger | Robison, Ky. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Evans, Iowa | Logan | Rogers, Mass. | Winslow |
| Fairchild | Longworth | Rogers, N. H. | Winter |
| Fairfield | Lowrey | Romjue | Wood |
| Faust | Lozter | Rouse | Wright |
| Favrot | Luce | Rubey | Wurzbach |
| Fenn | Lyon | Sanders, Ind. | Yates |
| Foster | McClintic | Sanders, N. Y. | Young |
| Frear | McKenzie | Sandlin | |
| NAYS—47 | | | |
| Aswell | Collins | Humphreys | Sanders, Tex. |
| Bell | Crosser | Jost | Schafer |
| Bland | Deal | Kincheloe | Spearing |
| Blanton | Doughton | Kindred | Stevenson |
| Bowling | Doyle | Lanham | Tague |
| Box | Drewry | Lazaro | Tydings |
| Boycie | Gallivan | Linthicum | Weaver |
| Briggs | Garrett, Tex. | McDuffie | Wilson, La. |
| Buchanan | Goldsborough | Martin | Wilson, Miss. |
| Bulwinkle | Griffin | O'Connor, La. | Wingo |
| Busby | Hill, Ala. | Rayburn | Woodrum |
| Byrns, Tenn. | Hooker | Reed, Ark. | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2
Carew O'Connell, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—113.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Anderson | Edmonds | Langley | Reid, Ill. |
| Anthony | Evans, Mont. | Larson, Minn. | Rosenbloom |
| Beedy | Fish | Lee, Calif. | Sabath |
| Begg | Fisher | Lindsay | Salmon |
| Bixler | Fitzgerald | Little | Smith |
| Boies | Fleetwood | McFadden | Snyder |
| Boylan | Freeman | McLeod | Stengle |
| Browne, N. J. | Frothingham | Madden | Strong, Pa. |
| Brumm | Garner, Tex. | Magee, Pa. | Sullivan |
| Buckley | Garrett, Tenn. | Miller, Ill. | Sweet |
| Burdick | Geran | Mills | Swing |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Gibson | Mooney | Temple |
| Cable | Gifford | Moore, Ill. | Vare |
| Campbell | Graham, Ill. | Moore, Va. | Wainwright |
| Celler | Graham, Pa. | Morin | Ward, N. C. |
| Clancy | Green, Iowa | Mudd | Wason |
| Clark, Fla. | Griest | O'Brien | Watres |
| Collier | Hawes | O'Connor, N. Y. | Watson |
| Connolly, Pa. | Hawley | Oliver, N. Y. | Weller |
| Corning | Howard, Okla. | Park, Ga. | Wertz |
| Cramton | Hull, Morton D. | Patterson | White, Me. |
| Curry | Hull, William E. | Peavey | Williams, Tex. |
| Darrow | Hull, Tenn. | Perkins | Wolf |
| Dempsey | Kahn | Perlman | Woodruff |
| Dickstein | Keller | Porter | Wyant |
| Dominick | Kendall | Quayle | Zihlman |
| Drane | Kiess | Reece | |
| Driver | Kunz | Reed, N. Y. | |
| Dyer | Kurtz | Reed, W. Va. | |

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. Dyer with Mr. Weller.
Mr. Kahn with Mr. Clark of Florida.
Mr. Wyant with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.
Mr. Vare with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Drane.
Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Byrns of South Carolina.
Mr. Sweet with Mr. Garner of Texas.
Mr. Begg with Mr. Park of Georgia.
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Fleetwood with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
Mr. Griest with Mr. Boylan.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Browne of New Jersey.
Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Graham of Illinois with Mr. Stengle.
Mr. Cable with Mr. Quayle.
Mr. Temple with Mr. Corning.
Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Geran.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Watres with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. Hawes.
Mr. Cramton with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Bixler with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Darrow with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Fish with Mr. Driver.
Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Williams of Texas.
Mr. McFadden with Mr. Garrett of Tennessee.
Mr. Curry with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
Mr. Little with Mr. Evans of Montana.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Wolf.
Mr. Mudd with Mr. Salmon.
Mr. Boies with Mr. Oliver of New York.
Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Lea of California.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Moore of Virginia.
Mr. Brumm with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Mooney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be allowed to extend their remarks in the Record on this bill for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all Members be allowed to extend their remarks in the Record on this bill for five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will that be five legislative days after the passage of the bill?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that means their own remarks.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And after the passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the same request was made with reference to the adjusted compensation bill and the objection on this side was systematically made every time. So it seems to me the gentleman ought to postpone this request until a little later, at least, and give us time to see what is in this bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, the modification should be made that Members will be allowed to insert their remarks in the Record on this bill for five legislative days after final action on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT], and myself, three and three-quarters hours each.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time be divided into four parts. Is there objection?

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there was an agreement that the chairman control one-fourth of the time in favor of the bill on that side of the Chamber, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT] one-fourth of the time on that side against the bill, that I would control one-fourth of the time on this side against the bill, and that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] would control one-fourth of the time for the bill on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is embodied in my request.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand, then, that if this request is granted, the time will be controlled as outlined by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Chair inadvertently, perhaps, stated that the Members would have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on this bill after the passage of the bill. Should not that be after the vote on the bill?

The SPEAKER. That was the final request.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to know whether I can get 10 minutes of any of this time?

Mr. ASWELL. I will yield the gentleman some time during the course of debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] as to the division of time? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9033) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9033, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the unanimous consent just agreed to divides the 15 hours given to general debate on this bill in four parts, so that I shall have 3 3/4 hours at my disposal. I have had some 20 or 30 requests for time, so the time allotted to me will not permit me to discuss at this time all the details of the bill. In order to cover as many points as possible I ask that I may be allowed to conclude my statement without interruption.

I have frequently been asked what the McNary-Haugen bill proposes to do and how it will relieve the depressed agricultural situation. Briefly, the bill establishes a corporation with a capital stock of \$200,000,000 subscribed by the Federal Treasury to purchase certain basic agricultural commodities at a ratio price in such amounts as to make the ratio price the prevailing market price. The ratio price at which the corporation shall purchase the commodities will be the pre-war price, increased proportionately with the increase in 404 other commodities; in other words, the corporation will buy certain basic agricultural commodities on the open market at the ratio price thus bringing the market price up to the same exchange value compared with other commodities that obtained for a normally representative period prior to the war, and the farmer's dollar will have a buying power equal to that which it had before the war. The surplus thus purchased or pooled by the corporation will be sold on the world market at the best obtainable price and

the discount on such exportable surplus and the cost of operation of the corporation will be collected from the producers of the total crop of that commodity; thus the \$200,000,000 advanced by the Government should not be impaired and the producers as a whole, who are materially benefited by the enhanced price brought about by the legislation, will stand the cost of operation.

I am also asked, why this emergency legislation? Why the continued depression in agriculture? It is not due to crop failures, nor to lack of industry, or intelligent management on the part of the farmers, but to various other causes, especially to the low prices on agricultural products as compared with the increased prices of other commodities. The prices of the two are out of line, as indicated in President Coolidge's speech of February 13, in which he stated:

But the great food staples do not sell on a parity with the products of industry. Their average price is little above the pre-war level, while manufactures are about 50 per cent higher. The farmer is not receiving his share.

I believe I am safe in saying that, generally speaking, the agricultural depression is largely due to this inequality in prices between agricultural commodities and other commodities, referred to by the President, which has resulted in an inadequate return to the farmer for his labor and capital invested; and due also to the exportable surplus of these agricultural commodities, upon which their price is made dependent and lowered by reason of the unsettled world conditions and lower cost of production in the foreign countries.

It is generally conceded that in the absence of a monopoly, combination, or organization to pool and boost prices, where there is a surplus of any product for export, due to intense competition, the price obtained for the surplus determines the price of the whole product.

Organized industry in the United States, under a highly protective policy, is able to sell its products in the domestic market at a price equal to the cost of foreign production plus the tariff, cost of transportation, and other charges incident thereto. In other words, organized industry sells for domestic consumption on the American price level—cost of foreign production plus tariff, transportation, and other charges incident thereto—and sells its surplus on the world price level in competition with the surplus products of other countries without affecting the domestic price. Thus the average price of the whole product is materially advanced, the average price being the domestic price less the discount occasioned by the lower price of the surplus.

On the one hand, the six and a half million farmers are unable to organize so as to pool their products and restrict production, and thus control their price, because of their large number and the fact that they are scattered throughout this vast country. It has been tried out, but without success, except when done on a small scale and in a limited area, in which case it has been fairly successful, as, for instance, the citrus fruit growers and tobacco growers have organized with some success. Experience in the past has clearly demonstrated that organization among farmers can not be accomplished on a large scale or on a scale that will cover the entire country. As a result of the farmers' inability to organize and pool, and thus determine the price of their products for domestic consumption, they sell their whole product at a price dependent upon the price obtained for their surplus, which is sold in competition with the surplus products of other countries. The American farmer sells his eggs and butter in competition with the surplus products of the world.

The American wheat grower sells his wheat, grown on high-priced land, yielding on an average of about 14 bushels to the acre, in competition with the wheat grown on the productive soil of Canada, selling at \$5 to \$20 an acre, and yielding from 40 to 60 bushels an acre. The farmer in the Corn Belt of Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Nebraska, and Minnesota, tilling \$200 an acre land, sells corn and cattle in competition with the surplus cattle and corn of Argentina, produced by underpaid labor on its low-priced and rich soil. The farmer buys on the highest market in the world and sells his products on the lowest market in the world, which has resulted in the inequality in prices and depressed conditions in agriculture.

The object sought in the proposed bill, then, is to establish a fairer relation between the basic agricultural commodities and other commodities, to equalize prices, to overcome the disparity in prices, to raise the purchasing power of agricultural commodities to the price level of other commodities, to put the farmer in the same position as organized industry, to establish a domestic price for the product sold for domestic consumption, to sell the exportable surplus at the world price, and in the

end bring up the average price of the farmers' whole product, so that the farmer may do as organized industry is doing—in other words, to make the purchasing power of basic agricultural commodities equal to the purchasing power of the products of organized industry and labor.

A proposition not to fix prices, but to furnish a ready buyer to buy at a price commensurate with the price paid for other commodities. To give the farmer an even break, so that if organized industry continues to put up and maintain prices, the price of agricultural commodities may also be raised proportionately, to make the rate of duty applicable to agricultural commodities in the same manner as it applies to the products of organized industry. So if the protective policy is to be continued, it shall also apply with equal force to the farmers' products. Thus it will make it possible for the farmer to do what organized industry is doing.

All will agree that it is unfair to continue a policy which protects one and not the other. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. Such a discriminating policy can not long continue. If protection is to be denied the one the alternative is to deny it to the other also.

How is the equalization of prices to be accomplished? First, it is proposed to create a corporation to be directed by a board consisting of four directors appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be chairman, the salary of the four directors to be \$10,000, and one of the four to be selected as managing director.

The capital of \$200,000,000 is to be subscribed by the Federal Government. The board is given authority to borrow not to exceed five times the amount of the authorized capital. The United States assumes no liability for any obligation of the corporation.

Notes and bonds are not exempt from taxation.

The corporation may sue and be sued; may make contracts, and may acquire, hold, and dispose of property.

It may appoint and fix the compensation of employees.

It may acquire the right of operation of storage warehouses and facilities for processing such commodities.

It may make contracts for processing of basic agricultural commodities.

It may make advances to any person not to exceed 75 per cent of the market value.

The corporation shall utilize as far as possible existing facilities and agencies.

It shall cooperate with and encourage formation of associations of producers.

The corporation shall purchase basic agricultural commodities produced in the United States in respect of which a special emergency has been declared of wheat, flour, rice, corn, wool, cattle, sheep, swine, or any food product of cattle, sheep, or swine.

The ratio price of such basic agricultural commodities—computed by the Secretary of Labor and Secretary of Agriculture—for such period shall bear the same relation to the pre-war basic-commodity price thereof as the current all-commodities price in effect for such period bears to the pre-war all-commodities price.

The corporation shall purchase the basic agricultural commodity in any amount necessary to maintain at the level of the ratio price the domestic price of such commodity or any class or grade thereof in respect of which a ratio price is established, and may from time to time make allowances to cover storage and other holding costs.

The corporation shall sell in foreign markets at the highest prices obtainable, in the domestic market at not less than the purchase price, for its exportation—or for processing for exportation under such regulations as the corporation may prescribe—at the highest prices obtainable.

The corporation shall determine the probable export surplus, the probable domestic consumption, and the amount of basic agricultural commodities to be purchased. It shall notify the President of its findings. It is then the President's duty by proclamation to declare that a special emergency exists as to such agricultural commodities. The President is given authority to adjust the rates of duty and to prohibit the importation of basic agricultural commodities or any such derivative.

The Secretary of Labor shall compute the average of all commodities—404 in number—for the period 1905 to 1914, inclusive—referred to as the pre-war basic commodity price—as given in Bulletin No. 335, Bureau of Labor statistics.

The Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Labor shall after the issuance of a proclamation declaring a special emergency in respect of a basic agricultural commodity jointly pre-

pare the average price for such commodity during the period 1905-1914, referred to in this bill as the pre-war basic commodity price.

The Secretary of Labor shall compute and publish the average price of all commodities for such month. The index numbers of wholesale prices for all commodities for such year shall be referred to as the current all-commodities price.

The current all-commodities price in effect for any period shall be the price computed for the month preceding the commencement of such period.

The corporation shall determine the amount to be paid or withheld from each producer to defray expenses and to make up the losses on the export surplus.

The corporation may require the purchaser to issue to such producer a receipt therefor, which shall be evidence of the participating interest of the producer.

It may by regulation require any purchaser or producer to file returns under oath any report in respect of his purchases or sales of the basic agricultural commodities, and so forth.

There shall be established in the treasury of the corporation for each basic agricultural commodity an equalization fund into which all equalization fees for such operating period shall be deposited, and from such funds there shall be disbursed all operating expenses and losses.

After the expiration of such operating period the corporation shall distribute ratably any balance remaining in such fund to the persons to whom such equalization fee has been paid.

For example, had the bill been in operation and the corporation functioning last December, according to the table prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

Market prices of commodities

| | |
|--|-------|
| Index of all commodities, 1905-1914 | 100.0 |
| Index of all commodities, year 1923 | 162.3 |
| Index of all commodities, December, 1923 | 159.8 |

| Individual commodities | Average market price, 1905-1914 | Average market price, year 1923 | Average market price, December, 1923 | Ratio price, year 1923 | Ratio price, December, 1923 |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cotton: Upland middling | 0.120 | 0.293 | 0.388 | 0.194 | 0.191 |
| Corn: Contract grades, cash, Chicago | .602 | .821 | .730 | .977 | .962 |
| Wheat: Range of No. 1 northern spring and No. 2 red winter, Chicago | 1.002 | 1.163 | 1.097 | 1.624 | 1.598 |
| Cattle: Good to choice, steers, Chicago | 6.283 | 9.962 | 9.785 | 11.123 | 10.949 |
| Hogs: Heavy, Chicago | 7.099 | 7.690 | 7.000 | 11.622 | 11.342 |
| Sheep: Wethers, Chicago | 5.379 | 7.848 | 8.600 | 8.731 | 8.594 |
| Flour: Patents | 5.127 | 6.365 | 6.109 | 8.322 | 8.192 |
| Wool: One-fourth and three-eighths grades, scoured basis | .492 | .970 | .964 | .799 | .787 |

The indexed number of all commodities—1905-1914—is 100. Index number for all commodities December, 1923, was 159.8. According to it, prices of all commodities increased 59.8. The average market price of wheat in Chicago for 1905-1914 was \$1. The ratio price for December, 1.598. The average market price for December was 1.097. The price of wheat would have advanced 50.1. In other words, eliminating the decimals, the farmer would have received 1.59 for his wheat instead of 1.09, an increase in price of 50 cents a bushel. If the corporation had estimated the number of bushels required for domestic consumption at 600,000,000 bushels and the surplus for export at 150,000,000 bushels and the loss on the exportable surplus at 50 cents a bushel, or \$75,000,000, it would have found it necessary to withhold or collect \$75,000,000 from all purchases, or 10 cents a bushel on the whole crop. If so, the farmer would have received \$1.49 in cash and a receipt for 10 cents, instead of \$1.09, the amount which he received.

The bill has been characterized as a vicious circle of price raising, pyramiding, and one increase upon another. It is stated that for these reasons the bill is unworkable, impracticable, and undesirable. Let us see about that. If the bill had been in effect the 1st of last December, according to the table furnished by the Department of Labor just referred to, the indexed number of all commodities of December, 1923, was 159.8. The current price of hogs in December was \$7.05; the ratio price would have been \$11.34, and the price of hogs would have been increased \$4.29, or about 60 per cent. Assuming that the corporation had been functioning and a special emergency had been declared effective on the 1st day of December, 1923, the price of hogs would have advanced to the ratio price \$11.34, instead of selling for the current price, \$7.05, an increase of about 60 per cent in the price of hogs.

According to Bulletin 335, United States Department of Labor, hogs in weight are reported at 4.07 per cent, or, say 5

per cent; and assuming that all other commodities had remained the same, say at 1.60, what would have been the result? If the advance in price of hogs would have advanced the index number of all commodities, say, 3 points, added to 160 equals 163. Suppose building material had decreased in price in an amount affecting the all-commodities index number in a like amount. The result would be: First, add 3 to 160; second, deducting 3 from 163; the index number would be just where we started.

Suppose there had been declared a special emergency on butter the 1st of May. The current price in New York, 35½ cents to 36½ cents, say 36 cents, extra creamery, score 92, would have advanced to 45 cents, or 9 cents a pound, which is 25 per cent increase over 36 cents.

Objection to the bill is made on the ground that it will increase the cost of living. I believe the Wall Street Journal was the first to raise this objection. Yes; it will increase the cost of living. The increase of cost of flour in an 8-ounce loaf of bread would be less than a half cent; in a 16-ounce loaf less than 1 cent. It requires about 4.6 bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour. A 50-cent increase in the price of wheat would make an increase of \$2.30 a barrel. One barrel of flour makes five hundred and eighty-five 8-ounce loaves of bread, or from two hundred and seventy-five to three hundred 16-ounce loaves. The additional burden of a half cent a loaf will, of course, be felt by the Wall Street Journal, but I trust that Mr. Morgan and his associates will be able to stand the burden. If not, when the farmers get back on their feet they will help out. While it may work a hardship on Wall Street, the increased cost of living apparently is satisfactory to the wage earner. Representatives of practically every labor organization appeared before the committee. I quote from hearings before my committee:

STATEMENT OF MR. EDGAR WALLACE, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, when I appeared here about a year or a little over a year ago there were some 5,000,000 workmen walking the streets. We considered then that the reason for the depression in the industries was the fact that the farmers were not getting prices for their products and consequently were unable to buy.

We fear that this condition of comparative steady employment is only temporary, that just as long as that great group of the people of our country, the producing people of our country, are underpaid for their labor (for that is what it amounts to), when they are not getting a fair price for their products, prosperity is just for a time and can not last.

We believe it is only enlightened selfishness to say that this great, big portion of the citizenry be placed in the position where they can feel safe.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; we recognize that if the farmer gets a better price we will have to pay it; that is, we will have to pay our share of it.

When they determined to deflate, they hit the farmers hard, and the farmer found himself helpless, because he had no economic organization. When it came to the miners, the miners said, "Maybe you will; we will give you a scrap," and they did.

Mr. WALLACE. A cause probably of raising the price of things that we have to buy; yet we are for that, recognizing the farmers as our best customers. What does it profit us if we can get meat for 10 cents a pound if we haven't the 10 cents?

The farmers are our customers; when they have no money we can not work. We are the farmers' customers; when we can not buy, their foodstuffs pile up and lose in value. Hence, I think it is to the interest of all the workers—and I want to say that the condition of the workers is not improving.

I can not see any hope for improvement, except the farmers can buy. Those are the people on whom we depend.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not see any difference in confiscating a farmer's product by force, or forcing upon him confiscatory prices that will have the same effect. The danger is, and I know that in certain places it is now taking effect, that the farmer here may also let his fields lie fallow and not raise the foodstuffs that are needed by the entire country.

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT FECHNER, REPRESENTING THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

Mr. FECHNER. Our general executive board is in session here in Washington, which is the headquarters of our organization at the present time, and President William H. Johnston called the attention of the board members to the reports which have been recently received

on the subject, and the board felt that we were sufficiently concerned in the matter to take official recognition of the situation. We did so, and after giving due consideration to the entire matter we have officially recorded ourselves as supporting in principle at least the provisions of this pending legislation.

We feel that the farmer is entitled to a sufficient price to justify him in continuing the operation of his farm, just as well as transportation or any other industry is entitled to a fair return on their investment or the activity of those who are engaged in these other lines, and we are convinced that if anything can be done by the Congress to help bring about that condition it will be reflected in all other lines.

No; I certainly hope Congress will not stand still. That is what I am here for, to urge that something be done, and I am sure that the committee can formulate some plan.

We believe that if we can get some relief for the farmers and get things started on the farms, it is going to be reflected along all lines and that the mechanics will benefit just as well as the farmers. We are very anxious that at least an effort be made to afford that relief.

We do believe that the workers must have a living wage and that the farmers must also get a price for their product that will enable them to live and to continue to operate their farms; and it is that principle that we want to see preserved.

STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR J. LOVELL, VICE PRESIDENT AND LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEERS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. LOVELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have the honor to represent the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, one of the railroad transportation organizations, in support of this measure, which is the preferred measure of the farmers for marketing their crops. During the last Congress I appeared before your committee in support of a bill similar to the one introduced at this session.

Our organization is on record in favor of such legislation on behalf of the farmers.

Now, the farmer is entitled to some consideration, some help, and this bill in our opinion will give him some betterment of conditions. The farm is absolutely essential.

We are not in affiliation with any farm organization; we are not affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. These four railroad brotherhoods are independent. We are a fraternal insurance organization. We are very old. Our organization has been more than half a century in existence.

STATEMENT OF MR. W. M. CLARK, VICE PRESIDENT AND NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS; ALSO REPRESENTING THE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. CLARK. I am vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors, and also represent the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. A year ago our organization and other organizations went on record as favoring a bill that would benefit the farmer and a bill with which the farmers were in accord. As far as we are concerned, we are not wedded to any particular bill or language, if it benefits the farmer, because that is what we are trying to do.

The testimony of these excellent gentlemen speaks for itself and should satisfy all as to the attitude of labor toward legislation along the line suggested in this bill.

STATEMENT OF MR. EDGAR WALLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C., REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I come here with some hesitation to reiterate the statement that I presented before this committee when the Sinclair-Ladd bill was under discussion, the Little bill was under discussion, and the Sinclair-Norris bill was under discussion. Now, I am appearing in favor of the McNary-Haugen bill, with very little real knowledge as to what might be the effect, the detailed effect of this bill if enacted into law. The organization that I represent recognizes that this bill provides for unprecedented action on the part of Congress to aid the farmers of the country. It is our opinion that there is an unprecedented situation to be met. If in this country there was a pestilence in some sections that threatened the entire country, we would not hesitate to take some drastic action in order to meet the emergency. The workingman of the country realized that lopsided prosperity can not continue for any great length of time. With great numbers of our citizenry threatened with ruin, facing ruin, the rest of us can not continue prosperous for any great length of time.

The farmers were crushed, first by the economic power of the bankers, who sought to deflate the commodities of the country in order to inflate the value of the dollar. The pressure was brought to bear first upon the farmers, and effectively upon the farmers because they had no organization competent to meet the organization of the bankers.

Mr. RUBEX. I understand you are in favor of the McNary-Haugen bill?

Mr. WALLACE. I am in favor of any bill, including the McNary-Haugen bill, that will help the farmers out of their present trouble.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you folks feel that this is one of the real, necessary measures that Congress should pass at this session?

Mr. WALLACE. We believe it should not only be passed at this session, but just as early as possible; we read every day of banks failing in the Northwest as a reflection of the condition of the farmers there, and that can not continue long until it is going to affect the whole economic organization of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is your opinion about the rest of the labor organizations other than those you are now speaking for?

Mr. WALLACE. I represent possibly 5,000,000 workers. The rest of the labor organizations, the only ones that I know of that are not in the American Federation of Labor, are the railroad organizations, and I believe they are absolutely in sympathy. I can not speak for them directly.

Objections have been made to the word "shall."

That the President shall declare an emergency existing.

Why not "shall"? If an emergency exists, why not give the farmer the benefit? Why not equalize prices as contemplated? Why delay? The dairy people have spent a year in having the duty on butter and substitutes adjusted. Why not give immediate relief? Why not do away with the discrimination or disparity in tariff rates on butter and all basic agricultural commodities as quickly as possible?

Others say:

If it is going to work out, farmers will certainly raise four times the number of hogs.

Yes; it might glut the market if Uncle Sam's corner crib would hold out. Hogs can not be raised without corn or feed. Our supply of corn is limited. If hogs go up, corn is sure to follow, hence no incentive to increase the hog production.

Another objection:

This bill does not permit the corporation that is proposed to be created to buy a slaughtering plant.

The object is not to put packers nor any worthy and legitimate enterprise out of business, but to utilize existing facilities. It goes without saying that with the numerous idle packing plants and plants with sufficient capacity to take care of the business for the next 20 years there is no need of additional plants. Under such conditions there can be no question but that satisfactory arrangements may be made for processing, if found necessary to process livestock.

It has been stated:

The only people who are engaged in the export business are the Big Five packers.

Mr. Norman Draper, representing the Institute of American Meat Packers, of Chicago, stated:

The packers are now endeavoring to sell, and are selling every pound they can in every foreign market. The fact that they did not last year sell even more than 2,000,000,000 pounds abroad is due not so much to inability of people to purchase American meats in foreign countries, as so many people have been led to believe, but it is due quite as much to restrictions which foreign countries have thrown up against American meats. In France, for instance, we developed, after the war, an excellent market for American pork. To-day, and for a year, this market has been denied us, in spite of the fact that meat inspection in the United States is more efficient than that existing in any country in the world.

You are familiar with the Federal Trade Commission's report. Evidently some of the packers are continuing questionable practice. If so, it may be necessary to take over the export business to restore our foreign markets. What is true as to the meat industry is true as to the exportation of grain.

One contention is that the corporation would be absolutely at the mercy of the Big Five packers. If the Big Five are as unpatriotic and contemptible as the statements imply, we have some 700 or 800 independents. In 1923 a Federal inspection was conducted in 867 establishments in 261 cities and towns as compared with 899 in 1922. So if the Big Five can not be depended upon, there should be no difficulty in arranging with the 800 independent packers for processing.

One objection is raised:

If you are a farmer and I am a city fellow, and you slaughter a hog and sell him to me, I am obliged to pay the so-called equalization fee, which is estimated would run, on a 200-pound hog, anywhere from \$2 to \$5; that men are not going to pay that tax unless they are legally obliged to.

If all are dishonest and tax evaders, there would be no equalization fee; but all are not dishonest. The penalty clause would take care of the others. Just how the \$2 and \$5 equalization fee on 200-pound hogs was arrived at is beyond me. It requires no sharp-pointed pencil to calculate the exact fee. If the increase in the price of hogs is \$4.29 a hundred, as it would have been last December, the increase on 200 pounds would be \$8.58. The exportable surplus of hogs would run about 5 per cent to 8½ per cent—say, 10 per cent. If so, \$4.29 a hundred loss to the corporation on 20 pounds would be 85.8 cents instead of \$2 to \$5 estimated. The net gain to the producer would be \$4.29 a hundred on 200 pounds, or \$8.58 minus 85.8 cents expense and loss on export, which would be \$7.722 net gain to the producer on a 200-pound hog.

One contention is that if you declare an emergency on hogs you must immediately declare an emergency on cattle and sheep. Why not, if the current price is below the ratio price? If one is above, no emergency can be declared under the bill. If the ratio price on butter or wheat is above the current price, why deprive the wheat grower and the dairy producers of their just dues?

One objection raised is if you put up the price on pork 60 per cent people are going to eat less pork and more of other meat. No; cattle and mutton are high. Hogs are at a low price; consumption of cattle and mutton have not been affected.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What does the gentleman estimate is the amount that the millers have on hand?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes. One contention is that it will make the packers and millers of this country an immediate present overnight of at least \$200,000,000.

Some one has estimated the profit of the meat packers through the operation of the bill from \$1,500,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000.

According to the reports of food on hand in cold storage and warehouses, it is estimated that there is on hand at the present time:

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Wheat | \$52,000,000 |
| Corn | 4,362,000 |
| Flour | 3,759,000 |
| Pork | 54,316,000 |
| Miscellaneous meats | 4,475,000 |
| Total | 118,912,000 |
| 50 per cent increase in the price of flour would be | 1,879,500 |
| 50 per cent increase in the price of pork and meat would be | 29,395,500 |
| Total | 31,275,000 |

According to the testimony of Mr. Weld, of Swift & Co., whose testimony appears in the hearings on cold storage, the Bureau of Markets reported on hand July 1, 1919:

| | Amount | Percentage of total production | Would last— |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Eggs | 7,508,530 | 7 | 22 |
| Butter | 87,851,371 | 6 | 20 |
| Poultry | 48,895,000 | 3 | 10 |
| Frozen beef | 162,386,570 | 2 | 7 |
| Pork products, including lard | 1,047,808,000 | 10 | 35 |

About two-thirds of this quantity is in process of being cured in pickle and salt and is not ready for market.

By it it will be seen the amount on hand is only from 2 to 10 per cent of the total annual production of the various commodities, which, according to the report, would last only from 7 to 35 days, and that two-thirds of pork products is in process of being cured and not ready for the market.

If the packers should have livestock on hand, raised on their farms or bought, section 206 provides that the term "sale" means—

(1) The first sale of cattle, sheep, or swine, after the declaration of a special emergency for slaughter for market.

If the miller has on hand wheat grown on his farm or bought, (2) provides that the miller pays the equalization fee when milling or processed for market. So whatever wheat or livestock purchased or raised on farms owned by the miller or packer, if

not acquired in pursuance of a sale described in paragraph (1) of that subdivision, is subject to the equalization fee.

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Even if the 4,800 millers should profit to the extent of 50 per cent on \$3,759,000 worth of flour, their profits would be | \$1,879,500 |
| Then suppose the packers should profit 60 per cent on their \$59,000,000 worth of pork and meat; their profit would be | 35,400,000 |
| Total | 37,279,500 |
| (which is less than 2 per cent of the estimated profits and not several hundred million dollars, as claimed.) | |
| On the other hand, if the price of wheat should be advanced 50 cents a bushel and 600,000,000 bushels sold by the farmer for domestic consumption, the profits to the producers would be | 300,000,000 |
| 10 cents a pound on 1,500,000,000 pounds of butter would be | 150,000,000 |
| If the price of corn should advance 25 cents a bushel on, say, 2,000,000,000 bushels marketed, the profit to the producers would be | 500,000,000 |
| If the price of 65,000,000 hogs should advance 4 cents, \$10 a head, the profit would be | 650,000,000 |
| A grand total annually of | 1,650,000,000 |

So if we are a genuine friend of the farmer, we should not be alarmed about giving the 4,800 millers and 867 packing establishments \$37,279,500, where the 6,500,000 farmers would gain \$1,600,000,000 annually. In other words, if the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill will result in a profit of \$37,000,000 to the millers and packers, it will also at the same time result in a profit to the farmers of \$1,600,000,000.

One contention is that the bill could not apply to cotton because we export 65 per cent; that if the cotton should go down to 15 cents, or 5 per cent below the ratio price, it might result in a loss to the cotton grower. The percentage of cotton exported is less than 50 per cent. Exports in 1920 were only 43.41 per cent, now below that. But say 50 per cent; if cotton should drop 5 per cent below the ratio price and 50 per cent of it exported, and if the crop is ten million 500-pound bales and 50 per cent exported, the gain to the cotton grower would be 5 cents a pound, or \$25 a bale, net \$125,000,000, which amount is \$20,000,000 in excess of the total production of gold and silver in the United States.

Production of gold in the United States in 1922 was only— \$49,096,000
Production of silver in the United States in 1922 was only— 55,510,859

Total 104,606,859

Mr. McKEOWN. What effect will this ratio price have on the product? For instance, when wheat is bringing \$1.59 under this law, domestic wheat for domestic purposes, what effect does that have on the price of flour? Does it raise the price of flour or not?

Mr. HAUGEN. If the price of wheat advances, naturally the price of flour will increase.

Mr. McKEOWN. That is what a great many people want to know—what effect this will have on the price of the finished product.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am glad the gentleman brought that up.

The bill has been characterized as a price-fixing bill. No; it is not a price-fixing bill but a bill to furnish a ready buyer of basic agricultural commodities at a price commensurate with that of other commodities. No person or agency can forecast what the price will be under the proposed bill any more than he can under the present marketing system.

Under it the prices of basic agricultural commodities will be determined by the prices of 404 commodities referred to as all commodities. If the prices of all commodities go up, up goes the price of basic agricultural commodities. If down, down goes the price of basic agricultural commodities. Under the present system prices of agricultural commodities are determined by the exporters, speculators, and gamblers, the bulls and bears on our exchanges. If the bulls and bears put the price up, up goes the price to the producer. If the bulls and bears put the price down, down goes the price to the producer.

Whenever the manipulation of grades and crooked dealings on the exchanges and in the export business depress the price or rob the producer of his legitimate world market, prices to the producers go down. Under the proposed bill, if the prices of all commodities go down, down goes the price of basic agricultural commodities in proportion.

So, unless one has knowledge of what is in the minds of the producers of all commodities, no one can tell in advance what the future price will be under the proposed bill. No one can even estimate future prices with any degree of accuracy.

Under the present market system frequently the prices of grain fluctuate to the extent of 20 cents a bushel in a single

month. There will, of course, be fluctuations under the proposed act, but only in a small degree as compared with the fluctuation under the present policy. If you still insist that the measure is a price fixing bill, I ask you, Whom will you trust to fix prices? Shall it be by the exporters, speculators, and gamblers, or the manufacturer, laborer, and a Government agency? Have you more confidence in the gamblers and manipulators than you have in our Government? If so, I refer you to Federal Trade Commission report, June 18, 1923. You will find extracts from the report printed in the hearings, pages 689, 690, 694, 695, 696, and 697.

The bill has been characterized as socialistic, unworkable, bolshevistic, and by every other pet name. Well, there is nothing new about that. Every constructive act and remedial legislative bill suggested to correct wrongdoing or to relieve the public, especially to relieve agriculture, has been thus characterized. You will recall the pet names applied to the packer bill, the cotton futures and grain futures acts, the grain standards act, the Federal reserve act, the Federal land bank act, the War Finance Corporation act.

Many who are now opposed to this relief measure were even more pronounced in their denunciation of those bills, and I have no quarrel with any of them. Many opposing this measure, like all other measures, are sincere and actuated by the best motives. On the other hand, some interests may be more interested in how it concerns them personally than in the public welfare.

Objection has been raised to the Government financing the corporation and to the \$50,000 expenditure to set the machinery of this bill in motion. After financing the War Finance Corporation, the Federal reserve system, the Federal land banks, and the railroads I am at a loss to know why six and one-half million farmers now in distress should be denied the paltry sum of \$50,000 to set the machinery of this bill in operation and a loan of \$200,000,000, or as much thereof as will be necessary. In my opinion the farmers should be given preference.

You recall that in time of need the farmers came to the rescue of Uncle Sam. During the war Congress fixed the minimum price of wheat at \$2 and authorized the appointment of a commission to investigate and report on the price. It reported \$2.20. Later transportation rates were advanced 6 cents, which brought the price of wheat up to \$2.26. Instead of making it the minimum price, as contemplated by Congress, it was made the maximum price. The price of wheat at the time the bill fixing the price was under consideration was \$3.38. Scandinavian countries were offering \$1 premium, making the price \$4.38. Mr. Hoover stated before the committee that he thought the price might go to \$7 a bushel. A commission was appointed which ascertained and reported the ratio price between hogs and corn at 13 to 1. In other words, a hundred pounds of hog equals 13 bushels of corn. Corn was then selling at \$2.05 in Chicago, but the price of hogs was fixed at \$16.50, which was \$10.15 below the ratio price fixed by the commission.

According to the Federal Trade Commission report, four packers increased their profits \$121,000,000 above their pre-war profit. The packers' profit in 1917 was more than four times as great as their average yearly profit before the war, although their sales in dollars and cents, with even the inflated prices, had barely doubled. In the war years 1915, 1916, and 1917 four of the five packers made net profits of \$178,000,000.

The millers made 175 per cent profit after the war. The millers asked that they be protected against loss and Congress promptly granted the request by section 5 of the act of March 4, 1919.

One contention is that packers and millers will profit by the bill. Do not worry about the packers and millers; they are capable of determining for themselves what is best for their interests. It is safe to say that if there were any profit to them in the bill they would be here supporting the bill and not fighting it. See statement by Mr. Draper, representing the Institute of American Meat Packers. See page 468:

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You are opposed to this bill?

Mr. DRAPER. The way it applies to the meat business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You are opposed to this bill?

Mr. DRAPER. Yes; in the way it applies to the meat business.

That should make it clear as to the attitude of the packers. Page 452, Mr. Draper stated:

To-day, and for a year, this market (France) has been denied us. In spite of the fact that meat inspection in the United States is more efficient than that existing in any country in the world.

The Federal Trade Commission report makes it clear, why? I am not going to discuss that phase of it. Years ago we had an agreement to let the report speak for itself.

If you will turn to page 685, statement by Mr. Husband, secretary of the Millers' National Federation:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you or any of your associates prepared or suggested any amendments to the bill?

Mr. HUSBAND. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are absolutely against it?

Mr. HUSBAND. Yes, sir.

Under regulations millers were allowed 25 cents a barrel profit instead of 13½ cents pre-war profit. They were not satisfied with that but took 45 cents. One made \$283,000 in excess of the maximum price. The claim was settled by paying \$8,000. Another, \$19,000, who settled for \$402. Both claims were settled without reauditing the accounts. This ought to make it clear as to millers' position and reasons for opposing the bill.

The following organizations have indorsed the bill:

- American Federation of Labor.
- American Farm Bureau Federation.
- National Grange.
- National Board of Farm Organizations—composed of the following organizations: Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, Farmers' National Congress, National Agricultural Organization Society, National Conference on Marketing and Farm Credits, Farmers' Society of Equity, Wisconsin State Union, American Society of Equity, Pennsylvania State Grange, National Milk Producers' Federation, American Association for Agricultural Legislation, Federation of Jewish Farmers of America, Intermountain Farmers' Association, Farmers' Equity Union, National Dairy Union, Pennsylvania Rural Progress Association, Florida Citrus Exchange, American Society of Equity.
- Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, Montgomery, Ala.
- State Department of Agriculture, Phoenix, Ariz.
- Clearing House Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
- Clearing House Association, San Francisco, Calif.
- San Luis Obispo County Farm Bureau Exchange, California.
- Colorado Farmers' Union, Denver, Colo.
- American National Livestock Association, Denver, Colo.
- Colorado Wheat Growers' Association.
- Cotton Growers' Association, Miami, Fla.
- Tobacco Growers' Association, Jacksonville, Fla.
- Cotton Growers' Association, Savannah, Ga.
- Idaho State Farmers' Union, Moscow, Idaho.
- Local Progress Club, Weiser, Idaho.
- Idaho Wheat Growers' Association, American Falls, Idaho.
- Grangeville Chamber of Commerce, Idaho.
- Chamber of Commerce, Moscow, Idaho.
- Idaho Export Commission League, Moscow, Idaho.
- Moscow Farmers' Union, Moscow, Idaho.
- Illinois Agricultural Association (paid membership of 62,000), Chicago, Ill.
- National Livestock Producers' Association, Chicago, Ill.
- Farmers Grain Dealers' Association of Illinois, Bloomington, Ill.
- Chicago Producers' Commission Association, Chicago, Ill.
- Clinton Chamber of Commerce, De Witt County, Ill.
- De Witt County Cooperative Grain Co., Clinton, Ill.
- La Salle County Farm Bureau, Ottawa, Ill.
- Boone County Farm Bureau, Belvidere, Ill.
- Knox County Farm Bureau, Galesburg, Ill.
- Henry County Farm Bureau, Ill.
- Lawrence County Farm Bureau, Ill.
- Three hundred and seventy-five stockholders of Mazon Farmers' Elevator Co., Illinois.
- Indiana Farm Bureau Federation, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Indiana Wheat Growers' Association, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Iowa State Legislature.
- Iowa State Farm Bureau Federation, Iowa.
- Republican State Convention, Iowa.
- Iowa Retail Merchants' Association, Des Moines, Iowa.
- Des Moines Commercial Club, Des Moines, Iowa.
- Corn Belt Meat Producers' Association, Des Moines, Iowa.
- Farmers Grain Dealers' Association of Iowa, Fort Dodge, Iowa.
- Greater Des Moines Committee, Des Moines, Iowa.
- President Iowa State College and chairman of the executive committee Association of Land Grant Colleges, Ames, Iowa.
- Farmers Grain Dealers' Association of Iowa, Fort Dodge, Iowa.
- Iowa City Merchants' Retail Bureau, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Cedar Falls Chamber of Commerce, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
- Cedar Falls Commercial Club, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
- Knoxville Chamber of Commerce, Knoxville, Iowa.
- Pella Chamber of Commerce, Pella, Iowa.
- Ninety-five members Polk County Wheat Growers' Association, Iowa.
- Mason City Merchants' Association, Mason City, Iowa.
- Kiwanis Club, Creston, Iowa.
- Worth County Farm Bureau, Iowa.
- Howard County Farm Bureau, Iowa.

- Chickasaw County Farm Bureau, New Hampton, Iowa.
 Polk County Farm Improvement Association, Des Moines, Iowa.
 Plymouth County Bankers' Association, Lemars, Iowa.
 Woodbury County Farm Bureau, Sioux City, Iowa.
 Palo County Farm Bureau, Iowa.
 Farmers' Incorporated Cooperative Society, Grafton, Iowa.
 Dallas County Farm Bureau, Adel, Iowa.
 Emmett County Farm Bureau, Iowa.
 Adams County Farm Bureau, Iowa.
 Johnson County Farm Bureau, Iowa.
 West Pottawattamie County Farm Bureau, Council Bluffs, Iowa.
 Lions Club, Osage, Iowa.
 O. O. Wolf, member State board of agriculture, Topeka, Kans.
 O. F. Whitney, secretary State Horticultural Society, Topeka, Kans.
 Kansas Farm Bureau Federation, Manhattan, Kans.
 Kansas State Farmers' Union, Salina, Kans.
 Kansas Livestock Association, J. H. Mercer, secretary, Topeka, Kans.
 J. M. Kessler, secretary Kansas Taxpayers' League, Topeka, Kans.
 F. D. Merriam, president Central Trust Co., Topeka, Kans.
 J. W. Greenleaf, chairman; C. E. Rugh, E. T. Hackney, members,
 public utilities commission, Topeka, Kans.
 Franklin County Farmers' Union Local, Kansas.
 Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation, Louisville, Ky.
 Maryland Farm Bureau Federation, Baltimore, Md.
 Republican State convention for Minnesota.
 Minnesota Editors' Association, annual convention, Minnesota.
 Minnesota Department of Agriculture, St. Paul, Minn.
 Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, St. Paul, Minn.
 Minnesota School Board Association, annual meeting, Minnesota.
 Minnesota Dairymen's Association, St. Paul, Minn.
 Red River Valley Dairymen's Association, Halstead, Minn.
 Red River Valley Livestock Association, Crookston, Minn.
 American Wheat Growers Associated, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Minnesota Wheat Growers' Cooperative Marketing Association, Thief
 River Falls, Minn.
 Grain Growers' Council No. 5, Climax, Minn.
 Winger Council Minnesota Wheat Growers' Association, Minnesota.
 Minnesota Federation of Farm Loan Associations, St. Paul, Minn.
 John Gustafson, president Farmers' National Grain Dealers' Asso-
 ciation, Windom, Minn.
 Minnesota Export Commission League, Crookston, Minn.
 Minnesota seventh congressional district convention, Morris, Minn.
 Minnesota Crop Improvement Association, Owatonna, Minn.
 Minnesota Cooperative Improvement Association, Owatonna, Minn.
 Minnesota Realty Dealers' Association, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Greater St. Paul Committee, St. Paul, Minn.
 St. Paul Association of Public and Business Affairs, Minnesota.
 The Greater St. Paul Committee, St. Paul, Minn.
 Minnesota Red River Valley Development Association, Red Lake
 Falls, Minn.
 North Branch Commercial Club, North Branch, Minn.
 East Grand Forks Commercial Club, East Grand Forks, Minn.
 Angus Commercial and Community Club, Minnesota.
 Lake Benton Community Club, Minnesota.
 Town and Country Service Club, Slayton, Minn.
 Fisher Community Club, Fisher, Minn.
 Owatonna Chamber of Commerce, Owatonna, Minn.
 Kittson County Export League, Kittson County, Minn.
 Big Stone-Traverse County Bankers' Association, Minnesota.
 Executive committee for the promotion of the McNary-Haugen bill,
 St. Paul, Minn.
 Crookston Council United Commercial Travelers, Crookston, Minn.
 Town of Lake Stay, Minn.
 Bankers Association of Rock County, Minn.
 Joe River Farmers Club, St. Vincent, Minn.
 Sinnott and Augsburg Farm Bureau Units, Minnesota.
 Martin County Farm Bureau, Fairmount, Minn.
 Faribault County Farm Bureau Association, Faribault, Minn.
 Kasota Farm Bureau Unit, Kasota, Minn.
 Cottonwood County Farm Bureau, Minnesota.
 Rock County Farm Bureau, Minnesota.
 Grand Prairie Farm Bureau, Minnesota.
 Michigan Federation of Farm Loan Associations, Mount Pleasant,
 Mich.
 Missouri Farmers Association, Columbia, Mo.
 Secretary of agriculture, Jefferson City, Mo.
 Missouri Farm Bureau Federation, Jefferson City, Mo.
 R. W. Hoffman, representing millers of Southwest, Columbia, Mo.
 American Hereford Breeders' Association, Kansas City, Mo.
 Dekalb County Farm Bureau, Maysville, Mo.
 Montana State Department of Agriculture, Helena, Mont.
 Montana Bankers' Association, Helena, Mont.
 Montana State Farm Bureau Federation, Bozeman, Mont.
 Montana Farmers' Union, Montana.
 The Holstein Association, Livingsprings, Mont.
 Montana Wheat Growers' Association, Lewistown, Mont.
 Montana Export Commission League, Lewistown, Mont.
 Montana Land Settlement Congress, Helena, Mont.
 Southern Montana Joint Land Bank, Montana.
 Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of Montana, Billings,
 Mont.
 Montana Retail Merchants' Association, Lewistown, Mont.
 Three Forks Chamber of Commerce, Montana.
 Red Lodge Montana Club, Red Lodge, Mont.
 Polson Farmers and Business Men's Club, Polson, Mont.
 Retail Merchants' Association, Gallatin County, Bozeman, Mont.
 Stillwater County Union, Billings, Mont.
 Commercial Club and Farm Union, Belgrade, Mont.
 Canton County Farmers' Union, Roberts, Mont.
 Livingsprings County Farm Bureau, Livingsprings, Mont.
 City of Polson, Mont.
 Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union, Golden Valley County, Mont.
 Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Nebraska Wheat Growers' Association, Hastings, Nebr.
 Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Updike Grain Co. (Inc.), Omaha, Nebr.
 McCool Local Nebraska Wheat Growers, York, Nebr.
 New Mexico Wheat Growers' Association.
 National Cigar Leaf Tobacco Dealers' Association, New York City,
 N. Y.
 North Carolina State Farm Bureau Federation, Statesboro, N. C.
 North Dakota Bankers' Association, Fargo, N. Dak.
 North Dakota Department of Agriculture, Bismarck, N. Dak.
 North Dakota Farm Bureau Federation, Fargo, N. Dak.
 North Dakota Livestock Association, Fargo, N. Dak.
 North Dakota Live Stock Breeders, North Dakota.
 North Dakota Wheat Growers' Association, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
 Tri-State Grain Growers, Fargo, N. Dak.
 North Dakota Federation of Farm Loan Associations, Grand Forks,
 N. Dak.
 National Farm Loan Association, Fargo, N. Dak.
 Grand Forks County Bankers' Association, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
 Rotary Club, Fargo, N. Dak.
 Anita Commercial Club, North Dakota.
 Bergen Community Farmers' Club, Pekin, N. Dak.
 Lansford Wheat Growers' Council, North Dakota.
 Niagara Shawnee Agricultural Club, North Dakota.
 Edgeley Community Club, Edgeley, N. Dak.
 Grand Fork County Bankers' Association, North Dakota.
 Nekoma Farmers' Club, Nekoma, N. Dak.
 Washington Township Local Franklin County Farm Bureau, Colum-
 bus, Ohio.
 Oklahoma State Board of Agriculture, Oklahoma City, Okla.
 Oklahoma State Farmers' Union, Oklahoma City, Okla.
 El Reno Local, Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association, El Reno,
 Okla.
 Kingfisher District Nomination Convention, Oklahoma Wheat Grow-
 ers' Association, Kingfisher, Okla.
 District Number Four, Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association, Car-
 men, Okla.
 District Nominating Convention, Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Asso-
 ciation, Carmen, Okla.
 District Delegate Convention, Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association,
 Blackwell, Okla.
 Ponca City Local, Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association, Ponca
 City, Okla.
 Okarche Local, Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association, Oklahoma
 City, Okla.
 Oklahoma Federation of Labor, Oklahoma City, Okla.
 Oklahoma Farm Labor Economic, Oklahoma City, Okla.
 Kiowa County Mass Meeting, Lone Wolf, Okla.
 Okarche Local, membership 300, Oklahoma City, Okla.
 Oregon State Bankers' Association, Portland, Oreg.
 Oregon State Farm Bureau Federation, Portland, Oreg.
 Oregon Cooperative Grain Growers, Portland, Oreg.
 Oregon Export Commission League, Pendleton, Oreg.
 Export Commission League, Milton, Oreg.
 Oregon Wool Growers' Association, Portland, Oreg.
 Northwest Wheat Growers' Associated, Portland, Oreg.
 Oregon Hardware & Implement Dealers, Portland, Oreg.
 Port of Portland Commission, Portland, Oreg.
 Portland Chamber of Commerce, Portland, Oreg.
 Pendleton Commercial Association, Pendleton, Oreg.
 Astoria Chamber of Commerce, Astoria, Oreg.
 Agricultural College Economic Conference, Corvallis, Oreg.
 Pilot Rock Export Commission League, paid membership 200, Pilot
 Rock, Oreg.
 Opal City Grange, Colver, Oreg.
 Morrow County Export Commission League, Heppner, Oreg.
 Morrow County Farm Bureau, Heppner, Oreg.

Sherman County Teachers, Moro, Oreg.
 Lane County Agricultural Economics Conference, Eugene, Oreg.
 South Dakota Bankers' Association, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
 South Dakota Farm Bureau Federation, Brookings, S. Dak.
 South Dakota Wheat Growers' Association, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
 South Dakota Export Commission League, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
 South Dakota Potato Growers' Association.
 Mitchell Chamber of Commerce, Mitchell, S. Dak.
 Commercial Club, Redfield, S. Dak.
 Commercial Club, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
 Commercial Club, Tyndall, S. Dak.
 Gregory Commercial Club, Gregory, S. Dak.
 Eureka Commercial Club, South Dakota.
 Fall River County Farm Bureau, Hot Springs, S. Dak.
 Marshall County Bankers' Association, Britton, S. Dak.
 Marshall County Farm Bureau, Britton, S. Dak.
 Roberts County Bankers' Association, Wilmot, S. Dak.
 Texas Wheat Growers' Association.
 Planters' Mutual Hail Insurance Co., Pampa, Tex.
 Pampa Chamber of Commerce, Pampa, Tex.
 Pampa Local, Texas Wheat Growers' Association, Pampa, Tex.
 Cotton Growers' Association, El Paso, Tex.
 Pampa Poultry Producers' Association, Pampa, Tex.
 Fourth and fifth districts, Texas Wheat Growers' Association, Texas.
 Highland Hereford Breeders' Association, Marfa, Tex. (Cooperative marketing association of Brewster, Jeff Davis County, annually branding 40,000 calves)
 Panhandle Local, Texas Wheat Growers' Association, Panhandle, Tex.
 Tobacco Growers' Association, El Paso, Tex.
 Panhandle Chamber of Commerce, Panhandle, Tex.
 Pampa National Farm Loan Association, Pampa, Tex.
 Utah State Board of Agriculture, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Utah State Farm Bureau, Utah.
 Nephi National Farm Loan Association, Nephi, Utah.
 National Wool Growers' Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Farmers' Cash Union, Tremonton, Utah.
 Utah Wheat Growers' League, Nephi, Utah.
 Juab County Farm Bureau, Nephi, Utah.
 Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, Roanoke, Va.
 Rockingham County Farm Bureau, Harrisonburg, Va.
 Washington State Bankers' Association, Cheney, Wash.
 Washington State Farm Bureau Federation.
 Washington State Farmers' Union, Spokane, Wash.
 Northwest Livestock Association, Spokane, Wash.
 Washington Wheat Growers' Association, Spokane, Wash.
 Washington Federation of Farm Loan Associations, Spokane, Wash.
 Washington Export Commission League, Rosalia, Wash.
 Spokane Post, American Legion, Spokane, Wash.
 Spokane Central Labor Council, Spokane, Wash.
 Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash.
 Tri-State Hardware Dealers' Association, Spokane, Wash.
 The Building Owners and Managers' Association, Spokane, Wash.
 Spokane Realty Association, Spokane, Wash.
 Associated Engineers, Spokane, Wash.
 Export League Commission, Pullman, Wash.
 Lind Local Washington Export League, Ritzville, Wash.
 Oakesdale Farmers' Union, Oakesdale, Wash.
 Goldendale Commercial Club, Goldendale, Wash.
 Associated Bankers, Walla Walla, Wash.
 Spokane Chamber of Commerce, Spokane, Wash.
 Spokane Central Labor Council, Spokane, Wash.
 Tri-State Hardware Dealers' Association, Pomeroy, Wash.
 Walla Walla Chamber of Commerce, Walla Walla, Wash.
 Waterville Chamber of Commerce, Waterville, Wash.
 Spokane Building Owners and Manufacturers' Association, Spokane, Wash.
 Waitsburg Commercial Club, Waitsburg, Wash.
 Commercial Club, Endicott, Wash.
 St. John Commercial Club, St. John, Wash.
 Pacific Farmers' Union, Pullman, Wash.
 Garfield Farmers' Union, Garfield, Wash.
 Winona Branch, Washington Export Commission League, Winona, Wash.
 Thornton Farm Bureau Federation, Thornton, Wash.
 Pullman Chamber of Commerce, Pullman, Wash.
 Pomeroy Commercial Club, Pomeroy, Wash.
 Edwall Cooperative Club, Edwall, Wash.
 Asotin Community Club, Asotin, Wash.
 Colfax Chamber of Commerce, Colfax, Wash.
 Coulee Commercial Club, Coulee, Wash.
 Adams County Branch, Washington Export Commission League, Ritzville, Wash.
 Klickitat County Pomona Grange, Goldendale, Wash.
 Whitman County Farmers' Union, Garfield, Wash.

Walla Walla County Farm Bureau, Walla Walla, Wash.
 Rosalie County Farm Bureau, Rosalie, Wash.
 Whitman County Tax Payers' League, Washington.
 Whitman County Farm Bureau, Colfax, Wash.
 Whitman County Republican Convention, Whitman County, Wash.
 West Virginia Farm Bureau, Charleston, W. Va.
 Wisconsin Federation of Farm Loan Associations, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Five hundred and two National Farm Loan Associations in Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon.
 Interstate Export League, Minnesota.

I shall also insert the following indorsements:

LOUIS W. HILL INDORSES McNARY-HAUGEN BILL
 The McNary-Haugen bill now before Congress was indorsed by Louis W. Hill, chairman of the Great Northern Railway, following conferences Thursday with St. Paul business men on the agricultural and general trade conditions of the Northwest.

"The operation of the principle developed in the bill should restore the purchasing power of the farmer and get him back on his feet," Mr. Hill said after hearing the bill explained by Frank W. Murphy, of Wheaton. "At the same time it should directly benefit industry, commerce, and transportation."

"I recognize that what the farmer needs and must have in order to get back on his feet is a better price for the things he is producing," Mr. Hill declared, "and I am heartily in favor of any sound and practical plan that will be of help to him. This bill seems to point the way clearly."

KUHN, LOEB & CO.,
 New York.
 S. K. STEVENSON, Esq.,
 Johnson County Bank Building, Iowa City, Iowa.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 13th instant.

I realize with every sympathy the unfortunate plight of the farmer and shall be only too happy to do what may be within my modest capacity toward supporting any well-considered measure of redress. As to the McNary-Haugen bill, I inclose herewith copy of a letter which I wrote on this subject to Secretary Wallace recently, and I remain, with best wishes,

Very faithfully yours,
 OTTO H. KARN,
 Kuhn, Loeb & Co.,
 New York, March 8, 1924.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have gone carefully through the papers which you sent me. Not being an expert in matters of agriculture, being indeed but little acquainted through personal observations with the methods and ways of that industry, I am without competence to express a definite opinion on the details of the McNary-Haugen bill and on the practical workability of its provisions. It does seem to me that certain of the functions and responsibilities assigned by it to the Government could, and had better, be left to the private or semiprivate initiative of the farming industry.

As to the principle, however, which the bill seeks to apply to the present emergency, it seems to me, under the conditions such as I understand them to be, a logical sequence to policies which in other respects have long been generically characteristic of the trend of economic legislation in America, whichever party was in power. If I am correctly informed as to the situation and prospects of the farming industry, I believe the application of that principle, on carefully considered lines and within prudent limitations, to be warranted by the circumstances which exist and for some time have existed in agriculture and which are likely to result in grave and lasting national damage unless they are dealt with promptly and comprehensively.

No doubt strong arguments based upon economic orthodoxy can and will be adduced in opposition to the proposed theory, and various complexities and novel points will have to be met in respect of its practical application, including the question of the attitude and the actions which other nations may see fit to take in the face of it.

No man, I believe, is wise enough to foretell with assurance the precise results and repercussions of the operation of the scheme. But, unless the plight of the farmer is a good deal less serious and ominous than many reports and symptoms have led us to believe and unless an effective plan of relief can be devised of a less drastic character, it would seem to me that the Government would be justified in giving its indorsement to a fair test of a measure along the lines of the principle on which the McNary-Haugen bill rests, though full discussion and deliberation will, no doubt, lead to certain modifications of its present form and substance.

The farmer, finding himself, as we are informed, in an intolerable situation, is gravely discontented and under a sense of grievance toward the existing order of things. His is a toilsome calling at best, involving inevitable hardships and hazards, and usually a poorly rewarded one, indeed one of the least adequately remunerated among those which make up the sum total of the Nation's activities. The farming

business is the largest in the country. The basic and vital necessity of the farming industry needs no emphasizing. The immense social value of the farming class to the State is beyond argument.

There can be no lasting prosperity in trade and industry, unless the farmer is reasonably prosperous. There can be no stable and propitious condition in the field of politics—using the term in its larger meaning—as long as the farmer harbors the resentful feeling that he is not accorded a square deal.

Not only is the farmer entitled in fairness to relief from conditions of maladjustment, which place him in a position of heavy disadvantage as compared to other callings, but the continuance of these conditions constitutes a serious social evil and a derangement of so grave a portent as to justify resort to an heroic remedy, if it must be admitted that the lesser measures heretofore applied or suggested are impotent to effect a cure.

It will be far less costly, I believe, to the country at large to bear the very slight addition to the cost of food which is involved in a reasonable trial of the theory embodied in the McNary-Haugen bill than to pay the penalty which would appear to be inescapable if the Nation countenanced or failed to redress a state of things that would leave agriculture languishing and declining and 12,000,000 farmers aggrieved, resentful, and deprived of a fair share of prosperity and well-being.

As to the fear of setting a precedent, I believe that, in a broad sense and in its underlying thought, the principle of the McNary-Haugen bill—granting the existence of the conditions which it aims to correct—rather follows than creates precedent. Moreover, aversion against or apprehension of establishing a precedent is never a valid reason for failure to do that which is justly called for. I feel assured that we may rely—and, indeed, under a popular system of government we must rely—upon the soundness and watchfulness of public opinion to see to it that precedents are not harmfully misapplied or abused.

I beg to remain, dear Mr. Secretary,

Very sincerely yours,

Hon. HENRY C. WALLACE,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

STATEMENT BY BERNARD M. BARUCH, NEW YORK CAPITALIST

Equality for agriculture is what the farmer is striving for. What are the inequalities? Other industries are organized and farming is not. Therefore the farmer buys in a more or less restricted market and sells in a competitive market.

The price obtained for the surplus determines the price the farmer receives for his total product. The price of American surplus wheat is made in the Liverpool market, where it comes in competition with the wheat produced by the cheapest labor in the world. But the price of a manufactured article is not necessarily determined by the price the surplus brings, because on account of Government protection the manufacturer can sell here all the market will absorb and sell or dump the balance in the markets of the world.

Therefore it is only just to permit the farmer to do what is necessary to correct the inequalities. It should be unnecessary for him to sell competitively, and the fixing of the price of his total production by the surplus that comes in competition with the cheapest labor in the world should be prevented. How can that be done? The provisions of the McNary-Haugen bill will do that. In the beginning let me say that I am not in favor of all the bill contains, but I do favor the principle of it, which will accomplish the following:

It will make cooperative marketing mandatory where it is now permissible. The price is not to be arbitrarily fixed by the farmer, but there is a minimum price below which wheat can not be sold. This figure is determined by a proper relationship with all other things on the index list of prices of the Department of Labor creating a proper relation between the results of labor in agriculture and the results of labor in other industries. Surely there is nothing unfair about that.

When the necessity occurs, the President will declare a crisis, let us say, in wheat. Then by mandate all selling of wheat will be fixed at a minimum price, which will be arrived at according to a fair relationship established by scientific and well-known principles of price ratios between wheat and other things. A computation will be made of the probable surplus and of the amount of money necessary to take care of that surplus. From the price at which the wheat is sold will be subtracted a certain amount, which will be used for the purpose of buying the surplus wheat at the minimum price.

From each bushel that the farmer sells he must pay into the agency that is established a certain number of cents a bushel, for which he will receive a certificate of interest. All the surplus wheat will be placed in a surplus-carrying corporation which will sell the surplus in the markets of the world and return to the farmer his proportionate share of the price received. Thus it will be seen that the farmer himself bears any loss that may be entailed and that it is not a loss that can fall upon the Government.

There are some who may read stern economic lectures concerning this, but as soon as the principle of the tariff and of modern business organization is admitted, the correctness and propriety of this or-

ganization must also be acknowledged. There is no arbitrary fixing of prices, but only a price that will create a fair and proper relationship between the labor engaged in agriculture and labor employed in other industries. The farmer will take care of the surplus and pocket the loss; the consumer will meet only the same condition that he meets when paying for the other things necessary for his daily life, whether it be rent or clothing.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Is it not true that the price of the farm products bears a very small relation to the price of the food products, and while wheat may decline from 60 to 75 per cent, the price of bread will decline only 2 or 3 per cent?

Mr. HAUGEN. To give an illustration of that, potatoes in my section of the country are selling for about 25 to 30 cents a bushel. We have been paying 35 cents for one potato at the hotel all winter. That is a fair illustration.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. WEFALD. I remind the gentleman who asked the question of the fact that during the war when wheat was \$3 a bushel or more, bread was only within 1 or 2 cents a loaf of what it is now.

Mr. McKEOWN. That is what I am trying to get at. What will be done to prevent them from going on and raising the price of the bread on the plea that we have raised the price of the products out of which bread is made, when the 5-cent loaf has not yet returned? There ought to be something in this bill to prevent that. Is there any way by which you can prevent those men from charging more than the bread is worth, in comparison with the price of wheat?

Mr. HAUGEN. There is nothing in this bill to do that, and this committee has no jurisdiction over that phase of it. We have a law on the statute books in respect to that, and all that is necessary is to put in force the laws that we have.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. The chairman will note that on page 42 of the majority report the thought is brought out that the increase of the cost of living per capita for bread alone will be \$2.50 for the people of the United States, and that means \$250,000,000 increase in the cost of living on account of the raising of your wheat price. That is in the majority report.

Mr. HAUGEN. That all depends upon the amount of bread a family consumes.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. The farmer is not responsible for the high price of bread.

Mr. HAUGEN. No; he is not.

According to the testimony printed in the hearings on the Brand bread bill the value of the ingredients in a loaf of bread that sells generally over the United States for 8 to 9 cents in loaves from 14 to 16 ounces is the first consideration. There is about a cent and a half's worth of wheat in such a loaf of bread, when it is full weight, and when the wheat is converted into flour the cost of the flour is in the neighborhood of 2 cents when good grades of flour are used.

As evidence of this, the United States Government is baking bread for the Army and they report the cost of all ingredients in a pound loaf of bread as low as a cent and three-quarters. Such bread is now being sold by the Army at 3 cents at Army camps and hospitals.

The Shultz Baking Co., of New York, claim bread is costing them \$0.0311 per pound, including all ingredients. This gives you the cost of the Army bread and also the cost claimed by one of the largest bakers in the country.

In the city of Washington bread is being sold by the Corby Bakery to the Navy as low as \$0.0369 per pound loaf of the same quality that they are selling wholesale the same bread at the same time to retail merchants at 8 cents for a pound loaf.

With the cost of the materials in a loaf of bread established by the above at from 2 to 3 cents for a pound loaf, and the wholesale selling price generally over the United States being from 8 to 9 cents a loaf, it seems perfectly clear that the consumers are entitled to full weight, and that is the purpose of the Federal bread act.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I am anxious to be friendly to this bill, as are a great many city members. The gentleman has stated that there is a surplus of certain commodities and he has not given any reason for the surplus. I hope the gentleman will as he goes along. It strikes me that with the

paternalistic effect that this bill will have on the commodities in which there is not a surplus there will be a tendency not to create a diversification of crops with this legislation, but rather a tendency to intensify production on those things of which you have no surplus.

Mr. HAUGEN. If there is an increase in production, they penalize themselves. The greater the surplus is the greater will be the discount, of course, from the ratio price.

Mr. BLACK of New York. What is done in this bill to stimulate the diversifying of crops?

Mr. HAUGEN. There is nothing here to stimulate the diversifying of crops. We had inflated prices during the war. That did not increase production to any great extent. When you bring the price of corn up, you bring up the price of oats with it. When you bring up the price of wheat, the price of rye rises with it, and one will be just as profitable as the other. Here is your dairy business. Everybody says that there is a great deal of money in the dairy business. It has been profitable. It is not profitable to-day. What has happened? The bottom has fallen out of it. About a month ago butter was selling above the ratio price, and the other day it was down to 35½ cents to 36½ cents, say 36 cents. The ratio price was 45 cents. The price of butter was 9 cents below the ratio price. What does that mean to the farmer, 9 cents a pound on a price of 36 cents? That is 25 per cent.

The farmer to-day would receive 25 per cent more for his butter had the bill been in operation. One suggestion is to take care of the wheat farmer and that that is all that is necessary. Oh, yes; they admit that all are sick; all of them are going into bankruptcy. They say to take care of the few of them, that if you do take care of a few of them we will let the others take care of themselves. I take it that it is a question of the survival of the fittest. What unpardonable sin has the hog grower or the dairyman committed in this country? Are they not entitled to the same consideration as the wheat growers? The ratio price of hogs to-day is 60 per cent above the current price, and it is only 50 per cent on wheat, and still some say it is in the interest of the packers. No; it is not for the packers, and the packers do not want to come in under this bill.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman refers to dairy products.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The bill refers to food products of cattle, sheep, and swine. Is it the gentleman's contention that the words "food products" do not include milk, cream, and butter?

Mr. HAUGEN. We consider them food out in our country.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; and pretty good food; but I want to get the the gentleman's idea as to whether or not this bill would permit the corporation to fix the ratio price on all dairy products.

Mr. HAUGEN. If milk and butter are food products, they are included in the bill. Some try to make out that they are not.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I want to get a little information as to what you are going to do for the farmers. I have heard what you are doing to the fellows in the city. I see on page 19 you have changed the original provisions of this bill from requiring the buyer either to provide the scrip or the equalization fee, and you require the producer or the seller to pay the equalization fee.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is all by regulation.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would like to ask the gentleman if the ratio price on wheat, say, is \$1.50, and I come on the market and sell it and the equalization fee is determined at what—say 25 cents?

Mr. HAUGEN. You would not determine it at 25 because it would scarcely exceed over 10 or 12 cents. It might go to 15.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. When I sell the wheat for the ratio price do you deduct the fee from the ratio price, and I pay for it in that manner?

Mr. HAUGEN. If you sell the wheat under this bill—say they would most likely fix the equalization fee at 10 cents—the price advances from \$1.09 to \$1.59. The 10 cents paid in the equalization fee would leave you \$1.49 in cash instead of \$1.09, and at the end of the year if there is anything left of the equalization fee it would be proportioned out.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. In fact, then, the seller does not pay anything into the corporation directly?

Mr. HAUGEN. The grain buyer would collect it from the producer.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. You do not require—

Mr. HAUGEN. One moment. It may be paid into the equalization fund either by the producer or the purchaser of the grain may deduct from the price and remit the equalization fee to the corporation to be paid into the Treasury out of which the operating expenses and the losses will be paid.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Has the gentleman any calculation as to the total value of the crops that are affected by the gentleman's bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. Much has been said about wheat. The yield of wheat runs about 700,000,000 bushels a year, up to a billion bushels. The average crop is about 750,000,000 bushels; for the current year, 781,000,000 bushels. Well, assuming the crop will be 750,000,000 and we will assume that there will be 150,000,000 bushels of surplus for export. Now, I know what the gentleman has in mind.

I will tell you what is the matter: They are shipping wheat through the United States in bond. And what are they doing? They are bringing in, in bond, Canadian wheat exported from our ports, or to be milled into flour and the flour to be exported from our ports, and what they are doing is substituting American rye and exporting that instead of the good Canadian wheat brought in; part is being exported as wheat and part as flour. Every time they bring in 1,000 pounds of wheat in bond, and while in this country substitute 1,000 pounds of rye, which they export either as wheat or flour, they rob our Government of the duty which should properly be collected on the wheat brought in, besides it adds to our surplus, and if this bill were in operation such a transaction would add to the loss of our surplus. Now—

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. On that question I will tell you what I have in mind. I know what the folks in the city I live in are going to ask me. They are going to ask me what is it going to cost us to help put the farmers on their feet, and I have been trying to make a rough calculation of what it is going to cost. If the total value of the products affected by this bill are, let us say, \$2,000,000,000—\$3,000,000,000, I do not know how much—

Mr. HAUGEN. The total value?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Say \$5,000,000,000 affected by this bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. No.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Four billion dollars.

Mr. HAUGEN. Wheat, about 750,000,000 bushels at \$1 a bushel, that would be \$750,000,000. Corn, 3,000,000,000 bushels at 75 cents, would be \$2,250,000,000.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. But you have got cattle, flour, rice, and all those things. Suppose it only aggregates \$3,000,000,000?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; more than that.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. And to be conservative you are going to raise the price about 20 per cent. Is that right? All right, that means you are going to increase the value to almost—I am not saying it is wrong or is not right—you are going to increase the value of those crops \$600,000,000.

So that we ought to tell the American people that we are going to take out of the pockets of the consumers—I am not saying that it should not be done—this \$100,000,000 and turn it over to the farmers in order to equalize prices. Is that right? I want to be fair.

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe in being fair.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. For every dollar of value of crops we buy we are going to take 20 cents out of the pockets of the consumer and turn it over to the farmer?

Mr. FREAR. That is argument simply. What is the increase for the clothing and shoes and all the manufactured articles that have a tariff to-day?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am asking the gentleman a plain question.

Mr. HAUGEN. You are fair and right. I admit all you say. But how much do we give the organized industries? Here are the statistics. What is the purchasing power of the farmer? What is the price of commodities which the farmer must buy with his products? The value of his products is less than 50 per cent what it was a few years ago in its purchasing power.

Only a few years ago a thousand pounds of hogs would buy, for instance, two corn planters. To-day it would require 1,000 pounds to buy one. A few years ago a thousand pounds of hogs would buy a lumber wagon, and to-day it takes about 1,500 pounds to buy a lumber wagon. A thousand pounds of hogs would buy a wagon and a half a few years ago.

Now, as to farm labor, we used to pay \$20 a month for labor. We pay \$60 now. Where is the purchasing power of the farmer? You can tear down the tariff laws and you can open the gates now to immigration, and what will you accom-

plish? Your immigration laws and your tariff laws and your prices will be brought down to the level of competing countries abroad.

Now, I believe in the policy of a protective tariff. I believe in that great and cardinal principle of the party with which I am affiliated. I believe in encouraging and bulding up American industry that will benefit labor and result in the good of the common people.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Do you regard this bill as an outgrowth of the tariff?

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe in the great principles underlying the construction of our tariff laws. We may not agree on that or on any other subject, but this committee of which I am the chairman has no jurisdiction over the tariff. We did the best we could. The thought now is to equalize these prices, and, as Mr. Wallace, who represented the American Federation of Labor, stated before our committee, we appreciate that it is going to increase the price, but what is that to us? We are willing to pay it. It will increase the cost.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. About a billion dollars a year?

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss this question without interruption.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Would the gentleman be willing to call this an internal tariff for the protection of the American farmer? Would you call it that?

Mr. HAUGEN. No. I would prefer to call it a bill for the equalization of prices. What I propose to do is to make the tariff absolute as to the farm products, as we do with other products.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Are you not going to tax the consumer? The protective tariff has worked for industry, and because it has not worked for agriculture you now hit upon a scheme of equalization, which will bring the prices of agriculture up?

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. We have got to admit in that that we are taxing the consumer?

Mr. HAUGEN. Absolutely. But every time we pass a bill restricting immigration or a tariff bill we generally add to the cost.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. How did it happen that the protective tariff which you fixed, which was wanted so much for the farmer, did not help the farmer?

Mr. HAUGEN. Generally it would protect the farmer, except in case of a surplus. In that case the farmer takes the price fixed on the surplus. There is no way of getting away from it. I have voted for restricted immigration and protective tariff consistently. While I believe in a protective tariff, I believe in one that will result to the common good of all the people of the Nation. Hence I have always contended that the farmers have never been given the full benefit of our tariff system. Tariff does not always raise the price. For instance, recently the duty on wheat was raised 12 cents a bushel; the price of wheat went down 10 cents. The object of the bill is to make the tariff applicable to the farmer as effectively as to organized industry, to sell for domestic consumption at one price and for export at the world price, and at the end of the operating period to proportionately equalize prices of the whole product. In other words, to make it possible for the farmer to do as organized industry does.

Mr. KINDRED. Going back to the question of how this bill will operate, as a concrete example and illustration of what the gentleman has already said, as I understood it, about increasing the price to the consumer of one-half a cent on a loaf of bread, is it not true that the retailer instead of charging the necessary half cent will make it to the ultimate consumer, the small consumer, 1 cent or 2 cents more for each loaf of bread?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will tell you this: You can double the price of wheat and sell bread at the same price that it is now sold for. There is another institution at the other end of the Avenue that may give attention to that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit another short question?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; but then I must decline to yield further.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Under the bill as first introduced the 15 cents which was to be paid by way of equalization for possible loss was to be paid into the post office by the buyer?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. When I sell my wheat I get \$1.35, but I do not pay 15 cents into that fund, which is to equalize this loss. Who pays that 15 cents under this bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is deducted from the \$1.60, and whatever is left of the 15 cents is returned proportionately at the end of the operating period.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But I do not see where you get that 15 cents that is in the equalization fund.

Mr. HAUGEN. You deduct 15 cents from every bushel.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But who pays the 15 cents?

Mr. HAUGEN. The producer pays it. He pays it into the treasury of the corporation, or the purchaser may deduct it from the ratio price and pay it into the treasury of the corporation. The regulations may require the producer to pay the equalization fee into the treasury of the corporation, or the amount may be deducted from the ratio price and be paid into the treasury by the purchaser.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Then it is not collected from the seller, but is collected when the product is sold?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes, indeed; on the first sale. Now, my friends, as I told you, I have no desire to tell a hard-luck story. It is a sure thing, my friends, that we know very little about what is going on in the country, and that we do not know all about the real conditions. The metropolitan press is not saying anything about the bank failures, and it is probably proper that they do not.

According to the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1923—

In 15 corn and wheat producing States 24 1/2 per cent of owners of farms were in fact bankrupt, practically one out of every four bankrupt.

One million two hundred thousand left the farms to better their financial conditions in 1922.

In New York alone, for the year ending February, 1923, 26,000 moved from the farms to the cities.

In Michigan, 10 per cent of the farms are vacant and 13 per cent more are only partly worked.

According to the annual report of the Attorney General on bankruptcy among farmers—

The number of Iowa farmers in bankruptcy increased from 60 in 1913 to 499 in 1923. Farmers' percentage of all cases in bankruptcy increased from 16.8 per cent in 1913 to 52.3 per cent in 1923. The number of farmers in all cases in bankruptcy in all the States increased from 942 in 1913 to 5,940 in 1923, an increase of 4,998 in 10 years.

Bank failures in the United States have increased by leaps and bounds.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not yield, because I would be taking time from other gentlemen. I do not want to be discourteous, but I can not yield and take time away from other gentlemen.

I have no desire to sound a note of alarm. By nature I am an optimist. I prefer to look at the bright side of things rather than the dark side. I am aware that "knock and the world knocks with you," but, as we know, in recent years we have had an unusual flow of hard-luck talk about the depressed conditions in agriculture. Many well-meaning people have been most generous in their utterances along that line. Agitators along various lines, in their mad chase to further their interests and gratify their ambitions, have talked and talked, knocked and knocked, alleging that all their ills are the results of unjust and discriminatory law. While I do not subscribe to that, unfortunately as a result many have been led to believe that there is something radically wrong in our laws.

While bank failures, farm-mortgage foreclosures, and bankruptcy proceedings are very much in evidence everywhere, while conditions are far from what one would desire, I do not share in the contention that our troubles are due to legislation enacted, while practically every measure suggested having for its object to better conditions has been enacted, notwithstanding every effort should be made to further improve conditions, especially agriculture.

All practically agree that upon agriculture, our basic industry, rests the whole structure. Our experience in recent years seems to have demonstrated that with absolute finality—that the stability, growth, and greatness of our Nation, yes, the progress of prosperity and happiness of our people, depend upon the success of the tillers of the soil.

As a class the farmer is the great conservative force of our Nation. All wealth springs from Mother Earth. It is the farmer who produces new wealth. He furnishes about 50 per cent of our exports. Our gold reserves or balance of trade is dependent on the tillers of the soil. Without his industry and success our gold reserve and balance of trade would dwindle into insignificance.

About one-half of the American people live in rural districts; of that number six and one-half million farmers employ a like number of wage earners, which, together with the members of their families make up a total of more than thirty-one million tilling six and one-half million farms producing annually from seven hundred million to ten hundred million bushels of wheat, from six to seven billion bushels of cereals, or, in other words, about one-third of the world's production of wheat or cereals.

According to the figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture we have:

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Head of cattle..... | 66,801,000 |
| Head of swine..... | 65,000,000 |
| Head of sheep..... | 39,361,000 |

Twenty-four million six hundred and seventy-five thousand milk cows giving more than 12,000,000,000 gallons of milk annually, about 15,000,000 pounds of beef, veal, pork, and mutton. The livestock on the farms on the 1st of January and the 1918 crop was valued at \$24,700,000,000, which in amount was more than three times the then stock of money in the United States, even after our paper mills and printing presses had been running overtime turning out all kinds of money. According to recent reports the estimated value of crops and livestock have shrunk to about one-third.

It goes without saying that our export trade is dependent upon the products of the farm. The farmer furnishes on an average about one-half of our total export. One year as high as 84 per cent. It is clear without his industry and success our balance of trade now in our favor would turn into an adverse balance to be paid in gold.

As a result our gold reserve would disappear. American exchange, now at premium, will go below par and thus deflate our currency and further deflate the purchasing power of agricultural products.

One suggestion is to repeal our tariff laws and to lower the American wage scale and high standard of living to a world level, so as to enable the American producer to compete with the products of the world; to increase the export of the products of our American mills and factories and exchange them for food. Yes; under such arrangement we might succeed in doing that for a while, but only for a short time.

Just as sure as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, without prosperity in agriculture our factories and mills and our banks would crumble to pieces. Our railroads would rust from idleness, our beautiful towns, villages, and cities, including our schoolhouses in the valleys and churches on the hilltops, would to a large extent suffer. Our grand and glorious Government, its splendid and magnificent institutions, would materially suffer. Much of our productive farms, producing bread in quantities sufficient to satisfy not only 112,000,000 of our own people but millions in far lands, would return to unproductivity.

The product of the farm is food. Food supplies fuel and energy; yes, life! The recent war demonstrated the value of food. No matter how strong and courageous the young man may be he can not long fight or endure without food. What is true of a human is true of a nation. You recall that during the war the munition trains and passenger trains were sidetracked, and the trains carrying pork and flour and every train carrying food was given right of way. Why? Because it carried food, the most essential aid to the men and women at the front in winning the war! The war was not won because of our munition factories and automobile factories, but more because of our bread baskets, our supplies of food, which made it possible for our brave and heroic men and women to carry the war to a successful conclusion.

You recall that only a few years ago our factories and mills were running on part time with about 35 per cent production. As a result, 6,000,000 men were walking the streets, and that without creating a national disturbance; disturbances here and there, but not to the extent of a national calamity.

What would happen with a failure of crop, or only a 35 per cent production? It would create not only a national calamity but a condition of great alarm throughout the world. Millions and millions of our people would starve. Not only that, but the farmers' purchasing power, about 35 per cent of the total purchasing power, would naturally be cut in the same proportion. As a result, millions of wage earners would again be without a job, factories and mills would crumble.

Thus I might go on, but I believe this sufficient to indicate the importance of our basic industry—agriculture—its success and prosperity. If my contention is well taken, if the tiller of the soil is entitled to a consideration, they are entitled to more than flattery, to more than party-platform promises, to more

than promises made by self-professed friends of the farmer who work in and out of season to defeat every measure having for its object the improvement of agricultural conditions. No, my friends, glittering generalities, unfulfilled promises, and legislation to extend credit, which will run him more into debt, to create a few soft berths in the public crib, or legislation to extract large sums of money from the Treasury afford no relief to the farmer. He is entitled to something more substantial in order that prosperity may again be restored to agriculture.

I thank you. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. LOZIER. I am sympathetic with your argument and commend you for its fairness. Is it not true that the agricultural distress which is prevailing throughout the United States is being reflected in the commercial and industrial centers to such an extent that in 1921 and 1922 the amount of new capital invested in corporations or chartered companies was \$11,000,000,000 less than in 1919 and 1920, and the total bank clearings in 1921 and 1922 were \$93,000,000,000 less than in 1919 and 1920, and is not this distress ultimately going to be felt more keenly in the industrial and commercial centers of the Nation?

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe it is felt right now. He is entitled to a square deal and equalization in prices, to restore the purchasing power of his products to a level with that of other products, so as to give him more money with which to pay his debts rather than to run him into debt. The purchasing power of the American farmer must be restored. This will be done if the Members from the East or the Members from the South will join with the Members from the Middle West and Northwest—who are unanimously for this bill—and pass this bill, frequently referred to as the "Merry-Haugen bill." [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point there is no quorum present.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to yield three minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CLAGUE]. Will the gentleman from Maryland withhold his point of order for three minutes?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; I will.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, persons whose self-interest is adversely affected by any legislative enactment or proposed enactment readily find the weaknesses in any bill proposed in Congress. Against no bill have more bitter objections been made than at the McNary-Haugen bill. The Committee on Agriculture of this body has devoted nearly four months of earnest study to the question of agricultural relief. It has heard dozens of reasons, both for and against the several measures which it has under consideration, and especially this one. Many hundreds of pages of testimony have been taken, thousands of petitions have been received, practically all in favor of the bill, and at the conclusion of all of this study of the problem our committee by a favorable vote of 14 to 6 has brought in the measure now before us.

In my judgment no measure has ever been considered of its character as to which more things can be said on the favorable side with full truth. Some of the opponents of the bill, particularly in the grain trade, have unfortunately stooped to vituperation and abuse instead of to argument. At the outset of this debate it is my desire to bring before Members of the House a brief discussion of some of the opposing assertions that are most frequently heard. Directly or in substance those who oppose the bill have reasons of self-interest, or who misunderstand it, or who honestly hold political and governmental views with which the bill conflicts have said that the bill is one or all of the following:

1. Unworkable.
2. Unsound.
3. Uneconomic.
4. Unconstitutional.
5. Un-American.
6. Unnatural.

I will briefly discuss the thought as I understand it and the argument answering these challenges.

(1) Opponents of the bill say it will increase production but is unworkable. How can it produce results and be unworkable at the same time?

(a) Can a man buy things if he has money to pay for them? Certainly.

(b) Can a man sell things that others want if he is willing to sell them at the market price? Of course he can.

(c) Can you hire someone to do a service for you, like milling wheat or slaughtering hogs, if you have the raw product

and are willing to buy the services, especially when both the millers and packers have ample capacity and would kill the same hogs and mill the same wheat if there were no McNary-Haugen law? Undoubtedly you can.

(d) Can the agencies that sell abroad now, sell abroad next year? Of course they can and the corporation will compensate them for their services. It does not put them out of business.

(e) Can the corporation with the powers given it collect fees? The other branches of the Government do this now in millions of cases. Undoubtedly this creature of government can do it, too.

(f) Can the Government refund moneys if it collects too much? It does it now by the millions of dollars. The co-operatives do it by distributing their patronage dividends. Private corporations do it.

(g) Can the Government regulate imports? Of course it can and does and has from the beginning of the Nation. Opponents speak of bootlegging in the case of hogs. Inasmuch as 275 firms kill 65 per cent of all American livestock, and these are already under Federal supervision, enforcement will not be so difficult as some would have you believe. The true reason for the opposition to the bill is not that it will not work—it is that it will.

(2) Is the bill unsound? I say it is sound public policy. It is always sound for government to do for the citizen things required by the public welfare that the citizen can not do for himself. We are confronted with a condition in our national life due to the farm crisis—and not a theory. Is it sound to restore farming to a sound basis? Is it sound to arrange a solution that will save our export trade in farm products? Agriculture contributed nearly \$2,000,000,000 in 1923 to the exports of \$4,000,000,000 from the United States. Is it sound to bring this new wealth into the United States? Of course it is. It is one of the factors, and a large one, that has made our Nation in less than 150 years the greatest Nation in the world. Starving out farmers will not be of service to the Nation. The bill in effect organizes American agriculture in the only way it can be done fully to handle its export surpluses. The Webb-Pomerene and Edge laws were passed to help industry and do the same things in principle.

(3) Is the proposal uneconomic? If saving the business well-being of 35,000,000 of our people—yes; otherwise—no. As stated above, agriculture contributes \$2,000,000,000 to our \$4,000,000,000 worth of yearly exports. It is good business to keep this market. Good business is sound economics. It takes the dear old law of supply and demand and make it work for us and not ruin us—just as we harness the mountain stream and control the law of gravity in its operation to do good instead of harm. The bill reduces available supply and this increases the price. It uses what we have for the greatest good of all the people. This is the soundest of economics.

(4) Is it unconstitutional? Only the Supreme Court can finally decide that question, but good constitutional lawyers passed on this, and they all say that it is not. The brief submitted with the report of the Committee on Agriculture to the House of Representatives sustains every constitutional point. The unconstitutionality smoke screen is a mere attempt to kill the bill by those who fear their self-interest may suffer.

(5) Is it un-American? Only if a square deal is. Industry, labor, transportation, and finance are all in many senses special beneficiaries of existing legislation. The farmer supplies the food and is entitled to a seat at the table.

(6) Is it unnatural? It is just as unnatural as the tariff that we have had over 100 years. It is no more unnatural than anti-toxin for diphtheria or insulin for diabetes. The trouble is not a broken leg; it is a disordered system that is not functioning right. The remedy prescribed by the bill was not prepared by quacks and politicians but by those who for many years have been and now are the farmers' ablest advisers and his true friends.

It has been stated that the bill will—

1. Increase the cost of living.
2. Result in overproduction.
3. Produce a business panic.
4. Destroy the agricultural cooperative association.
5. Invite retaliation by foreign countries.
6. Necessitate helping other industries—for instance, like copper and straw hats.

There is not time to analyze more than a few of the alleged dire calamities (?) that will happen if Congress passes this bill.

IT WILL INCREASE THE COST OF LIVING

This is not a necessary corollary. Since 1918 wheat has dropped over 50 per cent in price in Minneapolis, but the Federal Trade Commission reports that bread there has come down only 2 per cent. If cutting the price of wheat from over

two to about one dollar per bushel has reduced the bread price only 2 per cent, it is certain that adding 50 cents to the wheat price need not add much to the price of bread.

When pork was 8 cents a pound in 1913, ham was 27 cents per pound. Later pork went to the sky but did not stay long. When it got back to 8 cents, ham was still 48 cents.

There is plenty of slack to be taken up.

If 50 cents is added to the 600,000,000 bushels of wheat used at home, it means \$300,000,000 to be provided from somewhere. Much of it can be gotten by taking up slack between producer and consumer. But if none of it can, it only adds about \$2.60 per head per year to living costs of all the people, including the farmer. Aside from this there is no reason in justice or economics why consumers should get foodstuffs at less than the cost of production—to the ruin of American farming. Economic justice calls for an even sharing of the burdens as between all classes of the people.

An important fact commonly overlooked is that the usual solution of "let the situation cure itself" means elevating prices—that is, raising cost of living—by cutting down production until such a real scarcity occurs that prices will be forced up to a point that will encourage farmers to keep on producing. Why destroy hundreds of thousands of farm homes to get a result that can be had without such a cruel remedy? The American Federation of Labor recognized the situation and sent a representative before the House Committee on Agriculture to favor the McNary-Haugen bill.

IT WILL CAUSE GREAT OVERPRODUCTION

This again does not follow. To begin with, there has been no serious overproduction. Nor is there now. Our wheat price is above the world price, and our hog price about at pre-war level. The trouble is that it takes about one and one-half times as many bushels of wheat, and almost twice as many pounds of pork to buy things as it took before the war. What we seek is to restore reasonable price relations. The patient has not a broken leg; he has rheumatism due to toxemia from infected tonsils. He does not need his leg amputated; he needs to have his tonsils—the export surplus—removed. The farmer will not overproduce grossly, because—

1. The export losses are assessed back on him.
2. The ratio price will not be high enough to give him great encouragement. Wheat above \$2 for over three years heretofore brought a peak production of only 668,000,000 bushels; why should \$1.50 be so enormously stimulating?
3. Increasing yield per acre is expensive and the farmer has no money to apply to this purpose—i. e., for fertilizers, new machinery, and more work stock.
4. Farmers and farmers' sons have been driven to town so that farms are running shorthanded. Besides farm wages are 100 per cent above pre-war.
5. Fertility has been progressively depleted and there are no new lands of attractive quality left in the United States.
6. With hogs and wheat both put on a ratio basis there will be little or no motive to devote corn land to wheat or vice versa.
7. It will take a period of years to turn the tide that is now running away from the farm back toward it. Indications right now are for a wheat crop under 750,000,000 bushels. And finally,

8. Why should people get so "het up" if the farmer should try to get himself out of the hole he has been put in by trying to produce in order to pay his debts?

The United States Chamber of Commerce magazine, The Nation's Business, talks about farm "bunk." This is the stuff the chamber and others are handing to the farmer; not what he is demanding shall be created for him, namely, a business agency to put him on an equality with commerce, industry, and labor, which are cared for by existing laws.

IT WILL DESTROY COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATIONS

That is what the enemies of the bill say. Most of them are also enemies of cooperation. Some among the latter, however, see the situation more clearly. These are members of the old-line grain trade. They say it will effectuate nation-wide cooperation at one stroke. What hundreds of organizations and thousands of individual cooperators think is shown by the following quotation from a telegram to the President:

On behalf of 16,000 members of the North Dakota Wheat Growers' Association we strongly urge the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill in preference to all other farm relief measures introduced in Congress. We are convinced that this is the only measure that will give immediate relief. * * * Farmers of the United States will not be satisfied with relief measures other than this.

This sounds almost like a group of industrialists or business or labor representatives demanding something they want, like tariff protection. The orthodox economists tell us how bad

the tariff is for them, but it beats all how they have thriven on over 100 years of it. The bill will not hurt the cooperatives. A special provision in the bill requires this.

IT WILL DESTROY OUR PRESENT WONDERFUL FUTURE TRADING AND GENERAL DISTRIBUTION

No one can tell fully what effect the bill will have on future trading. It will reduce hazards and fluctuations—effects agreed by almost all as desirable. It will probably reduce the volume of futures, but it will not destroy the system. As to the effect on the spot grain trade, note this quotation from a letter from a grain man of lifelong experience:

I believe the bill could operate practically to the great help of the grain and stock raiser and with no harm to the present dealers in the commodities affected. * * * When you brush aside all the foolish arguments the grain men and millers advance against the bill you expose the fact that they are afraid their business is going to be hurt, and while they profess an interest in the farmers' welfare that interest is lost sight of if they fear their own interests are threatened.

Prominent millers and grain men in many parts of the country share and have expressed similar views to those quoted above.

PASSAGE OF THE BILL WILL INVITE RETALIATION BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We sell our pork products to nations that are short of producing their own needs. The same is true of our wheat and flour. The corporation will sell at world prices. Just why will importing nations object to receiving things they need and want? The talk about dumping and reprisals is based on misrepresentation or on misunderstanding of the legislation. Our crops are now dumped. Under the McNary-Haugen bill they will be marketed in an orderly way through present channels under direction of a central supervisory organization. Now, the weight of our whole wheat crop bears on the world market; under the McNary-Haugen plan only the export surplus will so bear down on the world price.

As far as retaliation is concerned, look what has ever been said about our tariff laws and what in recent years has been said of our immigration laws. It is time, anyway, we considered our own interests as other nations do—trust them to look out for themselves.

Time forbids attempting to discuss more of the objections that are raised to the bill. One nationally known economist objects because successful operation of the plan will defer free trade 50 years more. Think of using the distressed and economically defenseless farmer as the fulcrum for the cruel lever that shall overturn protection of American industry and labor.

CONCLUSION

Genuine friends of the farmer should rather concern themselves with whether the bill will produce the results that are claimed for it. I have already indicated briefly the fundamental features as to its workability in my remarks. Subsequently I hope to develop this theme to show that the bill is absolutely workable and will produce the results. This the minority of the committee in its report said:

When this bill takes effect as to wheat, the price of \$1 wheat will necessarily rise to over \$1.50.

This will cure the officious price disparity between wheat and the commodities the farmer must buy; the same effect will be observed as to hogs and their products when they are brought under the effect of this bill. This bill is the only plan that seeks farm troubles where they exist and attempts to cure them where they are found. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. ASWELL. Under the disposition of the time, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT] be permitted to speak.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Maryland withhold his point a moment?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I suggest to the gentleman that, under the rule, there is required a recess at 6 o'clock. If the gentleman should persist in his point and a call of the House came, that would take until a quarter of six, which would leave 15 minutes. Does not the gentleman think, under those circumstances, nothing would be accomplished?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio I think this is a very important bill and I think the Members ought to be here to listen to the discussion. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, another roll call would consume time almost up to 6 o'clock and, under the rule, we recess at that time. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9033) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8905. An act to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Hungary to the United States of America.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 2665. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River in the vicinity of One hundred and thirty-fourth Street, in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois;

H. R. 2498. An act for the relief of the East LaHave Transportation Co. (Ltd.), owner; A. Picard & Co., owner of cargo; and George H. Corkum, Leopold S. Conrad, Wilson Zinck, Freeman Beck, Sidney Knickle, and Norman E. LeGay, crew, of the schooner *Con Rem*, sunk by United States submarine K-4;

H. R. 1629. An act authorizing the removal of the restrictions from 40 acres of the allotment of Isaac Jack, a Seneca Indian, and for other purposes;

H. R. 837. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 694. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910;

H. R. 2881. An act to compensate three Comanche Indians of the Kiowa Reservation;

H. R. 2887. An act 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;

H. R. 3183. An act for the relief of Rush O. Fellows;

H. R. 3800. An act to cancel an allotment of land made to Mary Crane or Ho-tah-kah-win-kaw, a deceased Indian, embracing land within the Winnebago Indian Reservation in Nebraska;

H. R. 3900. An act to cancel two allotments made to Richard Bell, deceased, embracing land within the Round Valley Indian Reservation in California;

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;

H. R. 4200. An act to provide for the cleaning of the exterior of the post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio;

H. R. 4462. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the payment of the Choctaw and Chickasaw town-site fund, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4494. An act authorizing extensions 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.;

H. R. 4647. An act for the relief of the Underwood Type-writer Co. and Frank P. Trott;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Edward T. Williams;

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. 6059. An act authorizing the conveyance to the city of Washington, Mo., of 10 feet of the Federal building site in said city for the extension of the existing public alley through the entire block from Oak to Lafayette Streets;

H. R. 6298. An act to authorize the leasing for oil and gas mining purposes of unallotted lands on Indian reservations affected by the proviso to section 3 of the act of February 28, 1891;

H. R. 6810. An act 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.;

H. R. 7913. An act 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;

H. R. 7063. An act 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;

H. R. 7846. An act 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.;

H. R. 8229. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 8304. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundredth Street, in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates to preside this evening the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a tariff on copper.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement compiled by Mr. F. N. Stacey, formerly a statistician in the Census Bureau, commenting upon the provisions of the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. TINCHER. I object.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Federal Constitution, including two brief papers.

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

THE McNARY-HAUGEN BILL

Mr. LILLY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the McNary-Haugen bill is intended to, and will, in my opinion, benefit agricultural interests to a certain extent. While it will not give all the relief needed and deserved, yet it seems to me that the friend of the farmer could not refuse to support the bill. The farmer has suffered more severely during the past three years than he has ever suffered during the history of this Nation. He pays an enormous price for his necessities, and he is compelled to sell his products, when he can find a market at all, at a price far less than the cost of production. This bill is the only measure that has been introduced and sufficiently urged to bring about its consideration that tends in the least to give the farmer relief.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer has been unfairly treated. The Sixty-seventh and Sixty-eighth Congresses seemingly have tried to legislate to benefit every class of industry with the exception of the agricultural class, and unless we do something for this class the result will be that the agricultural interests will be reduced finally to such an extent that the Nation will be in danger. We all know that agriculture is the backbone of the entire Nation.

Who is to blame for the neglect and refusal to relieve the farmer? The answer is, the people and party who have had control of this Government since 1920. We are a productive Nation, and we produce and are capable of producing agricultural products far in excess of consumption. If agriculture is to prosper, we must have a market not only at home but abroad; we must have transportation rates that are not excessive; we must have commerce with other countries. You Republicans, who have been in control of this Government, by your actions have absolutely isolated us and deprived us of a foreign market.

You have stood idly by and allowed transportation rates to be increased to such an extent that the shipment of farm produce is almost out of the question. You have refused to join the League of Nations or adopt any similar policy that will give us foreign trade; instead, you have enacted the iniquitous Fordney-McCumber tariff bill for the benefit of special interests, and other nations seeing these policies have retaliated by passing tariff laws which practically prevent the sale of our products in those countries.

I want to impress upon you that the farmer has had his eyes opened. He knows how he has been treated; he is holding us responsible for his losses and for the bank failures in the agricultural districts which have exceeded anything of the kind in the history of the country. It is time that we also wake up to a sense of our duty and give the interests of the farmers some consideration and progressive legislation; and this Nation had better adopt, and that just as soon as possible, some adequate foreign policy.

As I said in the beginning, this bill does not provide all the relief the farmer should have; it is not permanent, but since it is the only measure allowed to be reported we should vote for this bill without political prejudice.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege of extending my remarks on the McNary-Haugen bill, I desire to insert the following letters, written by myself.

The first letter is to the editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in reply to an article which appeared in that paper written by Hon. HENRY T. RAINY.

The second letter is to the editor of the Boonville Advertiser, answering an article written by C. F. Kelley, a miller, which appeared in that paper in opposition to the McNary-Haugen bill. My reply was made at the suggestion of the editor, so that the farmers of that locality might have opportunity to hear both sides of the question.

To the EDITOR ST. LOUIS GLOBE DEMOCRAT,

St. Louis, Mo.:

The Hon. HENRY T. RAINY, Member of Congress from the twentieth district of Illinois, is a very distinguished Member of that body. His service extends over a period of about 20 years. I have great regard for him personally and great admiration for his ability as a legislator. In a recent dispatch from Washington he is made to appear as answering a speech made by me on the McNary-Haugen bill. Having been placed in this attitude I feel that I should briefly make reply to Mr. RAINY'S statement. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture, which prepared and reported this bill. We have had it under consideration for the past four months, during which time we have had almost daily meetings upon it. I have attended all of these sessions of the committee, and I therefore believe I can speak as one having knowledge in regard to the provisions and objects of this important piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. RAINY is opposed to the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill. He has made a number of speeches against it, and the article which appeared in the Globe Democrat of May 13 is similar to others made by him. In fact, Mr. RAINY has, probably without his own knowledge, furnished a great deal of material which had been used by the grain exchanges and the grain speculators of Chicago in their fight against this measure. One of his speeches appears in full in a publication issued by the grain dealers of Chicago.

In the article which appears in the Globe Democrat Mr. RAINY says:

"If I could make myself believe that the McNary-Haugen bill would accomplish what its proponents claim for it, I would be shouting for it from the housetops."

It therefore behoves me to convert him if it is possible for me to do so. I want to call his attention to the primary object of this legislation. The corporation created by this act will first ascertain the amount of the export surplus of the basic agricultural product and then it will go into the market and purchase at the ratio price that amount. The amount so purchased will be exported, not necessarily all at once, but if it be wheat or other nonperishable products it may be stored and held awaiting such time as the corporation may obtain a satisfactory price for it abroad. Thus the corporation will diminish the available domestic supply. By this process the price of the remaining product will be raised, and if there were no other provisions in the bill the very fact that the surplus would be exported would have a very strong influence in bringing about an increase in the price of the product remaining in the domestic market. If Mr. RAINY doubts the fact that a diminishing supply increases prices, he doubts the operation of the law of supply and demand. I want to illustrate how this operates, and herewith give you some figures:

| Year | Head |
|-----------|------------|
| 1910 | 52,500,000 |
| 1920 | 35,000,000 |
| Reduction | 17,500,000 |

| | |
|--------|---------------|
| Value: | |
| 1920 | \$395,000,000 |
| 1910 | 232,000,000 |

Difference 163,000,000

In other words, in spite of a reduction of 17,500,000 head, the flocks of the United States were worth \$163,000,000 more.

Take cotton as another illustration of the fact that a reduced supply increases prices.

| | |
|---------|------------|
| Cotton: | Bales |
| 1914 | 16,000,000 |
| 1923 | 10,000,000 |

Difference 6,000,000

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Value, December 1 basis: | |
| 1923 | \$1,563,000,000 |
| 1914 | 549,000,000 |

Difference 1,014,000,000

Despite the fact that we had a crop of 6,000,000 bales more in 1914 than in 1923 the value of the crop in 1914 was more than a billion less. So that no matter how it may be brought about, if the supply is reduced prices will be increased. This same condition may be illustrated by taking other crops. Take potatoes, for instance.

| | |
|-----------|-------------|
| Potatoes: | Bushels |
| 1922 | 458,000,000 |
| 1923 | 412,000,000 |

Difference 46,000,000

But the crop, with 46,000,000 bushels less in 1923, was worth \$76,000,000 more than the larger crop of 1922. Mr. RAINEX need have no doubt as to the efficiency of reduction of supply based upon exportation producing the desired result of placing farming on an equality with trade, industry, and labor. He says:

"A great many farm organizations are vigorously opposing the McNary-Haugen bill."

Scores and scores of farm organizations have petitioned our committee and the Senate committee to pass this legislation, and so far as I know only one or two have opposed it. One of these was the Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association, which first opposed it and later advised the committee of the House that fully 90 per cent of its members had reversed their position, and that they had at first opposed it because of misrepresentation as to the purpose and effect of the measure. Not only have the farm organizations practically unanimously indorsed this bill, but it has also been indorsed by men who have had years of experience in the marketing of farm products. Managers and officers of marketing associations who have handled as high as \$2,000,000 worth of livestock in a single year, and many million dollars' worth of wheat and other grain have come before our committee and indorsed the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. RAINEX says the directors of the corporation are given most unusual powers. As a matter of fact the powers conferred are almost identically the same as those conferred upon most any private corporation engaged in similar activities. In some respects the powers of the Agricultural Export Corporation are less than those of private corporations. The corporation created under this act is denied the right to construct, purchase, or to own processing facilities, such as packing houses, mills, elevators, warehouses, etc. We have endeavored in this act to give the corporation all the powers necessary in order that it may function properly; to do otherwise would be to make it inefficient and unsuccessful.

Mr. RAINEX's statement—
"No man can hazard a guess as to how many employees will be needed"

is an intimation that a very large number of employees will be necessary, whereas it is a fact that this bill will not require "an army of Government officials" to enforce it. The bill specifically requires that the corporation shall use the existing agencies, and gives it ample power to contract with the present agencies—mills, elevators, packing plants, etc. In these contracts provision will be made to compensate these agencies for services which they may render the corporation in helping to put this law into effect.

Mr. RAINEX says:
"May I suggest the following illustration: There is, let us say, a washerwoman who lives in the outskirts of a city, who has raised a pig."

He uses over 700 words in describing what would happen to this woman if the McNary-Haugen bill is passed and she decides to sell her pig. I want to say frankly that if all the things set forth in Mr. RAINEX's illustration of the washerwoman and her pig were true there is not a man on the Agriculture Committee who would be in favor of the enactment of this legislation. There is nothing in the proposed legislation that warrants the statements made in this illustration. I can tell you in a very few words what would happen to this woman if the McNary-Haugen bill were passed. If her pig weighed 200 pounds when the butcher came to buy it she would receive for it at least \$8 more than she would receive for it under the existing conditions. The

butcher would pay her the ratio price for the pig, less the equalization fee. She would not have to make any report of it, but, of course, the butcher would have to make a report of the transaction when he made his report to the corporation or its agent at the end of the month.

The ratio prices and the equalization fees upon basic agricultural products are required to be published in the terminal markets, and, of course, they will be published in every market paper, in the city press, in the local county papers, and will be known far and wide throughout the country. The ratio prices do not change oftener than once a month and may not change that often, while the equalization fees are fixed annually. Let me say right here that it is through the payment of the equalization fees that the farmers of the country will pay the losses and the expenses of this corporation, and when the five-year period of emergency ends the \$200,000,000 furnished by the Government as the capital stock of the corporation will be returned to the Treasury of the United States without the loss of a single dollar.

In connection with this unwarranted illustration of the woman and her pig I want to call the attention of Mr. RAINEX to the fact that in the case of livestock there are 257 firms in the United States that kill 65 per cent of the meat annually consumed in the United States. These firms are already under Federal regulation of the meat-inspection law. I believe that so far as it relates to meat not less than 95 per cent of the total volume of business will be brought under the operation of this law. Small interfarm transactions between farmers will not come under the provisions of this act.

Mr. RAINEX objects to the Government going into business. I would like to avoid that, if possible. I would not for a moment be in favor of this legislation or in favor of putting the Government into business if there were any other means whereby immediate relief could be brought to the farmers of the country. Agricultural conditions are critical; relief must come, and come at once. But the Government has already gone into business. It went into business when the first tariff law was passed. It went into business when the first immigration law was passed, because it decreased the supply of labor. It went into business when the Adamson law and the Cummins-Esch law were passed. It took the first step to go into business the other day when the House passed, with only one or two votes against it, a bill creating a corporation with a capital stock of \$5,000,000 to operate certain boats on certain streams. There is only one industry in the United States for whose benefit the Government has not yet gone into business, and that is our greatest industry—agriculture—constituting about one-third of the people of America. We propose by this bill to go into business in its behalf. Through legislative enactment we have helped every industry in America except this one great basic industry—agriculture. Now is our time to help it.

Mr. RAINEX says the packers are not fighting this bill. In this Mr. RAINEX is mistaken. The packers are fighting it, and so are those who handle the farmer's products after they leave the farm—the miller, the elevator man, the grain trader, the packer, and the exporter. I do not mean to say that all of these oppose this bill, but as a rule all of those who do oppose it belong to one or the other of these classes.

Mr. RAINEX says that a representative of the packers drew the bill. I do not agree with Mr. RAINEX in this statement. However, whoever may have prepared the bill as originally introduced, it was taken up and rewritten from beginning to end by the Committee on Agriculture. For weeks and weeks we worked upon this measure, meeting every day. We took it up not only by paragraphs but line by line. We went over it again and again. We had four different drafts made of the bill, something very unusual, and something which has never before been done by our committee. The bill we reported to the House and asked it to pass is the work of our committee, and the statement of Mr. RAINEX that a representative of a packer drew the bill is without foundation.

Mr. RAINEX makes an attack upon Mr. Charles J. Brand. It is not my purpose to enter into this controversy—I am sure Mr. Brand can take care of himself. I do not think, however, it would be out of the way, inasmuch as Mr. RAINEX's article has been read by the people of St. Louis and vicinity, to insert here copy of a letter given to Mr. Brand by Hon. D. F. Houston, then Secretary of Agriculture, when he resigned from public service some years ago. Mr. Houston was formerly a prominent and highly respected citizen of St. Louis. The letter is as follows:

"You have been in charge of the organized marketing work of the department since its beginning in 1913. Starting with a modest appropriation of \$50,000, the Bureau of Markets this year has had a budget of approximately \$1,500,000 aside from the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the purchase and sale of nitrate of soda. Its activities have been greatly extended in many directions and it has rendered increasingly valuable service to the Nation. It is charged with the administration of a number of important and difficult laws. When you assumed your duties you were faced with a pioneer task. There were then no marketing agencies either in the Federal or State services solely designed to assist the Nation in the marketing and distribution of farm products. These matters had received too little attention at the hands of

institutions training men for national service, as well as at the hands of legislative bodies. You were confronted with the duty not only of marking out in a definite way the paths of endeavor, but also of discovering and, in a measure, of training the men for the work.

"Throughout your period of service, both in peace and in war, you have discharged your task with remarkable ability and patriotic devotion. Wishing you the greatest success and happiness in your undertakings, I am

"Cordially yours,

"D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary."

It may not be out of place for me to say that the \$50,000 for the Bureau of Markets referred to in Secretary Houston's letter was secured by me in 1913, by an amendment I made to the Agriculture appropriation bill.

These propositions, however, and others mentioned in Mr. RAINEY's statement are beside the question so far as they relate to the provisions of the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. RAINEY calls attention to the fact of the difficulty that will confront the corporation in the handling of meat products. No one denies that so far as it relates to the meat the McNary-Haugen bill will be difficult to administer and yet these difficulties can be overcome. When the President appoints the members of the board of directors of the corporation, they will meet and organize, and prepare to put the act into effect. One of the first things they will do before any emergency is declared to exist, on either wheat or meat products, will be to arrive at a harmonious understanding with millers, packers, and the handlers of other commodities to the end that these agencies may conduct their operations with safety and outlive such contracts and agreements as will insure the hearty cooperation between them and the corporation in the administration of the law.

Mr. RAINEY criticizes the Committee on Agriculture by inference for giving careful consideration to this measure, to which it has devoted almost daily sessions for about three months. It was reported by the House committee by a vote of 14 to 6 and had been previously reported by the Senate committee by a vote of 10 to 2. He not only criticizes the bill itself, but he does not hesitate to criticize those who have given it profound study and care. Extensive hearings were held and men were invited from all parts of the country to come before our committee and were invited to criticize the bill and to offer suggestions in order to assist in perfecting it. As finally reported, this bill is workable, although like every other big undertaking it will have its difficulties. Mr. RAINEY, like one of the representatives of one of the packers, who appeared to oppose this bill, expresses great sympathy for the farmer, yet he criticizes everything that we propose and he has no constructive measure to offer in its place.

But, I must not prolong this discussion. Suffice it for me to say that through legislative enactment we have helped every industry in America except the one great basic industry—agriculture. More than one-fourth of the people in America live upon the farms. They toil through all kinds of weather, both early and late. They seek no eight-hour law. They depend for their success more than any other industry known to man upon the elements. They plow, they plant, they cultivate, and if the sun shines and the rain comes in due proportion they harvest their crops. On the other hand, if perchance the rain does not come, or if it comes in too great abundance, the result of their labor is destroyed by a drought or by a flood. These are conditions that we can not regulate by legislation, but when the farmer reaps an abundant harvest, and takes his products to the market place, we want him to receive a just and fair price for those products. This is what we are trying to do by the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill.

THOS. L. RUBEY, M. C.,
Committee on Agriculture.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BOONVILLE ADVERTISER

MAY 12, 1924.

MR. EDGAR C. NELSON,

Editor the Boonville Advertiser, Boonville, Mo.

DEAR MR. NELSON: In a recent issue of the Advertiser there appeared a letter from Mr. O. F. Kelly, a miller of your city, criticizing the McNary-Haugen bill. I do not know Mr. Kelly personally, but I am sure he is one of your best and most conscientious citizens, and it is not my purpose to enter into any controversy with him. Your paper has a large circulation throughout central Missouri, and I would like for its readers to get the viewpoint of the proponents of this pending legislation, hence this letter.

Mr. Kelly is opposed to the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill. I am not surprised that he is if he bases his opinions upon the information which he has obtained through the reading of a statement recently given out by Julius S. Barnes, who is president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and who is also one of the largest American grain exporters. I take it that Mr. Kelly has secured his information from this source, because some of his language is almost identical with the language set forth by Mr. Barnes in his statement.

Mr. Barnes has carried on an astonishing amount of misrepresentation of the McNary-Haugen bill. He is opposed to the passage of the bill, as all other exporters are, because he believes it will put them out of business. In advocating passage of the McNary-Haugen bill we are not seeking to help the exporter—he does not need any help. His profits run into millions and millions of dollars, and he needs no help from any source. But we are seeking to help the American farmer and to bring the price he receives for his basic agricultural products up to the point where those products will have their pre-war purchasing power.

The McNary-Haugen bill is advocated by farm organizations throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is opposed by those who handle the farmer's products after they leave the farm—for instance, the miller, the elevator man, the packer, the exporter, and the speculator. I do not mean to say by any means that all of these oppose this bill, but as a rule all of those who do oppose it belong to one of these classes.

These men have been sending out propaganda to the millers and elevator men and doing everything in their power to bring the McNary-Haugen bill into disrepute. They all say, as Mr. Kelly says, that they favor steps to help agriculture but they do not make any constructive suggestions as to how it may be done. Mr. Barnes, in his statement has gone further than that—he has recommended diversification, cooperative organizations; and he also says he believes in letting the situation cure itself. We all believe in diversification where conditions warrant it, and we are strongly in favor of cooperative organizations, but diversification will not restore the purchasing power of the farm crops. How can diversification or cooperation help the farmer to get 1,000 feet of lumber for \$30, as he did in 1914? Now he has to pay \$52 for it. How can they restore the purchasing power of the hog grower's dollar which is now only a little less than 60 cents of the pre-war value? Of course this can be done by destroying or putting out of business enough farmers of the country and reducing production. If one-half or one-third the farmers of America would cease production and could find other work to do, the price of the farm products would rise in value. At the same time we would increase the number of consumers, would put the country in a critical situation, and we would be confronted with the question as to where we would get sufficient to feed and clothe our own people.

The McNary-Haugen bill was prepared after careful study by some of the ablest men of the country. Mr. Kelly says that the bill is admittedly directed at wheat exclusively. This bill is intended to help the hog industry, which is in a worse condition than the wheat industry, although it is intended to help both. The hog grower now pays 2,973 pounds for a 22-7 grain drill that cost him only 1,471 pounds in 1913. The wheat grower gives 206 bushels of wheat now for the same drill which he bought for 132 bushels in 1913. In terms of hogs the price of drills has come up over 100 per cent; in terms of wheat it has gone up 56 per cent. This statement shows beyond any doubt that this measure is not and should not be intended as exclusively a wheat measure. Mr. Kelly evidently gets his figures from Mr. Barnes's statement, but the figures are wrong. Mr. Kelly's mention of Pennsylvania yield is certainly wrong, and this same statement was also made by Mr. Barnes. The average wheat yield for Pennsylvania is 17.4 bushels per acre instead of 25, based on five-year average 1918-1922. The Pennsylvania farmer gets along because he is near the market, in fact, the market is right under his nose. He does not have to pay large freight rates to get his products to market. However, many of the farmers of Pennsylvania came before our committee urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill. On the other hand, some of the western wheat-growing States have a relative high yield. The five-year average for the State of Washington is 22.6 bushels per acre, but the Washington farmer has more difficulty in getting his wheat to market.

Mr. Kelly states we should improve agricultural methods, and we all agree that farm methods should be improved, and we know that the farmers, through cooperative organizations, are doing much to improve their conditions, but there are some things over which the farmer has no control. How can he buy new machinery, fertilizers to make his soil more productive, hire the necessary labor when farm labor is 150 per cent higher than it was before the war, and everything he buys has advanced that much or more, and when the farmer's prices for his commodities have been going lower and lower all the time.

Of course the argument is made by those opposed to this legislation that it is unworkable. Mr. Kelly makes the statement that unscrupulous tactics and illegal evasions will bring unfair results to the honest farmer and the honest grain dealer, but the fact must not be overlooked that violations along the lines mentioned in his letter will result in fines, and if persisted in, in fines and imprisonment, or both. Some years ago when we passed the first income tax law the same argument was made that it would be unworkable, that it could not be carried into effect, and while we all know that there are violations of the income tax law, some men hide away their wealth, make false returns, and seek to evade payment of their income taxes, yet its administration has been fairly

successful and billions of dollars have been collected in recent years through the income tax law.

This bill does not require an army of Government officers. It specifically requires that the corporation shall use the existing agencies and facilities and gives ample power to contract so that the present agencies, millers, elevators, packing plants, etc., may be contracted with and in these contracts they will be compensated for services which they may render to the corporation in putting this law into effect.

I can not see why the miller should be opposed to this bill. If he is an exporter the law protects him against loss in his export trade. If he manufactures his flour and sells it in the domestic market he will sell it for a higher price by reason of the increased price of the grain which he uses. Just before the bill was reported to the House I offered an amendment which was agreed to, which gives the corporation authority, if it deems it advisable, to extend the ratio price over a period instead of from month to month. Under this amendment, during certain months of the year, the corporation may fix the ratio price for a period of several months, and this will be of great advantage to the miller, and many of them have already expressed their approval of this change. In fact in the preparation of this bill, while our main effort has been to help the farmer, we have sought in every way to throw about it every safeguard that would protect the miller, the elevator men, packers, etc., from losses by reason of this legislation.

Recent figures from the Department of Agriculture indicate a reduction in the wheat acreage of the country for the coming year. It is believed that the reduction in acreage in 1924 over 1923 will be at least 12 per cent, so that the estimate made by Mr. Barnes and others in regard to the enormous amount of wheat that will have to be exported is, beyond doubt, greatly exaggerated. In 1919, when our crop was 968,000,000 bushels and the world price twice what it is now, we exported only 214,000,000 bushels. At the very height of the war in Europe, when its production was reduced to a mere fraction of pre-war production, our greatest export in all time was 332,000,000 bushels. Those who assume that there will be a possible export of 320,000,000 bushels of wheat with Europe, in its present condition, and with its destroyed purchasing power, are, it seems to me, doing so for the sole purpose of endeavoring by such means to defeat this legislation.

Mr. Kelly assumes the world market price, Chicago basis, to be 90 cents. He also assumes a 60-cent loss per bushel on an export of 320,000,000 bushels. These are imaginative export figures. If he would divide that in half and assume 50 cents per bushel as the difference between the domestic and foreign values he would be more nearly correct.

Mr. Kelly also says that it is admitted that the expenses of the corporation will be 5 cents per bushel. Who admits it? Certainly not the proponents of the measure. It is believed that the cost of the administration of this law will be between 1 cent and 2 cents per bushel. It should be remembered and understood that this bill specifically provides that the corporation, in the administration of its affairs, shall utilize existing agencies. We do not want to put the miller out of business, or the elevator man, or any other agency. We want the corporation to earnestly cooperate with them, and when that is done the cost of the administration will be comparatively small, and when the period ends the miller and other agencies of the country will not be injured, but can continue right on with their business the same as if this period of Government aid and help had not existed. The trouble with Mr. Kelly is that his figures are not correct, and with these figures as a basis for conclusion that the operation will be so expensive as to eat up all the increased price brought about by reason of the ratio price is entirely erroneous. It is idle to discuss figures, assuming such mistaken premises. Some one has said of Mr. Barnes, that in his argument he is speaking for Julius Barnes, the grain exporter, and not for the American farmer.

I note what Mr. Kelly says in regard to the grain futures act, which curbs speculation. In this connection it will be interesting to note that in a single year, 1921, on the Chicago Board of Trade alone about 12,000,000,000 bushels of wheat were traded in when only 45,000,000 bushels were received in Chicago. In other words, in a single year between five or six times as much wheat were traded in in futures as were actually delivered in Chicago in over 60 years. Some of the very best observers are certain, in so far as the grain futures act has had any effect, it has headed off a short-selling campaign that the speculators were afraid to put on that would have driven the price even lower than it went.

The McNary-Haugen bill does not fix the price of wheat, but what it does is to require the corporation to buy wheat at the various terminal markets, or through agencies elsewhere, if necessary, at the ratio price. The ratio price, when ascertained, will be published in all the terminal markets. The farmer will know that there is an agency which will buy his wheat at that price, less, of course, the cost of transportation, loading, and other charges such as exist at the present

time. When the farmer knows this he can figure out about what he ought to receive for his wheat at the local market. He will also know the equalization fee per bushel, which is the amount he must contribute to make up for the loss and the expense of the commission, so that he will know what his net price will be for every bushel of wheat he sells.

Many estimates have been made by the proponents of this measure as to the amount of losses of the corporation and the expenses of the corporation, and taking wheat as an illustration, the most conservative estimate is around 15 cents per bushel, so that if the ratio price of wheat is \$1.62 per bushel at Chicago the farmer at Boonville will receive \$1.47 per bushel, less, of course, the transportation charges between Boonville and Chicago, and these same charges he must now pay under present conditions.

Very truly yours,

THOS. L. RUBEY.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, no subject before Congress in recent years has attracted such widespread attention and interest as the question of farm relief now under consideration. Few measures have affected so directly and so vitally the prosperity and well-being of the Nation, and certainly none have been so earnestly advocated and so bitterly criticized as the McNary-Haugen bill, formulated by the Committee on Agriculture and championed by the representatives of the farm organizations as the most practicable solution of this perplexing problem.

The bill has been the subject of exhaustive study and analysis. For weeks a steady stream of letters, pamphlets, newspaper articles, briefs, and monographs, from pen, typewriter, press, and mimeograph have alternately urged its merits and alleged its defects, and its critics and advocates include some of the most noted economists in the country.

But one of the most valuable and practical contributions on the subject yet submitted, one of those most frequently quoted, and perhaps the most influential in its effect on the actual drafting of the bill, is an open letter by Mr. William Hirth, editor of the Missouri Farmer. It is captioned "Agriculture is dying," and has been characterized on the floor of the House as "the best discussion of the situation of agriculture throughout the United States."

Mr. Hirth is high in the national councils of agriculture and is the founder of one of the foremost cooperative organizations in America. He has made an exhaustive and intimate study of farm economics and is recognized as an authority on the subject.

His letter has been so often quoted and there are so many requests for copies of it that I ask unanimous consent to reprint it in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks. The letter follows:

(An open letter to Congressman CANNON from the publisher of The Missouri Farmer)

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: As per my promise in Washington some days ago I herewith submit my views with reference to the McNary-Haugen bill and why I think this measure should be enacted into law. And first let me explain briefly what, as I understand it, this bill seeks to accomplish:

First. It proposes to create a commission to be known as the United States Agricultural Export Commission, composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, and three directors appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. I believe a suggestion has also been made to provide an additional advisory committee composed of one member from each of the different Federal reserve districts, to serve without pay, except as to actual traveling expenses.

Second. The intention is that the commission shall establish a fair "ratio price" between the great surplus commodities of the farm (such as wheat, pork, beef, etc.) and the current all-commodities' price which is commonly referred to as the "cost of living." Or, to put it in a simpler way, the function of the commission shall be to bring the price of surplus farm products which during the last four years have been selling on the basis of destructive low world price levels in line with what the farmer has to pay for farm implements, building materials, clothing, dry goods, shoes, freight rates, etc. And in arriving at a fair "ratio price" pre-war conditions are to be used as a basis.

Third. To this end it is proposed that the commission shall have at its disposal a fund of \$200,000,000 with which to buy up the surplus on such commodities as wheat, pork, and beef (and such other surplus commodities as the commission may decide to include in its operations) and, having removed such surplus as a factor in the home markets, to make the tariff 100 per cent effective with reference to the various "ratio prices" agreed upon.

Fourth. It is further intended that any loss sustained on the sale of the various surplus farm commodities shall be borne by the farmer and not by the Government, and to this end it is intended to issue "scrip," which shall be equalized at the end of the seasonal periods. Thus if the "ratio price" on No. 2 wheat is \$1.50 per bushel, the farmer would perhaps be paid \$1.30 per bushel in cash at the time of delivery and 20 cents in "scrip"; and then when the season's business on wheat is wound up and when the commission is in position to determine its expenses and loss on the surplus the farmer would receive such an additional dividend as may be due him. The same rule will apply to any other commodity included in the commission's operations, and thus the farmer will be assured of a fair price in the home markets less his share of the loss on the surplus and his part of the expense of conducting the commission.

Fifth. The act contemplates that the commission will arrive at a harmonious understanding with millers, packers, and the handlers of other commodities, to the end that such agencies may conduct their operations with safety and understanding.

Sixth. The act is regarded purely as an emergency measure, and is under no circumstances to continue for a period of more than five years. And in the meantime it is predicated upon the assumption that the farmers of the country shall immediately begin the perfection of cooperative marketing agencies so they will be able to exercise in a nation-wide sense the functions of the commission at the end of the emergency period.

Therefore, grouping the above provisions together, it may be said that the one and only purpose of the McNary-Haugen bill is to place the farmer on an even footing with organized industry and labor and to have the Government do for him in these premises what, in his present unorganized condition, he is not able to do for himself!

IS THIS LEGISLATION NECESSARY?

No doubt the first question the average Member of Congress will ask himself is, "Is this legislation necessary—is the condition of agriculture so desperate that Congress will be justified in a time of peace in taking a step as far-reaching as the one contemplated in this act?" And as one who is, as you know, quite intimately acquainted with agricultural conditions not only in Missouri but in other of the great Corn Belt States, my unequivocal answer is that it is. In fact, I will go further and say that American agriculture is to-day facing the greatest crisis in its history; and even if the McNary-Haugen bill is passed, thousands of farmers will be sold out by the sheriff and hundreds of country banks that are considered solvent to-day will close their doors before aid can possibly come from legislation or from any other source.

And in saying this I need only point to the foreclosure sales on farms and the great number of banks that have gone upon the rocks in the great farming States during the last two years. Here in Missouri—one of the greatest agricultural States in the Union—we have thousands of farms that have been abandoned during the last three years because their owners could not rent them, and thus despairing of what they considered a hopeless and useless struggle they turned them over to the mortgage holders and moved to some town or city in the hope of getting hold of some of the "easy money" which has been so plentiful in these quarters since the time when the World War reached its crest.

"What is the trouble?" you ask. Fundamentally, it is very simple. When the World War came to an end, and when the frenzied demand for the surplus food products of this country ceased, the American farmer was suddenly thrown back completely upon the world markets; and thus for the last four years the price of American wheat, pork, beef, and other surplus farm products has been determined, not on the basis of the American farmer's production costs, not on the basis of our so-called American "living standards," but purely on the basis of the competitive value of these commodities in Liverpool and in other world clearing ports where the peasant and peon farmers of the four corners of the earth dump their yearly surplus. And these world price levels govern not only with reference to our surplus but they fix the price of these commodities in our home markets; and thus we have the remarkable situation where the daily wage of a bricklayer or plasterer during 1923 equaled the value of an average acre of wheat or of a 230-pound hog which it took seven months of the farmer's care and feed to produce. Mind you, I am not saying that the bricklayer or plasterer should accept less, for this precipitates a question which I do not care to discuss at this time. I am merely citing the cold facts as they are and why there is serious trouble out at the "crossroads."

On the other hand, while the conclusion of the World War suddenly threw the farmer back completely upon the world markets, both industry and labor, which are powerfully organized, were able for the most part to "hold their first-line trenches"; and thus to-day industry is fighting its battles from behind the great protecting walls of the Fordney-McCumber Act, while labor has not only held to most of the advantages it obtained during the war but in the aggregate I think I am safe in saying that the Nation's pay rolls have been increased to

the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars since the armistice was signed, and this isn't taking into account the tightening up of our immigration laws. And thus the American farmer finds himself between two fires: On the one hand, the selling price of his commodities is determined by the peasant and peon farmers of the wide universe, while on the other hand his living and production costs are determined under the highest merchandise values, freight rates, and taxes ever known in this country and under the highest wage scales that obtain in any nation in the world. And thus, like a great ship, American agriculture is being pounded to pieces on the reefs of low world price levels; and in these premises one of two things must happen: Either industry and labor will have to reduce the cost of their wares and service to the level of the farmer's living and production costs or, as certain as the sun shines above, the destruction of agriculture will follow.

IS THIS MEASURE "WORKABLE"?

Already, as was to be expected, the critics of this bill say it isn't "workable" for a thousand different reasons, more or less. But why is it necessarily not a practical proposal?

When a governmental agency takes the surplus wheat, pork, or beef out of the domestic markets and fixes a definite tariff which will protect these commodities against the importation of cheaper similar commodities from the outside, then why will not such a tariff fix the domestic price? From time out of mind our great manufacturing enterprises that enjoy protection have charged a price within the United States, up even with the tariff wall—and when the export price lost them money they curtailed their output. But the farmer has never been able to "collect the tariff," because, unlike our great manufacturers, he is not in position to concentrate his selling—he is not in position to separate those of his commodities which are consumed in the domestic markets as against those which are exported, and therefore a tariff on wheat or other surplus farm commodities is as meaningless to him under existing conditions as the number of spots on the sun. And under these circumstances the fixing of tariff duties on surplus farm commodities has been nothing less than a ghastly political joke. Nor is the farmer in position to abandon the production of a surplus, as are our great manufacturers, first, because droughts, floods, and insect pestilence may disastrously affect his acre yields, while disease may devastate his flocks and herds. Again, with no organization or central directing force, about all our 8,500,000 farmers can do is to use their own best individual judgment, whether with reference to the production of grain or livestock.

But that a tariff can be made 100 per cent effective when the surplus of a given farm commodity is taken out of the domestic market, of this there is not the slightest question; and therefore we come back to the proposition which I made before, namely, that under this bill the Government would assist the farmer in doing what he is not now in position to do for himself.

And, furthermore, the Government can do this without the loss of a single penny. To illustrate, let us assume that the world price level on No. 2 wheat will be \$1 per bushel f. o. b. Chicago on July 15 of this year. Unless the McNary-Haugen bill or a similar measure is passed, this is all the wheat grower could hope to receive under any circumstances. But if the "ratio price" established by the proposed export commission should say that No. 2 wheat is worth \$1.50 per bushel f. o. b. Chicago, then the farmer would receive this amount less his proportionate loss on the exportable surplus and the expense of the export corporation. To illustrate further, suppose we produce 800,000,000 bushels of wheat during 1924, and that 600,000,000 bushels of this is required for home consumption, leaving 200,000,000 bushels for export; next let us assume that the "ratio price" within the United States is \$1.50 per bushel while the world price is only \$1 per bushel, thus representing a loss of \$100,000,000 on the surplus, and this loss charged up against the domestic price would mean a reduction of approximately 17 cents per bushel; next, in order to play perfectly safe, let us assume that it will cost 3 cents per bushel to operate the commission, or a total charge off of 20 cents per bushel, which would still leave the wheat grower 30 cents per bushel "ahead of the hounds" at the end of the equalization period as against existing conditions.

And now here occurs the most serious difference of opinion I entertain against the McNary-Haugen bill; instead of attempting the issuance of "scrip" as a means of finally clearing up the transaction I would simply require the elevators, mills, and grain buyers throughout the country to keep a record of the amount and grade of wheat purchased from each grower and then as soon as the loss on the surplus and the costs of operation had been ascertained I would pay the balance due in the form of a patronage dividend.

And while I am stating my opinion on this phase of the matter in very general terms, I have no doubt that it could be worked out—and thus the final windup of the whole matter would be that the farmer would receive a "ratio price" based on the all-commodity price, less his share of the loss on the surplus and costs of operation and the Government would not have lost a cent in the transaction.

Therefore why isn't the plan "workable"? And why can not the commission and the packers arrive at a similar arrangement on pork and beef? And why can not the millers and packers of the country adjust themselves to this kind of a program if they really have a desire to do so? In the meantime, our choice lies between trying to make the thing "workable," or sending agriculture to certain destruction. There is no other alternative!

Moreover, those who insist that this bill is not "workable" ought to get busy and bring forth some other measure that is, for certainly agriculture has a right to expect something more than a mere "dog in the manger" attitude from them. If they think the farmer's present cry for help is unwarranted—that actual conditions have been overdrawn—then let them have the courage to say so frankly. But if they do not desire to assume this attitude, if they do believe that something needs to be done, then let us remember the old saying that, "where there's a will, there's a way!"

The suggestion that the Government may under this bill invest "billions of dollars" in packing plants, warehouses, etc., is to me the purest claptrap. My personal view is that the commission should not invest a single dollar in such facilities and if there is any doubt on this score as the act now stands it should be amended and made "foolproof" in this respect—for why acquire such facilities when they are already in existence and when all that the owners have a right to expect, is fair compensation for their use?

AS TO "PRICE FIXING"

I am perfectly aware that this measure is being assaulted on the theory that it is "price fixing" and also that it seeks to "defy the law of supply and demand." But when a great manufacturing industry demands a tariff which shuts out foreign competition and when it then proceeds to collect a price in the home markets up even with the tariff wall which surrounds it—often selling for less in the foreign markets—in Heaven's name, what is this but "price fixing" and in such premises what becomes of the sacred law of supply and demand?

And likewise when the great labor unions through their organizations might demand and enforce the payment of stipulated wage scales, again what is this but "price fixing"—and what chance has the farmer who stands at the end of the line to escape these superimposed burdens which come down to him in the form of inflated prices for farm implements, building materials, clothing, dry goods, shoes, transportation rates, etc.? For he is the "Jones" who "pays the freight"—he is the fellow to whom everybody else "passes the buck" and who can not pass it on to anybody else.

Therefore what is the fairness of raising our hands in virtuous horror at the idea of "price fixing"? What is the fairness of delivering profound platitudes about the law of supply and demand—a sacred white ox that departed "to where the woodbine twineth" for lo, these many years? And when I say this I do not concede that the McNary-Haugen bill is a "price-fixing" measure as that term is generally understood. On the contrary, it merely seeks to establish a fair "price ratio" between certain great basic surplus farm commodities and the current cost of living which forms the inevitable basis of the farmer's production costs.

And again let me say that I am not pronouncing an indictment in these premises against the Fordney-McCumber Act nor against the wage scales of organized labor, regardless of what my views concerning them may be, were they under discussion on their merits. What I am trying to do is to show that through the exactions of these forces the farmer is confronted by a "condition and not a theory"—that while he himself is helplessly chained to the world-wide law of supply and demand, there is no such animal, so far as American industry and labor are concerned—and there isn't an intelligent or fair-minded student of economic conditions in this country who doesn't know that this is the simple truth.

As the sorely perplexed farmer realizes that the purchasing power of his dollar (as expressed in the fruits of his toil) has been knocked into a cocked hat, and when he thinks of the fact that it takes \$2 of his money to pay off an old debt, while industry and labor can still retire their obligations on an even basis—in these circumstances when supercritical gentlemen prattle about the law of supply and demand, let them not believe that they are fooling the farmer who knows perfectly well that he is getting the "hot end of the poker" and who is pretty apt to demand an accounting from those who continue to make him do it.

"WORKING ITSELF OUT"

This chatter that we should not seek to "defy the law of supply and demand" comes chiefly from the boards of trade and certain big grain exporters who pose as "experts" in these premises. Of course, the boards of trade don't want dealing in futures interfered with, for this is one of their chief sources of income. And even so certain eminent grain exporters don't want a commission to step in and perform functions which, under existing conditions, are a source of great profit to them—but if the time has come when Congress must make a

choice between these gentlemen and the preservation of American agriculture, should it find that choice very difficult?

These same critics who prattle about the inviolability of the law of supply, and demand say that the farmer is the victim of "natural causes" and that "everything will come out all right if we will only be patient," etc. And if Congress takes them at their word, it will do so at the peril of the whole Nation. For where is there a sane man who believes that either industry or labor will or can submit to a deflation during the next two or three years that will bring them down to a level with agriculture? And remember this is the issue—to assume that "everything will come out all right for the farmer" is predicated upon the idea that just as the peon and peasant farmers of the wide universe are fixing the price of American farm products at home and abroad, that in a like manner the American manufacturer and the American workman will consent to get down on an even basis of remuneration with the manufacturers and workmen of Germany, France, and England. And I believe you will agree with me that if such a suggestion were seriously made it would produce a riot in industrial and labor circles within 24 hours.

LIVING IN A FOOLS' PARADISE

Since the armistice was signed our cities have been living in a sort of fools' paradise—in other words, we have been speeding on the "gas" that we inherited from the World War period, during which time construction work of all kinds had largely ceased and also the rolling stock of our great railroad systems was so nearly shot to pieces that hundreds of millions of dollars had to be spent for its rehabilitation—and this isn't saying anything about the enormous amount of other repair work that had to be done. And thus things have been going along as merrily as a marriage bell, and we have paid little attention to the tragedy that is taking place out at the "crossroads" and which is becoming more serious with each passing day.

But during recent months there has been a perceptible slacking up in business circles, and there is every indication that we will soon "catch up with the hounds," if, in fact, we have not already done so—and the reason is that the American farmer is out of the game, as in truth he has been for the best part of the last four years. In other words, he is out on a "buyers' strike," not because he wants to be—not because he doesn't need billions of dollars' worth of new building materials, farm implements, fencing, etc., but because since the deflation following the war struck him his one thought has been to keep his farm from falling into the clutches of the sheriff, and therefore interest and taxes have had his first consideration.

Of course, the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill will somewhat increase the cost of the commodities it touches, such as bread, pork, beef, etc., and yet if the handlers of these commodities do not use this measure as a profiteering pretext, then that increase will not amount to enough to seriously affect a single family in the country, for our so-called "high cost of living" comes not from food costs but from the output of our mills and factories.

In the meantime the fact that the American Federation of Labor has sent some of its leading representatives to the Agricultural Committees to urge the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill should be a tremendous eye opener to every Member of Congress. And back of this action are three exceedingly pertinent reasons—first, having compelled the passage of the Adamson law during the war, labor knows that it has greatly benefited by specific congressional action, and this isn't saying anything about the favors it expects to continue to receive with reference to the matter of immigration; second, it knows that if it expects to continue to enforce its present exceedingly generous wage scales, that then the 40,000,000 people who reside on our farms must be placed in position to once more become aggressive buyers of merchandise; and, lastly, it realizes that if farmers continue to flock to our great industrial centers by the tens of thousands that the soup house will be the final answer and that this time is not far away.

EMBARRASSING TO A DEMOCRAT

And now I have no doubt that the average Democratic Member of Congress who is deeply grounded in the old idea of a "tariff for revenue only" will find some difficulty in reconciling himself to a measure which so strongly invokes the principle of protection—but, like the farmer, we are confronted by a "condition and not a theory" in these premises. In the past, or before the World War, no one believed more steadfastly in the historic position of our party on the tariff than I did—and in proof of this I wrote from beginning to end the last Democratic platform adopted in this State under the old delegate convention system (in the latter part of the Folk administration), and I doubt whether the party ever gave out an expression in Missouri that contained a more deliberate arraignment of the protective system.

But the World War has changed many things, and even if Democrats were in undisputed power in Congress to-day I doubt very much whether we would have the hardhood to place the country upon a purely "tariff for revenue only" basis—and I say this because with

our inflated wage scales I seriously question whether American industry is in position to hold its own against the low wage scales of Germany, France, England, and other foreign countries at this time. In other words, it is going to take time for both industry and labor to get down off the high horses they are riding, even should they honestly and earnestly strive to do so, and for the time being therefore it may be the part of practical wisdom to regard the Fordney-McCumber Act as more or less of a necessary evil. And by this I don't mean that it does not contain many iniquities which should be eliminated at the first opportunity.

And this makes the situation from the farmer's standpoint appear all the more alarming to me—the fact that if agriculture is to live the farmer must be provided with a dollar of as great purchasing power as the dollar of industry and labor (which is the basis of his production costs) and the deep-seated conviction that, considering the manufacturing profit margins and wage scales of Europe, American industry and labor will not and in fact can not place themselves on a level with our foreign competitors at this time. Therefore it brings us back to the starting point—namely, that if agriculture is to be preserved, then either the price of farm commodities must be raised or the wares and service of industry and labor must be brought down to a level with them—and the latter hope seems to me an idle dream for some years to come!

Therefore as a Democrat I would take the position that so long as industry and labor are beneficiaries of the protective system, that the farmer is entitled to his share of the spoils—and I would demand that if the Republicans think so, they make it more than an idle farce—that having given the farmer a tariff, they make it possible for him to collect it! And in these premises let me say that the McNary-Haugen bill is the "acid test," it is the greatest challenge to the sincerity of protectionists in the history of Congress!

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IS DYING

Never, in my humble opinion, has Congress been confronted (in times of peace) with a question more profoundly grave than the one that is involved in the McNary-Haugen bill. If the measure is defeated, there will be no loud outcry at the "crossroads"—for the "crossroads" has long since grown accustomed to being told that its pleas are "impractical" for one reason or another, and therefore with stoical resignation it will accept its fate, whatever it may be. But in the meantime the sheriffs' sales will multiply, country banks by the hundreds during the next two or three years will close their doors, and the steady stream from the farms to the towns and cities will continue—make no mistake on this score, for the rising and setting of the sun is not more certain!

And if Congress believes that we can safely run the gantlet—if our great captains of industry and our eminent bankers think they can keep our mills and factories in full-time operation and that the buying power of the 40,000,000 people who reside upon our farms is no longer necessary to this end—if they believe that our railroads can pay the present price of fuel, steel, and labor without hauling merchandise out to the "crossroads," as well as grain and livestock away from it—in short, if they believe that agriculture has ceased to be the great "basic industry" of the Nation and that it is no longer necessary in compelling favorable international trade balances, why, then perhaps the fate of the McNary-Haugen bill is of no great consequence! But let gentlemen make sure of their ground—let them be willing to accept the consequences if they have guessed wrongly.

And then there is another side to it. During recent years the tendency toward socialism and radicalism in our great centers of population has grown apace, and it is from these realms whence comes ever more insistently the demand that the Government shall operate the railroads and the coal mines and that the decisions of the Supreme Court shall be subject to congressional review—and unless laughter and the joy of contentment is brought back to the "crossroads," unless the deadly decay which is eating its way deeper and deeper into the heart of American agriculture can be arrested in the not distant future, then instead of our myriad farm homes continuing to be the great bulwark against this ever-increasing tide of radicalism which they have been through all the years of the past, let no one be surprised if farmers shall be found in increasing numbers among those who are striving with might and main to destroy our venerable institutions of government which have made the history of the Republic as wonderful as an Arabian Night's dream. Under normal conditions the farmer is a wholesome conservative, intensely proud of his country, and a firm believer in individual effort and responsibility—in fact the latter tendency is chiefly responsible for his present condition of helplessness. But the farmer is also human, and as he contemplates the contentment and comparative luxury of those who fix his living and production costs and who seem to have no great difficulty in obtaining the ear of Congress, who will blame him if he voices the pitiful plea of Shylock, "If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you prick us, do we not bleed?"

If the Republic of Washington and Lincoln is to remain anchored to its moorings in the years to come—if the sinister prophecy of Carlisle is not to be fulfilled—if in the future, as in the past, the farmer is to remain a wholesome "balance of power," who will say "Hands off" to those who would destroy the glorious handiwork of the fathers—then let Congress lose no time in directing its attention to the tragedy that is taking place out at the "crossroads," for, as certain as God reigns above, American agriculture is dying!

CONGRESSMAN RAINÉY'S OBJECTIONS

The files of old Egypt were not more numerous than the objections raised against the McNary-Haugen bill by Congressman HENRY T. RAINÉY, of Illinois, in a letter to S. H. Thompson, head of the Illinois Agriculture Association, and I shall therefore endeavor to answer only the more pertinent ones:

No. 1. "Will not the 'scrip' bring about an 'expansion in our currency' and increase our 'circulating medium without increasing our gold base'?"

Answer. The "scrip" should not affect our circulating medium in the slightest degree, for in substance it is nothing more than a "due bill" upon which a future dividend will be declared, and if there is any doubt on this score because of the present wording of the bill, it should be amended. Surely it is not intended that the "scrip" shall be "circulating medium."

No. 2. "Do you think farmers will be satisfied with 'scrip'?"

Answer. Well, in view of the fact that they will be just that much "ahead of the hounds"—that the "scrip" or whatever is decided on will pay them the difference between the "ratio price" and the world price, less the loss on the surplus and the commission's costs of operation—certainly they shouldn't raise any "kick" on this score.

No. 3. "Will it not make it necessary for the Government to slaughter food animals and to invest in packing plants, stockyards, etc., involving perhaps an "expenditure of billions of dollars in railroad switches, terminals, refrigerator cars, warehouses, etc., etc.?"

Answer. No. Why should the commission invest a single dollar in these facilities which are already in existence? All on earth the bill seeks to do is to require existing agencies to operate under the "ratio price." If the intention was to have the Government finance such facilities and to build up an enormous pay roll, I would be against it unqualifiedly.

No. 4. "Is it not time to keep the Government out of business as much as possible?"

Answer. You bet your life; and whenever you take it "out of business" in such premises as the Fordney-McCumber Act and with reference to tightening up the immigration laws, then perhaps farmers will not ask for legislation like the McNary-Haugen bill. But since this would be a horse of decidedly different color—since, in fact, Congress could possibly not safely do this at this time—in these circumstances hasn't the farmer a right to expect the Government to "go into business" as much for him as it already has for the other fellows?

No. 5. "Do you not think that in the end the farmer will become the greatest sufferer from its imposition, should it become a law?"

Answer. With the peasant and peon farmers of the world fixing his prices at home and abroad, how can it make the farmer a worse "sufferer" than he already is? And if a fair "ratio price" is enforced in the home markets, as I have already said, won't he be just that much "ahead of the hounds"?

No. 6. As to Mr. RAINÉY's reference to wool and cotton and how to apply the "ratio price" to meat products and the charge that it is only intended to help the wheat grower, I have already covered these points in my answer to Congressman ANDERSON's objections.

No. 7. "Isn't it time to ask what benefits farmers have received from the alleged remedial legislation demanded by the farm organizations, etc.?"

Answer. Well, the organizations have demanded very little specific legislation, and about all Congress has done is to expand credit facilities, and what the farmer wants and needs is not additional credit so much as prices that will enable him to pay debts and to buy sorely needed merchandise.

No. 8. "Has the farmer benefited by the protective tariff Congress has given him on practically everything he produces?"

Answer. Not so that you could notice it with an ordinary magnifying glass. On a commodity like wool, of which we only produce about half enough to supply our home needs, it "brings home the bacon," while on such surplus commodities as wheat it is a delusion and a snare; and all farmers, as well as most Members of Congress, know this.

No. 9. "I notice hogs are going up on the Chicago market. Is this due to the protective tariff, inasmuch as there is no protective tariff on hogs?"

Answer. No; the tariff has nothing to do with it. The heavy winter runs are over, and most likely the packers are "stiffening" the market so as to unload the hogs purchased at a low price and which are stored

away in their coolers, at a good profit. This is one way the big packer has of collecting a "ratio price" of his own.

No. 10. "Would it not be advisable (for farmers) to advocate a reduction in the tariff on all articles the farmer buys?"

Answer. Well, why not try it out on the dog? Why not put it up to the industries which only a few short moons ago insisted that the Fordney-McCumber Act was the only thing that could save them from destruction? Very likely they would say that to place them on the world price level, along with Germany, France, England, and other foreign countries, that this would put them out of business—and no doubt there would be much justice in this contention. But if this is true, then how can Congress expect the farmer to exist on the world-price level and carry protected industry and organized labor on his back to say nothing of enormously increased taxes?

No. 11. "How will the 'ratio price' be reflected back to the farmer through the local elevator?"

Answer. I would say that the local elevator would pay the farmer cash in hand such a part of the "ratio price" as would put the commission safe on the loss on the exportable surplus and its costs of operation, and then later on it could authorize the elevator to pay the remaining dividend when the season's business had been wound up.

No. 12. "Is there any authority in the bill by which the miller can be indemnified against possible loss?"

Answer. If the "ratio price" is applied to seasonal periods in the home markets, it will be a "lead-pipe cinch" for the miller, for then there will be no occasion to "hedge." As to export flour, this will have to be equalized on the world-price basis, just as export wheat itself; and it won't make any difference to the commission or to the farmer as to the form in which the surplus is gotten out of the country.

No. 13. "How many employees will there be?"

Answer. There ought not to be very many, if the law is applied so that existing private agencies can perform its functions.

No. 14. "Can you point to any method so far adopted by this Government in the matter of controlling food prices which has been successful?"

Answer. You bet! During the World War the Government fixed the price of wheat at \$2.26 f. o. b. Chicago, and it held it there, despite the fact that the price in Europe was as high as \$4.50 per bushel.

No. 15. "Is it not true that the only way to maintain a price is to have a buyer willing and able to take everything offered at the price specified?"

Answer. Under existing conditions the American consumer is buying the farmer's food commodities on the basis of the world-price level, while in turn the farmer's living and production costs are determined by our so-called "American living standards," which were created and which are being maintained by organized industry and labor, and the farmer has no choice except to "dance to the music." And under the McNary-Haugen bill the consumer would have to "dance to the music" also; he would have to pay the "ratio price," while the surplus would continue to be dumped onto the world market. If the farmer has nothing to say about the cost of merchandise, freight rates, etc., then why should the consumer have any greater immunity with reference to the price of farm commodities? Why shouldn't he be fair, and who has any right to assume that he doesn't want to be fair?

No. 16. "What is a Member of Congress to do when two agricultural organizations—equally important and equally interested—reach absolutely different conclusions?"

Answer. Except for some of the smaller units of the wheat growers, there is no appreciable disagreement over this matter—the Farmers' Union and the American Farm Bureau Federation and other of the leading farm organizations are for it—in fact never before have the farm organizations been in as complete agreement as they are in demanding the passage of this bill or a similar one that will accomplish its purpose.

No. 17. "Would not the McNary-Haugen bill put the Federal Government actively into the grain business?"

Answer. The only difference between what the Government would do for the farmer under this bill and what it has been doing for industry for years under the protective system is that it would make the tariff mean something for agriculture—after having given the farmer a tariff it would help him to collect it and it would do this without the loss of a penny! Therefore it is just as fair to say that the Government goes into the steel business when it gives steel the benefit of a tariff as that it is going into the grain business when it gives the wheat growers the benefit of a tariff—except that under this act it will go one step further and help the wheat grower to do what, in his present unorganized condition, he is not able to do for himself. Hence the real question is not whether the Government should take this extra step but whether the producers of wheat, pork, and beef really need this assistance! If they do, then why should the Government hesitate to make this assistance effective?

No. 18. "Do you not think the Russian experiment with its dead numbering over 7,000,000 ought to dissuade our people from proceeding in that direction?"

Answer. Good Lord—if it is half as bad as this, by all means kill the bill!

OBJECTIONS OF MR. ROBERTS, VICE PRESIDENT NATIONAL CITY BANK, NEW YORK CITY

In an able address delivered at the University of Ohio on February 6, 1924, Mr. Roberts made certain observations which may come to the attention of Members of Congress, and therefore I offer the following comment:

No. 1. Speaking against governmental "price fixing," Mr. Roberts among other things said: "There is no remedy for the situation except by reducing the production of wheat. Any form of Government aid, such as price fixing above the market, which has the effect of inducing farmers to continue wheat growing on the present scale would be a mistake, because wheat growing on this scale is not needed."

Answer. The farmer isn't kicking on having to accept the world price on the yearly surplus of 150,000,000 or 200,000,000 bushels—what he is sore about and what he has a right to be sore about is having to accept the world price on the 600,000,000 bushels that are ordinarily required to supply bread for the consumers of the United States. And with the uncertainty of acre yields because of flood, drought, winter killing, and insect pestilence how is the farmer to plan a wheat crop that will exactly meet our national needs?

But remember that under the McNary-Haugen bill the "ratio price" will merely apply to domestic consumption and from this price will be deducted the loss on the surplus and the commission's costs of operation. Therefore the surplus is not an issue; the issue is, is the American wheat grower entitled to a fair price for the bread he supplies to American consumers?

No. 2. "The remedy is simply for some of them to stop growing wheat and go into something else, or for them as a whole to scale down the production of wheat to such an extent as will bring the situation back into balance."

Answer. With 6,500,000 farmers scattered between the two oceans such teamwork would be extremely difficult, considering the farmer's present unorganized condition, for unlike the manufacturer the farmer can not regulate his production with exact precision. But for argument's sake, let us assume that such regulation had been practiced with reference to the 1924 crop and that we would produce a round 600,000,000 bushels, or just enough to supply our home demands; if this were true, let us suppose next that the spokesmen of the wheat growers would go to Congress and say, "You have extended protection to industry and labor with a generous hand, and turn about is fair play, therefore we ask that you give us a tariff that will make No. 2 wheat sell at \$1.75 per bushel f. o. b. Chicago"—and could Congress consistently deny their plea and wouldn't this be "price fixing" with much greater vengeance than the McNary-Haugen bill has in view? The point I want to drive home is that if the wheat grower was in position to do what Mr. Roberts implies he should do, then he would ask Congress to "deliver"—to give him his "pound of flesh," and it could not consistently deny him!

But because the farmer is helpless; because he is forced to come to Congress with a plea rather than a demand; this is why he is told in substance, "We are sorry for you—we know you are in a mighty tight place—but we can't do anything for you."

Also it may be said if Mr. Roberts's advice is sound for the wheat grower, then it must be equally sound for the hog and cattle raiser, for the latter find themselves in an even worse position; and if these tens of thousands of farmers are to quit raising wheat, hogs, and cattle, then what are they to do? Would Mr. Roberts suggest that they take to raising peanuts, onions, and cauliflower? Well, these things don't grow very well in the Corn Belt, and anyway the country is already surfeited with them. Far be it from me to become facetious in these grave premises, and yet if out of sheer desperation these farmers go to raising h— instead, let Mr. Roberts and certain gentlemen who dread the "ides of November" not be surprised! And in these premises I respectfully remind them on one MAGNUS JOHNSON!

No. 3. "If the Government is to guarantee a price for wheat, the natural question is—why not for copper, cotton goods, and everything else?"

Answer. Well, if Mr. Roberts doesn't think as the song had it some years back that "Everybody's doing it," let him get hold of the Fordney-McCumber Act and also take a squint at our immigration laws—and last but by no means least, let him contemplate the present wage scales of organized labor.

No. 4. "One might think from much that is written on the subject that there was danger of general desertion of the farms unless artificial means of some kind were adopted to improve the returns, etc."

Answer. And this is exactly what is taking place at this very moment. As I have said elsewhere, thousands of farms here in Missouri

have been deserted and thousands of others will be sold by the sheriff before aid can possibly come. Therefore if Mr. Roberts means that this fact might cause him to view matters in a more serious light, his change of front is in order.

No. 5. "The Government could not for long continue to buy and store such commodities upon terms that would encourage their production above the rate of consumption."

Answer. The farmer doesn't ask this. All the McNary-Haugen bill seeks to do is to maintain a "ratio price" in the home markets, letting the surplus bring what it will in the world markets, meanwhile charging the loss and costs of operation up against the said "ratio price"—and the only "buying and storing" the commission would have to do would be through the process of getting the surplus out of the country and in determining the amount of such surplus.

No. 6. "Finally, if the plan was workable at all, it would divide society into warring factions, emphasizing conflicting interests instead of mutual interests. It would be worse than socialism, for it would be syndicalism, the end of individual liberty and of reward for individual efficiency."

Answer. If it is as bad as all this, then why doesn't the protective system, which can not be applied with scientific precision or equity, "divide society into warring factions"? And even so when through organized action our bricklayers and plasterers demand and receive two or three times as much per day as tens of thousands of school-teachers, clerks, bookkeepers, etc., why doesn't this "divide society into warring factions"? What eminent business men like Mr. Roberts and the Members of Congress must do and do quickly is to get themselves "located" on agriculture: If it has ceased to be the Nation's great "basic industry"—if we can afford to let it shift for itself and still keep our mills and factories going and our railroads running, why, then all right. But let them make sure that they know what they are doing in these premises!

OBJECTIONS OF MR. ANDERSON

I now propose to briefly answer the criticisms of Congressman SYDNEY ANDERSON, which have been widely published:

First, Mr. ANDERSON says that the bill applies to flour, corn, cotton, wool, swine, cattle, sheep, or any of the food products of these commodities, and then he doubts its practicability in these premises.

As to flour that is exported, undoubtedly the world price of wheat will have to be taken into consideration in behalf of the miller—and there is no reason why the difference between the domestic and world price can not be practically applied to export flour for the miller's protection. As to wool, he is correct when he says that we are an importing rather than an exporting Nation and this item should therefore be stricken from the bill, for the present wool tariff is 100 per cent effective. As to cotton, the future alone can tell whether an emergency should be declared with reference to it and therefore why not let the future decide? In any event, why not leave the door open if the cotton grower should need assistance? Manifestly any bill of this kind must apply to all the great staples of agriculture, should they be menaced in the world markets. With reference to corn, I am again inclined to agree with Mr. ANDERSON not only because our corn exports are negligible but also the price of hogs and cattle very largely regulate the price of corn and would do so (in my opinion) almost absolutely under the operation of this measure. I do not, however, agree with him with reference to rye, oats, and barley, which are merely incidental and related crops.

Mr. ANDERSON next concludes that the bill is intended only to pull the wheat grower out of the hole and that the inclusion of hogs and cattle is for "political purposes only"—and if I thought so I would be against it. That its application to hogs and cattle will be more difficult than on wheat is undoubtedly true—and yet why should a commission made up of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and of the Treasury, together with the other able gentlemen whom it is assumed the President will appoint—why should not such a commission be able to reach a workable understanding with the meat packers of the country that will preserve a "ratio price" in these premises? At least why not try? In any case, we can not make things worse than they already are—for the farmer can not continue to supply the Nation's meat at a tremendous loss to himself, and therefore the price must be raised by one means or another if the meat-producing industry is to live!

Next, Mr. ANDERSON concludes that to establish a "ratio price" between wheat (or any other farm commodity) and the all-commodity price is a "fundamental weakness"—that the "appropriate price for agricultural commodities depends upon economic factors, etc." and of course this is the well-known red herring about the law of supply and demand—and the simple answer which I have already given is that the farmer can not continue to pay tribute to organized industry and labor according to their standards of value and then permit the

peasant and peon farmers of the world to fix a price on the products of his toil.

This is the foundation of this bill and it can not be waived aside by producing a smoke screen of mere technicalities!

As to the charge that the operation of this measure will make the all-commodities price go up, I do not think so to any appreciable extent—first, because a fair "ratio price" chiefly applied to wheat and meats will not perceptibly increase the "cost of living," and, second, the fact that prominent labor leaders are championing the McNary-Haugen bill without "saving their exceptions" would indicate that they are willing to "stand the raise"—that they prefer to see the farmer get back in the buying game, rather than to welcome the coming of soup houses.

As to his conclusion that a "ratio price" is "absolutely unsound" and "unworkable," why is this true? Has not the farmer the right to receive a dollar for his toll of as great purchasing power as the dollar of those who determine his production costs and whom he therefore helps to sustain, and is not this the equilibrium which the "ratio price" seeks to establish? As to Mr. ANDERSON's suggestion that the "ratio price" must be determined by anchoring it to certain great terminal markets, in this he is, of course correct; but why not assume that the commission and the handlers of the commodities in question will be able to arrive at a "workable" understanding in this respect?

As to his statement that the commission would have to ascertain production "a year in advance," this would not be possible nor would it be necessary. With reference to wheat, once the crop is made we will know measurably where we stand, whether the exportable surplus will be around 200,000,000 or 150,000,000 bushels; therefore if the commission removes a safe quantity from the domestic markets through export channels, why should it not warehouse for the time being a sufficient additional quantity until it knows where it stands, and why should it not, through the aid of the great meat packers, pursue the same tactics with reference to pork and beef? I do not pose as an authority in these premises, but why assume in advance that practical problems of marketing are impossible of solution? The statement that we have different grades of wheat, hogs, and cattle is of course true, but why should not the "ratio price" be applied accordingly?

As to Mr. ANDERSON's objections to the issuance of "scrip," this I have already covered elsewhere. As to his statement that the purpose of the McNary-Haugen bill is as "old as history itself" this also is partially true, and the reason it is, true is because for many years under the protective system the great industries of this country have made the farmer stand for this principle whether he liked it or not, and even so our workingmen have been and are at this hour protected against the so-called "pauper labor of Europe." Therefore, can anybody blame the farmer for also hankering after a little of the "pie"?

And, finally, his suggestion that it will lead to "overproduction"; in the first place every intelligent farmer will realize that this would "kill the goose that laid the golden egg," and also the commission is empowered to withdraw its support whenever the menace of overproduction becomes manifest with reference to any given commodity. In the meantime, to oppose the bill on this score is a good deal like advising a starving man against eating on the theory that he might die of indigestion!

Trusting that you will consider these views for what they may be worth, I am, with best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM HIRTH,

Publisher The Missouri Farmer, Columbia, Mo.

RECESS

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now recess until 8 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with the order previously made, stood in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired at 8 o'clock p. m., the House was called to order by Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa, as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

The Doorkeeper closed the doors and the Sergeant at Arms was directed to bring in the absentees. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Aldrich | Fenn | Lineberger | Scott |
| Anderson | Fish | Little | Sears, Nebr. |
| Andrew | Fisher | McFadden | Shreve |
| Anthony | Fleetwood | McKenzie | Simmons |
| Bacharach | Frear | McLaughlin, Nebr. | Sites |
| Beedy | Fredericks | MacGregor | Smithwick |
| Begg | Freeman | MacLafferty | Snell |
| Bell | Frothingham | Madden | Snyder |
| Berger | Fuller | Magee, Pa. | Spearing |
| Bixler | Gallivan | Mapes | Sproul, Ill. |
| Black, Tex. | Garrett, Tenn. | Martin | Stalker |
| Black, N. Y. | Garrett, Tex. | Mead | Stegall |
| Bland | Gasque | Merritt | Stedman |
| Bloom | Geran | Michaelson | Stengle |
| Boles | Gibson | Miller, Ill. | Stevenson |
| Bowling | Gifford | Milligan | Strong, Kans. |
| Boylan | Glatfelter | Mills | Strong, Pa. |
| Brand, Ga. | Goldsborough | Mooney | Sullivan |
| Britten | Graham, Pa. | Moore, Ill. | Swoope |
| Browne, N. J. | Graham, Ill. | Morin | Tague |
| Browne, Wis. | Greene, Mass. | Mudd | Taylor, Colo. |
| Brumm | Griest | Nelson, Wis. | Temple |
| Buckley | Griffin | Newton, Mo. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Burdick | Hawes | Nolan | Thomas, Ky. |
| Butler | Hawley | O'Brien | Tillman |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Hayden | O'Connell, N. Y. | Tilson |
| Cable | Hoch | O'Connor, N. Y. | Tinkham |
| Campbell | Hooker | O'Sullivan | Tucker |
| Carew | Howard, Okla. | Oldfield | Tydings |
| Celler | Huddleston | Oliver, N. Y. | Underhill |
| Chndblom | Hudspeth | Paige | Upshaw |
| Clark, Fla. | Hull, Tenn. | Park, Ga. | Vare |
| Connery | Hull, William E. | Parker | Vinson, Ga. |
| Connolly, Pa. | Humphreys | Parks, Ark. | Ward, N. Y. |
| Cooper, Wis. | Jeffers | Patterson | Ward, N. C. |
| Cooper, Ohio | Jost | Peavey | Wason |
| Corning | Kahn | Perkins | Watson |
| Cramton | Keller | Periman | Weller |
| Crisp | Kelly | Phillips | Welsh |
| Cummings | Kendall | Prall | White, Me. |
| Curry | Kerr | Quayle | Williams, Tex. |
| Darrow | Kless | Quin | Williams, Ill. |
| Davey | Kopp | Rainey | Williamson |
| Dempsey | Kunz | Ransley | Wilson, Miss. |
| Dickstein | LaGuardia | Rayburn | Winter |
| Dominick | Lampert | Rece | Wolf |
| Drane | Langley | Beed, W. Va. | Wood |
| Drewry | Larson, Minn. | Rogers, Mass. | Wursbach |
| Driver | Leatherwood | Rogers, N. H. | Wyant |
| Dyer | Lee, Ga. | Rosenbloom | Yates |
| Edmonds | Leibach | Salmon | Zihlman |
| Evans, Mont. | Lilly | Sanders, N. Y. | |
| Favrot | Lindsay | Schafer | |

During the roll call the following occurred:

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman can not interrupt the roll call with a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does it relate to the roll call?

Mr. ASWELL. It does.

Mr. BLANTON. All the precedents are against the right to interrupt the roll call with a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. There is no roll being called now.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That motion is not now in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Not until the result of the call has been announced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not in order until it is ascertained whether there is a quorum present.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that until the result of the roll has been announced nothing is in order.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the Chair hold that a motion to adjourn is not always in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no business in order until the roll call has been completed and the result is announced.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I think the Chair had better consult the parliamentarian on that proposition. If that be true, the House could never adjourn as long as the Clerk who is tallying the vote is busy.

The call was completed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One hundred and eighty-three Members have answered to their names—not a quorum.

[Subsequently 36 Members appeared and answered to their names.]

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. SANDERS of Indiana and Mr. KINCHELOE as tellers.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were 12 yeas and 115 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present and object to the vote.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I demand the yeas and nays. The gentleman from Texas can not make the point of no quorum, because it does not take a quorum to adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 2, nays 181, not voting 250, as follows:

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | | YEAS—2 | |
| Doughton | Kincheloe | | |
| | | NAYS—181 | |
| Abernethy | Elliott | Lozier | Rouse |
| Ackerman | Evans, Iowa | Luce | Rube |
| Allen | Faust | Lyon | Sanders, Ind. |
| Allgood | Fitzgerald | McClintic | Sanders, Tex. |
| Almon | Foster | McDuffie | Sandlin |
| Arnold | French | McKeown | Schall |
| Aswell | Fulmer | McLaughlin, Mich. | Schneider |
| Ayres | Funk | McLeod | Sears, Fla. |
| Bankhead | Garber | McNulty | Seger |
| Barbour | Gardner, Ind. | McReynolds | Shallenberger |
| Beck | Garner, Tex. | McSweeney | Sherwood |
| Beers | Gilbert | Magee, N. Y. | Sinclair |
| Blanton | Green, Iowa | Major, Ill. | Sinott |
| Bloom | Greenwood | Major, Mo. | Smith |
| Box | Hadley | Manlove | Spinks |
| Boyce | Hammer | Michener | Sproul, Kans. |
| Brand, Ohio | Hardy | Miller, Wash. | Summers, Wash. |
| Browning | Harrison | Minahan | Sumners, Tex. |
| Buchanan | Haugen | Moore, Ga. | Swank |
| Burness | Hersey | Moore, Ohio | Sweet |
| Busby | Hickey | Moore, Va. | Swing |
| Byrnes, Tenn. | Hill, Ala. | Moore, Ind. | Taber |
| Canfield | Hill, Wash. | Morehead | Taylor, W. Va. |
| Cannon | Holaday | Morris | Thatcher |
| Carter | Howard, Nebr. | Morrow | Thompson |
| Casey | Hull, Iowa | Nelson, Me. | Timberlake |
| Christopherson | Hull, Morton D. | Newton, Minn. | Underwood |
| Clague | Jacobstein | O'Connell, R. I. | Valle |
| Clancy | Johnson, S. Dak. | O'Connor, La. | Vincent, Mich. |
| Clarke, N. Y. | Johnson, Tex. | Oliver, Ala. | Vinson, Ky. |
| Clary | Johnson, Wash. | Peery | Voigt |
| Cole, Iowa | Johnson, W. Va. | Pou | Wainwright |
| Cole, Ohio | Jones | Ragon | Watkins |
| Collier | Kearns | Rainey | Weaver |
| Colton | Kent | Raker | Wefald |
| Croll | Keteham | Ramseyer | Wertz |
| Crosser | Kindred | Rankin | White, Kans. |
| Cullen | King | Reed, Ark. | Williams, Mich. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kvale | Reed, N. Y. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Deal | Lankford | Reid, Ill. | Wilson, La. |
| Demison | Larsen, Ga. | Richards | Wingo |
| Dickinson, Iowa | Lazaro | Roach | Woodrum |
| Dickinson, Mo. | Lea, Calif. | Robinson, Iowa | Wright |
| Dowell | Leavitt | Robson, Ky. | |
| Doyle | Longworth | Romjue | |
| Eagan | Lowrey | | |

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| NOT VOTING—250 | | | |
| Aldrich | Crisp | Hastings | McSwain |
| Anderson | Crowther | Hawes | MacGregor |
| Andrew | Cummings | Hawley | MacLafferty |
| Anthony | Curry | Hayden | Madden |
| Bacharach | Dallinger | Hill, Md. | Magee, Pa. |
| Bacon | Darrow | Hoch | Mansfield |
| Barkeley | Davey | Hooker | Mapes |
| Beedy | Davis, Minn. | Howard, Okla. | Martin |
| Begg | Dempsey | Huddleston | Mead |
| Bell | Dickstein | Hudson | Merritt |
| Berger | Dominick | Hudspeth | Michaelson |
| Bixler | Drane | Hull, William E. | Miller, Ill. |
| Black, N. Y. | Drewry | Hull, Tenn. | Milligan |
| Black, Tex. | Driver | Humphreys | Mills |
| Bland | Dyer | James | Montague |
| Boles | Edmonds | Jeffers | Mooney |
| Bowling | Evans, Mont. | Johnson, Ky. | Moore, Ill. |
| Boylan | Fairchild | Jost | Morin |
| Brand, Ga. | Fairfield | Kahn | Mudd |
| Briggs | Favrot | Keller | Murphy |
| Britten | Fenn | Kelly | Nelson, Wis. |
| Browne, N. J. | Fish | Kendall | Newton, Mo. |
| Brumm | Fisher | Kerr | Nolan |
| Buckley | Fleetwood | Kless | O'Brien |
| Bulwinkle | Frear | Knutson | O'Connell, N. Y. |
| Burdick | Fredericks | Kopp | O'Connor, N. Y. |
| Burton | Free | Kunz | O'Sullivan |
| Butler | Freeman | Kurtz | Oldfield |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Frothingham | LaGuardia | Oliver, N. Y. |
| Cable | Fulbright | Lampert | Paige |
| Campbell | Fuller | Langley | Park, Ga. |
| Carew | Gallivan | Lanham | Parker |
| Celler | Garrett, Tenn. | Larson, Minn. | Parks, Ark. |
| Chndblom | Garrett, Tex. | Leatherwood | Patterson |
| Chndblom | Gasque | Lee, Ga. | Peavey |
| Clark, Fla. | Geran | Leibach | Perkins |
| Collins | Gibson | Lilly | Periman |
| Connally, Tex. | Gifford | Lindsay | Phillips |
| Connery | Glatfelter | Lineberger | Porter |
| Connolly, Pa. | Goldsborough | Linthicum | Prall |
| Cook | Graham, Ill. | Little | Purnell |
| Cooper, Ohio | Graham, Pa. | Logan | Quayle |
| Cooper, Wis. | Greene, Mass. | McFadden | Quin |
| Corning | Griest | McKenzie | Ransley |
| Cramton | Griffin | McLaughlin, Nebr. | Rathbone |

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|
| Rayburn | Spearing | Tillman | Welsh |
| Reece | Sprout, III. | Tilson | White, Me. |
| Reed, W. Va. | Stalker | Tinkham | Williams, Ill. |
| Rogers, Mass. | Stagall | Tincher | Williams, Tex. |
| Rogers, N. H. | Stedman | Treadway | Williamson |
| Rosenbloom | Stengle | Tucker | Wilson, Miss. |
| Sabath | Stephens | Tydings | Winslow |
| Salmon | Stevenson | Underhill | Winter |
| Sanders, N. Y. | Strong, Kans. | Upshaw | Wolf |
| Schafer | Strong, Pa. | Vare | Wood |
| Scott | Sullivan | Vestal | Woodruff |
| Sears, Nebr. | Swoope | Vinson, Ga. | Wurzbach |
| Shreve | Tague | Ward, N. Y. | Wyant |
| Simmons | Taylor, Colo. | Ward, N. C. | Yates |
| Sites | Taylor, Tenn. | Wason | Young |
| Smithwick | Temple | Watres | Zihlman |
| Snell | Thomas, Ky. | Watson | |
| Snyder | Thomas, Okla. | Weller | |

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. McLaughlin of Nebraska with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.
Mr. Paige with Mr. Jeffers.
Mr. Ransley with Mr. Logan.
Mr. Madden with Mr. McSwain.
Mr. Parker with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
Mr. Mapes with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Purnell with Mr. O'Connell of New York.
Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jost.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Mooney.
Mr. Reece with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Phillips with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Mead.
Mr. Rogers of Massachusetts with Mr. Oldfield.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Lanham.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Milligan.
Mr. Shreve with Mr. O'Sullivan.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
Mr. Snell with Mr. Montague.
Mr. Mudd with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Favrot with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Dyer with Mr. Weller.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Evans of Montana.
Mr. Fleetwood with Mr. Drane.
Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Hill of Maryland with Mr. Garrett of Tennessee.
Mr. Griest with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
Mr. Frear with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Kahn with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Graham of Illinois with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Free with Mr. Glatfelter.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. Driver.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Gasque.
Mr. Lampert with Mr. Hawes.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Fulbright.
Mr. Hudson with Mr. Hooker.
Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Goran.
Mr. McFadden with Mr. Gallivan.
Mr. Little with Mr. Hayden.
Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Humphreys.
Mr. MacLafferty with Mr. Garrett of Texas.
Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Hudspeth.
Mr. Sears of Nebraska with Mr. Park of Georgia.
Mr. Taylor of Tennessee with Mr. Quayle.
Mr. Vare with Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire.
Mr. Stalker with Mr. Parks of Arkansas.
Mr. Ward of New York with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Temple with Mr. Quin.
Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Prall.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Salmon.
Mr. Wason with Mr. Sites.
Mr. Winter with Mr. Rayburn.
Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Smithwick.
Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Tague.
Mr. Tilson with Mr. Williams of Texas.
Mr. Watres with Mr. Spearing.
Mr. Swoope with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Stagall.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Vinson of Georgia.
Mr. Watson with Mr. Steadman.
Mr. Vestal with Mr. Wolf.
Mr. Welsh with Mr. Upshaw.
Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Stengle.
Mr. Winslow with Mr. Tydings.
Mr. Cable with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Carew.
Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina.
Mr. Chindblom with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Dallinger with Mr. Black of Texas.
Mr. Andrew with Mr. Davey.
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Bacon with Mr. Bowling.
Mr. Anthony with Mr. Connally of Texas.
Mr. Cramton with Mr. Black of New York.
Mr. Curry with Mr. Cook.
Mr. Begg with Mr. Browne of New Jersey.
Mr. Darrow with Mr. Crisp.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Connery.
Mr. Bixler with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Simmons with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Penn with Mr. Boylan.
Mr. Boies with Mr. Corning.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Fish with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Brand of Georgia.

Before the result was announced, the following occurred:

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a parliamentary inquiry is out of order during a roll call.

Mr. ASWELL. The roll call is ended, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is well

taken until the summary is made and the result is announced.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense

with further proceedings under the call, and on that I demand

tellers.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order

that that motion of the gentleman from Indiana is out of order.

You can not move to dispense with further proceedings under

the call when the call develops the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Oh, the gentleman is in error

about that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the ruling just pre-

sented to the Chair the Chair finds that it is permissible to

make that motion, and the point of order is overruled. The

question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to

dispense with further proceedings under the call, and on that

he demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. SANDERS

of Indiana and Mr. ASWELL to act as tellers.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of dispensing

with further proceedings under the call, and I am not demand-

ing a count.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will then ask the

gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] to act as teller.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana and Mr. KINCHELOE took their

places as tellers.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 4, noes 73.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that

under the present situation, when the House has four different

times found itself without a quorum and is still attempting to

do business, there is just one of two things to do—we have

either to get after the Members who are absent or adjourn,

and that has been held by every Speaker who has sat in this

House for 52 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rulings this is an

incidental motion.

Mr. SHALENERBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to lead the

construction of Rule XV:

The call of the House is ended by a motion "to dispense with

further proceedings under the call," which may be agreed to by less

than a quorum as well as by a quorum—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that

there is no quorum present.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and

nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair overrules the point

of order of the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from

Ohio demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a preferential

motion. I move to send for the absent Members, it having de-

veloped there is no quorum.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point

of order that that is not in order. I make the point of order

that the motion of the gentleman is not in order during a

division.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the division is not com-

plete. I am asking to complete the division by calling for the

yeas and nays.

Mr. WINGO. But I was demanding recognition at the time

the gentleman made his motion and I was demanding recogni-

tion when the Chair recognized the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, have I been recog-

nized? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What is the point of order of

the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I demanded recognition for the

purpose of making a privileged motion. I did that even before

the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] demanded the yeas

and nays, and my motion is plainly a privileged motion. The

House has found itself without a quorum and we have ex-

hausted every parliamentary expediency to get Members here

except to send for the absent Members. There is no excuse

for this House acting like children. We have important busi-

ness. Why not bring the absentees in?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Why do not you tell them that

the administration does not want any agricultural legislation?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the motion which the gentleman from Arkansas desires to make is a preferential motion as against the motion that was made to dispense with further proceedings under the call, but the motion was made to dispense with further proceedings under the call and the gentleman was not demanding recognition for the purpose of making the motion at that time. That motion having been made, and tellers having been demanded and ordered, the House having divided, and the yeas and nays being demanded, the gentleman from Arkansas can not now interrupt a division, and the vote on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call by saying that he has a preferential motion, even though it would have been preferential had he offered it at the same time that the motion to dispense was made.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, Mr. Speaker, my very point of order is that the Chair failed to recognize me when I was demanding recognition for something which was preferential over that of the motion of the gentleman who was recognized.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That is after the motion was made.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, no; it was before the motion was made.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if he still insists on the yeas and nays?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I ask for the yeas and nays in order to complete the division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Arkansas and sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Indiana. All those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. Evidently a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 7, nays 181, not voting 245, as follows:

YEAS—7

| | | | |
|---------|---------|---------------|--------|
| Fulmer | Lowrey | Newton, Minn. | Wefald |
| Holaday | McSwain | Sanders, Ind. | |

NAYS—181

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Dowell | Lea, Calif. | Sanders, Tex. |
| Ackerman | Doyle | Leavitt | Sandlin |
| Allen | Eagan | Logan | Schall |
| Allgood | Elliott | Longworth | Schneider |
| Almon | Evans, Iowa | Lozier | Sears, Fla. |
| Arnold | Faust | Luce | Seeger |
| Aswell | Fitzgerald | McClintic | Shallenberger |
| Ayres | Foster | McDuffie | Sherwood |
| Barbour | French | McKeown | Sinclair |
| Barkley | Funk | McLaughlin, Mich. | Sinnett |
| Beck | Garber | McLeod | Smith |
| Beers | Gardner, Ind. | McNulty | Speaks |
| Blanton | Garner, Tex. | McKeynolds | Summers, Wash. |
| Bloom | Gilbert | McSweeney | Summers, Tex. |
| Box | Green, Iowa | Major, Ill. | Swank |
| Boyce | Greenwood | Major, Mo. | Sweet |
| Brand, Ohio | Hadley | Manlove | Swing |
| Browning | Hammer | Michener | Taber |
| Buchanan | Hardy | Miller, Wash. | Taylor, Tenn. |
| Bulwinkle | Harrison | Minahan | Taylor, W. Va. |
| Burtness | Hastings | Moore, Ga. | Thatcher |
| Busby | Haugen | Moore, Ohio | Thompson |
| Byrnes, Tenn. | Hersey | Moore, Va. | Timberlake |
| Canfield | Hickey | Morehead | Treadway |
| Cannon | Hill, Ala. | Morgan | Underwood |
| Carter | Hill, Wash. | Morris | Valle |
| Casey | Howard, Nebr. | Morrow | Vestal |
| Christopherson | Hudson | Nelson, Me. | Vincent, Mich. |
| Clague | Hull, Iowa | O'Connell, R. I. | Vinson, Ky. |
| Clancy | Hull, Morton D. | O'Connor, La. | Voigt |
| Clarke, N. Y. | Jacobstein | Oliver, Ala. | Wainwright |
| Cleary | Johnson, Tex. | Peery | Watkins |
| Cole, Iowa | Johnson, Wash. | Pou | Watres |
| Cole, Ohio | Johnson, W. Va. | Ragon | Weaver |
| Collier | Jones | Raker | Wertz |
| Colton | Kent | Ramseyer | White, Kans. |
| Croll | Ketcham | Rankin | Wilson, Ind. |
| Crosser | Kincheloe | Reed, Ark. | Wilson, La. |
| Cullen | Kindred | Reed, N. Y. | Wingo |
| Dallinger | King | Reid, Ill. | Woodruff |
| Davis, Tenn. | Knutson | Roach | Woodrum |
| Deal | Kopp | Robinson, Iowa | Wright |
| Denison | Kvale | Robison, Ky. | Young |
| Dickinson, Iowa | Lankford | Romjue | |
| Dickinson, Mo. | Larsen, Ga. | Rouse | |
| Doughton | Lazaro | Rubey | |

NOT VOTING—245

| | | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Aldrich | Bland | Byrnes, S. C. | Corning |
| Anderson | Boles | Cable | Cramton |
| Andrew | Bowling | Campbell | Crisp |
| Anthony | Boylan | Carew | Crowther |
| Bacharach | Brand, Ga. | Celler | Cummings |
| Bacon | Briggs | Chindblom | Curry |
| Bankhead | Britten | Clark, Fla. | Darrow |
| Beedy | Browne, N. J. | Collins | Davey |
| Begg | Browne, Wis. | Connally, Tex. | Davis, Minn. |
| Bell | Brumm | Connery | Dempsey |
| Berger | Buckley | Connolly, Pa. | Dickstein |
| Bixler | Burdick | Cook | Dominick |
| Black, N. Y. | Burton | Cooper, Ohio | Drane |
| Black, Tex. | Butler | Cooper, Wis. | Drewry |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Driver | Jest | Nelson, Wis. | Stalker |
| Dyer | Kahn | Newton, Mo. | Stegall |
| Edmonds | Kearns | Nolan | Stedman |
| Evans, Mont. | Keller | O'Brien | Stengle |
| Fairchild | Kelly | O'Connell, N. Y. | Stephens |
| Fairfield | Kendall | O'Connor, N. Y. | Stevenson |
| Favrot | Kerr | O'Sullivan | Strong, Kans. |
| Fenn | Kless | Oldfield | Strong, Pa. |
| Fish | Kunz | Oliver, N. Y. | Sullivan |
| Fisher | Kurtz | Paige | Swoope |
| Fleetwood | LaGuardia | Park, Ga. | Tague |
| Frear | Lampert | Parker | Taylor, Colo. |
| Fredericks | Langley | Parks, Ark. | Temple |
| Free | Lanham | Patterson | Thomas, Ky. |
| Freeman | Larson, Minn. | Peavey | Thomas, Okla. |
| Frothingham | Leatherwood | Perkins | Tillman |
| Fulbright | Lee, Ga. | Perlman | Tilson |
| Fuller | Lehback | Phillips | Tincher |
| Gallivan | Lilly | Porter | Tinkham |
| Garrett, Tenn. | Lindsay | Prall | Tucker |
| Garrett, Tex. | Lineberger | Purnell | Tydings |
| Gasque | Linthicum | Quayle | Underhill |
| Geran | Little | Quin | Uphav |
| Gibson | Lyon | Rainey | Vare |
| Gifford | McFadden | Ransley | Vinson, Ga. |
| Glatfelter | McKenzie | Rathbone | Ward, N. Y. |
| Goldsborough | McLaughlin, Nebr. | Rayburn | Ward, N. C. |
| Graham, Ill. | MacGregor | Reece | Wason |
| Graham, Pa. | MacLafferty | Reed, W. Va. | Watson |
| Greene, Mass. | Madden | Richards | Weller |
| Griest | Magee, N. Y. | Rogers, Mass. | Welsh |
| Griffin | Magee, Pa. | Rogers, N. H. | White, Me. |
| Hawes | Mansfield | Rosenbloom | Williams, Ill. |
| Hawley | Mapes | Sobath | Williams, Mich. |
| Hayden | Martin | Salmon | Williams, Tex. |
| Hill, Md. | Mead | Sanders, N. Y. | Williamson |
| Hoch | Merritt | Schafer | Wilson, Miss. |
| Hooker | Michaelson | Scott | Winslow |
| Howard, Okla. | Miller, Ill. | Sears, Nebr. | Winter |
| Huddlestone | Milligan | Shreve | Wolf |
| Hudspeth | Mills | Simmons | Wood |
| Hull, William E. | Montague | Sites | Wurzbach |
| Hull, Tenn. | Mooney | Smithwick | Wyant |
| Humphreys | Moore, Ill. | Snell | Yates |
| James | Moore, Ind. | Snyder | Zihlman |
| Jeffers | Morin | Spearing | |
| Johnson, Ky. | Mudd | Sproul, Ill. | |
| Johnson, S. Dak. | Murphy | Sproul, Kans. | |

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 7 and the nays are 181, and the House refuses to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to notify and to send for and arrest absent Members in order to secure and retain their attendance, and that for that purpose the Speaker pro tempore issue his warrants, and that absent Members be arrested wherever they may be found by the officers appointed by the Sergeant at Arms for that purpose. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the absentees be arrested and that the Speaker pro tempore issue his warrants for the same, and that the Sergeant at Arms bring them to the Chamber.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. I think before proceedings should go any further the Chair should rule on the question. I think by now the Chair has discovered that he was in error in his ruling, so as not to appear as a precedent that the Chair—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As soon as the motion is put. The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Now, if the House will listen for a moment, the Chair would like to make a statement in reference to his former ruling. The ruling to which reference was made a short time ago is to be found in Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, paragraph 3038, and is as follows:

On September 10, 1890, during a call of the House, a motion was made that the House adjourn. On this question there were 50 yeas and 92 nays. The Chair announced that there were 172 Members present, a quorum.

Then, a motion being made by Mr. Nils P. Haugen, of Wisconsin, that all further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, there were 122 yeas, 15 nays, and 188 not voting.

Mr. Charles T. O'Ferrall, of Virginia, made the point of order that no quorum was present.

The Speaker pro tempore overruled the point of order on the ground that the former proceedings had disclosed the presence of 172 Members—more than a quorum—and that a motion to dispense with all further proceedings under a call did not require a quorum for its adoption.

The distinction is that in this case the previous roll call developed there was no quorum. In the other case it developed that there was a quorum. Therefore, the Chair was in error on the point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. I think the Chair should also state this, that a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call is never in order until a quorum is developed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. BLANTON. The apology of the Chair is accepted. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the further point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. My point of order is that the Speaker has heretofore ordered the Doorkeeper to close the doors. An order to arrest has been issued, but the doors have not actually been closed, and I fear this Republican filibuster may induce some of our brethren to escape if the doors are not closed again.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Members coming in have a right to report as they come in?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding.

During the foregoing roll call the following occurred:

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am not largely versed in these parliamentary matters, and I would not ask a question facetiously or to interrupt the proceedings, but on behalf of several Members I would like to ask if the official roll call discloses the presence of one TINCHEP, of Kansas? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In reply the Chair would state that the Chair has no information beyond what the roll call shows.

Mr. WINGO. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. The Sergeant of Arms has not yet reported the names of the persons who have been arrested and brought in. Now, the rule is very clear, and—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms has not returned anything.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, another point of order, please. The Constitution of the United States forbids the infliction of "cruel and unusual punishments." I think it is unconstitutional to require the gentleman from Kansas to come here under arrest and listen to that singing in the hall. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I insist on the point of order. We should proceed in an orderly way. The precedents are very clear. The arrested Members are arraigned at the bar of the House and sometimes fined.

At the conclusion of the roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hundred and nineteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against that. The precedents and practice of the House are very clear. Those Members who appear voluntarily may be reported to the Clerk, but a Member who has been arrested by the Sergeant at Arms and brought in must be arraigned at the bar of the House. The House has to dispense with and dispose of that proceeding. The proper proceeding is for the Sergeant at Arms to make a return.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not been informed that any arrests have been made under the warrants.

Mr. WINGO. But the House is informed that Members have been brought in by the Sergeant at Arms. Before dispensing with further proceedings it is in order—

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was not arrested. I came voluntarily. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that the Speaker of the House having issued his warrants of arrest, the presumption is that the Sergeant at Arms has done his duty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The presumption is not well taken. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, while the House may, and in most cases does, dispose of the whole thing by dispensing with further proceedings under the call, I insist that the proper procedure is to vacate the order of arrest and release the arrested Members.

Here we have a great measure for the relief of the American farmer, and the House insisted on night sessions, and it is now 10 minutes after 10 o'clock before we could get a quorum for that night session. If we maintain a quorum during the remaining nights of this session, we have got to discipline the offending Members. I insist that the Sergeant at Arms make his return and that the offending Members be arraigned at the bar of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair. Plainly, we have a right to follow the order of arrest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We will hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WINGO. I insist that the Chair can not entertain a point of order against an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not debatable now.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Oh, no; everything stops. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just moved to adjourn is responsible for all this delay.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order and insist on its being considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already overruled the point of order.

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

Mr. WINGO. It is not competent for the gentleman to make a motion under the present status that he occupies before this House. The record shows that the gentleman from Maryland was not present. He was brought in only a moment ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn. All those in favor of adjourning will signify their assent by saying "aye"; those opposed, "no."

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas had it.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my appeal from the decision of the Chair. It is unheard of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I withdraw the decision on the point of order until I can hear from the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, you do?

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to paragraph 753 of the Manual. The Manual, in relation to the arrest of absent Members, says—

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized at the present time.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I can get through while the gentleman is looking through the book he has in his hands. The rule is very plain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is ready to resume.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. All right.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I call the attention of the Chair to this paragraph, near the bottom of page 330 of the Manual:

The call of the House is ended by a motion "to dispense with further proceedings under the call," which may be agreed to by less than a quorum as well as by a quorum, and when so agreed to ends all proceedings of the call.

This motion is plainly in order, and permits the House to proceed with its business, which has been interrupted by gentlemen upon the other side of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman himself was not present early in the evening.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Further, Mr. Speaker, I call the Speaker's attention to paragraph 3089 in Hinds' Precedents, Volume IV, page 130:

The motion to dispense with proceedings under a call is in order, although Members under arrest may not have had opportunity to make excuses.

That is plainly in point, Mr. Speaker, to the present situation.

On April 29, 1892, during proceedings under a call of the House, Mr. William W. Bowers, of California, presented his excuse for failure to attend part of the session of the previous day.

Mr. Richard P. Bland, of Missouri, moved that Mr. Bowers be excused, which motion was agreed to, 123 yeas to 53 nays. Then Mr. Charles J. Boatner, of Louisville, submitted the following resolution: "Resolved, That all further proceedings against Members for non-attendance at the sessions of the House on yesterday are hereby dispensed with."

Mr. Bland made the point of order that each Member who is included in the warrant of the Sergeant at Arms and is under arrest has a right to give his excuse for his absence and to make such explanation as he thinks proper, and that the resolution submitted by Mr. Boatner was therefore not in order.

The Speaker overruled the point of order and decided that the resolution was in order.

I again call the attention of the Chair to section 3039:

The motion to dispense with proceedings under a call is in order, although Members under arrest may not have had opportunity to make excuses.

Which is precisely the case which is now before us. I insist, Mr. Speaker, on my motion. Gentlemen upon that side of the House have been delaying the passage of a bill for the relief of agriculture, and I insist that these gentlemen have been responsible for whatever delay there has been.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his motion.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have said all I wanted to say.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio reads a decision and he relies solely upon the proposition that the motion is in order, notwithstanding the fact that the arrested Members have not been permitted to give their excuses. That is a different proposition from the rights of the House, and the rule is clear. Rule XV, paragraph 2, provides:

In the absence of a quorum, 15 Members, including the Speaker, if there is one, shall be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, and in all calls of the House the doors shall be closed, the names of the Members shall be called by the Clerk, and the absentees noted; and those for whom no sufficient excuse is made may, by order of a majority of those present, be sent for and arrested, wherever they may be found.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio was absent in the early part of the evening, but he got in early enough to make the motion after I had first made it and he found that he could not prevent it by dilatory tactics.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am responsible for it and not the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. The record shows the contrary. The rule further provides:

By officers to be appointed by the Sergeant at Arms for that purpose, and their attendance secured and retained; and the House shall determine upon what condition they shall be discharged. Members who voluntarily appear shall, unless the House otherwise direct, be immediately admitted to the Hall of the House, and they shall report their names to the Clerk to be entered upon the Journal as present.

The Members, if we insist upon the strict rule which is being followed here to-night, are not permitted to report their names to the Clerk unless the House permits it. We have acquiesced in their coming in, but we have issued, upon a proper motion, a warrant of arrest to the Sergeant at Arms. The presumption is that he has arrested and brought in Members, but we can not tell until he makes a return upon his warrant whether he has, and whenever that proceeding has been established I shall insist, and do insist, that the return of the Sergeant at Arms should be made and that we should dispose of the motion as to who are in contempt of the House and decide what punishment, if any, we shall administer to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can I make a motion for punishment until I know who the absent Members are that have been arrested and brought in, and how can I tell about the punishment to be administered except upon the final return of the Sergeant at Arms?

All this talk about delay is mere bunk by the gentleman from Ohio. His party either is incompetent or can not or will not keep a quorum here, and we have had to send out and arrest them, very few Republicans being present. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Arkansas has yielded for a question. If the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to dispense with further proceedings under the call is adopted, will that discharge the Republican leader from the custody of the Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. WINGO. I want to be fair. The Republican leader, Mr. LONGWORTH, came in just before the order of arrest was issued.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I made the motion myself.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; I made a motion, and the gentleman tried to head it off by a dilatory motion which the Speaker has admitted was not in order, though the Republican leader wasted time by forcing a roll call.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And that was before the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was present.

Mr. WINGO. I first made the motion, and then to save his face the gentleman from Ohio, seeing he could not prevent it, made the motion to bring in the absentees.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this suggestion with reference to the argument made by my friend from Arkansas. He suggests that the House having ordered the arrest of Members must proceed with it until arrest is disposed of, and that when a quorum appears a motion can not be made to dispense with further proceedings under the call. The motion made by the gentleman from Ohio is a motion to dispense with all of these proceedings. A quorum is present, and if the House desires to dispense with the proceedings and proceed with this important agricultural bill, it has the right to do that and does not have to spend two or three hours doing something else in a technical way.

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

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Not just now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How do you know a quorum is present?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. A quorum has developed on the roll call.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let us ascertain and see if one is here.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. He is a mind reader.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio gives the House complete freedom of action. The House has a right on that motion to dispense with further proceedings and immediately go on with the consideration of this agricultural bill; or if the House wants to follow the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas and spend two or three hours on some dilatory tactics, it can vote down the motion of the gentleman from Ohio; but I say that under the rules of the House, which are supposed to furnish liberty of action by the House, the House has the right now at once to dispense with any further proceedings and go right ahead with the agricultural bill.

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one further suggestion—

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield for a question before he yields the floor?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence whatever that any of the gentlemen who have arrived here in sufficient numbers to make a quorum have been arrested. We desire on this side of the House, at least, to proceed with the business of the House. We can proceed if my motion is carried, and I insist upon my motion.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWELL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard then on the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. May I state to the Speaker that I have assurances from the Republican leaders who have at last arrived that they want to go on and consider the bill and stop their filibuster, and with that assurance I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. I think the gentleman had better proceed with this bill.

Mr. WINGO. I am glad to see my friend is now here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has moved to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to proceed for one minute.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9033) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9033, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VOIGT and Mr. ASWELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT] is entitled to recognition. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana rise?

Mr. ASWELL. I rise to yield myself three minutes of my time.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ASWELL. I am in control of one-fourth of the time, and I yield myself three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman for or opposed to the bill?

Mr. ASWELL. I am opposed to it, but I want to make a statement about this foolish, silly performance to-night brought about in this House by Members on the Republican side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for three minutes, and under the rule must confine himself to the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ASWELL. Am I recognized, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ASWELL. No; I want to make a statement of three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for debate on the bill.

Mr. ASWELL. For more than two hours I have appealed to the Speaker of the House—

Mr. DOWELL. I object to the gentleman stating—

Mr. BLANTON. He is speaking within his rights.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield to the gentleman for any question.

For more than two hours I have repeatedly appealed to the Speaker for recognition to make the earnest appeal I now want to make, to proceed with the business of this House, which is the discussion of this bill. I tried several times to get recognition to make that request.

The next speaker in this debate, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT], knows more about this bill than the father of the bill, or both of the two stepfathers of the bill, that are on the program. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I insist that in spite of the fact that the Republican leader on that side insisted and forced the roll call and delayed this procedure for nearly an hour and filibustered in every way he could—I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the committee proceed now to hear from a man who knows the inside and the outside of this bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT]. [Applause.]

Mr. VOIGT was recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Oregon to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VOIGT. I do.

Mr. WATKINS. It is now 25 minutes past 10; does the rule fix 11 o'clock as the time for adjournment?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not believe that I can live up to the powerful recommendation given me by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], but I shall do the best I can to explain the fundamental features of the bill. I shall not take the time to recite to the committee the distress that exists in certain lines of the farming industry. Every member of the committee, and I believe every Member of this House, is satisfied that there is distress in certain lines of agriculture in the United States; and I am sure that every Member of this House wishes to relieve that distress by some fairly workable and reasonably sound measure from an economic standpoint.

I can not support this measure. [Applause.] My record in this House warrants me in stating that I am a genuine friend of the farmer. If I thought there was a reasonable probability of having this measure work out, I should vote for it.

Now, I want to discuss as briefly as I may some of the salient features of this bill, and then I want to take the time to apply the principles of the bill to the commodities mentioned in it and show to the committee why this bill can not do what its friends claim it will do.

First of all let me say that this is a price-fixing measure. I should not condemn this bill because it is a price-fixing measure if I thought that the bill was otherwise workable. The friends of the bill and the worthy chairman of the committee deny that this is a price-fixing measure. Let us see about that. There are three factors which determine prices under this bill, two of which are absolutely fixed. This bill takes the 10-year average of all commodities from 1905 to 1914 and calls that 100. Now, that is an absolutely fixed figure which the directors of the proposed corporation can not change. It fixes another factor, and that is the average price of the respective farm

commodities that are mentioned in the bill respecting which it is proposed to declare an emergency. That is another 10-year average figure. So you have two absolutely fixed figures. The third factor is the so-called index number published by the Department of Labor. We all know that that factor fluctuates very little. It is composed of the average price of 400 and more commodities, and that figure is commonly known as the index number. That index number does not vary more than 1 or 2 per cent a month. So you have two absolutely determining factors and you have one practically nonfluctuating factor. From these three factors you determine the fourth factor by a process of arithmetic. How can anybody say that is not price-fixing? Let me read what the majority report says about that:

Thus the whole matter resolves itself into a few simple arithmetical elements.

As I say, I should vote for the bill although it is a price-fixing measure if I thought it would do the farmer any good. But I can not conceive of a greater calamity that might fall upon the farmers of this country than is contained in the provisions of this bill—to put him up anywhere from 20 to 50 per cent and then drop him into a hole.

Mr. KETCHAM. Where is he now? [Laughter.]

Mr. VOIGT. He is not as bad off now as he will be if you put him up 50 per cent and then drop him. If this bill works at all you might put the farmer up on stilts for 30 days and then give him lower prices than he has now. This would disorganize the farming industry in such a way that the distress you have now will not be a fraction of what it will be then. If you embark on this scheme, as the Secretary of Agriculture told the committee, you will have to renew it—that is, providing it works. Therefore there is nothing in the contention that this is emergency legislation. You can not put prices up artificially and then withdraw your prop without causing the greatest panic this country has ever seen. You will be like the issuers of marks and francs, and your day of reckoning must come.

Of course, this bill is open to all of the objections which may be raised against a price-fixing measure. Price fixing is uneconomic. This bill says that under it the price of live hogs shall be, say, \$11 a hundred. It is just as logical to say that it shall be \$10 or \$12. This bill provides that the price of hogs shall be determined by the price of 400 other commodities that have no relation to hogs; but they say that you take the 400 commodities and average them, and by what that gives you you establish the price of hogs, and similarly you establish the price of corn and of cattle.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. If the bill passes, what would the price of hogs be in August of this year?

Mr. VOIGT. August of 1924?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. VOIGT. It would depend upon the index number of that time.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I thought it was fixed.

Mr. VOIGT. It is fixed by that index number.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Would it be the same in October as in August?

Mr. VOIGT. There would be a very slight fluctuation. The point I make is this: You can not claim that this is not a price-fixing measure simply because the price of hogs may in three months' time fluctuate 20 cents a hundred. The majority report says that if the bill had been in force for the last four months the price of hogs would have fluctuated something like 23 cents per hundred pounds. As I said, the price fluctuates with the fluctuation of the index number, but your other two factors are absolutely nonfluctuating, so that you have a fixed and determined price which any office boy can figure out, except that it may vary as the average price of four hundred and some odd commodities varies. That fluctuation is so small as not to be taken into account.

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

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman not think that the farmer ought to have the ratio price for his products?

Mr. VOIGT. I say to you that I should be very glad to vote for any measure that I think would work out so as to give him that price.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. I must decline to yield now any further. After I get through making my statement I shall be glad to answer any questions. The friends of the measure ought to come before this House and say that it is a price-fixing measure.

You can not say that the price of hogs or the price of corn ought to be determined by the price of some other commodity.

That is just as logical as if you said that the price of a suit of underwear should be the equivalent of the price of two hats. That is just as scientific as the plan adopted in this bill. All of you gentlemen who have received any literature or propaganda regarding this bill have seen the working of the bill illustrated on wheat only. I have never seen anybody argue for this bill but illustrated the working of the bill on wheat. The chairman of the committee in his talk here this afternoon did not go any further than to illustrate the operation of the bill on wheat.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I referred to hogs.

Mr. VOIGT. Yes; the gentleman referred to hogs, but I did not understand him to show how this bill worked out on hogs, and I am going to do that. The bill provides that the price of hogs shall be \$11, and to satisfy some of my friends who say this is not a price-fixing measure I shall say that if the bill had been in operation there would have been a fluctuation in the past four months on account of the variation in the index number of about 23 cents on 100 pounds of hog, as I recall the figures. This bill provides that this export corporation which is created by the bill shall publish this price. The corporation has nothing to say about that price. This price is determined by the bill itself. When the corporation finds that the facts which call for the declaration of an emergency exist it certifies those facts to the President, and the bill provides that the President shall declare the emergency. It does not provide that he may, but it provides that he shall declare the emergency. So, then, if this bill is enacted into law, the directors of this corporation have no discretion whatever. They could not decline to declare the emergency because all the facts are present which authorize the declaration of the emergency. So, then, when you pass this bill in effect you are putting a price of 11 cents per hundred on hogs when the present market price is somewhere around 7 cents. It was down to 6½, I believe, last fall.

Let us see what that is going to do. According to the figures furnished by the Agricultural Department, we slaughtered in the United States, in 1923, 81,500,000 hogs, and in 1922 we slaughtered something like 67,000,000 hogs. In other words, in one year's time, from 1922 to 1923, we increased the slaughter of hogs in this country by 14,500,000, or about 20 per cent. If on a 7-cent market you increase the slaughter of hogs in one year 14,500,000 and you raise the price from 7 cents to 11 cents, what is going to be the production of hogs in the United States during the next year or two?

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. I shall yield later on. I have a small farm; and if this thing takes effect, and I see it is going to work out, and I find I was mistaken, I shall certainly raise about four times the number of hogs I raise on that farm now, and so would every other farm proprietor in this country. Now, you will not only raise 14,000,000 extra hogs when you raise the price 60 per cent, but probably raise thirty or forty million extra hogs. Now, what will take place when you do that? Your equalization fee, or tax, which is prescribed in the bill to meet the loss on the export, is going to be so high as to wipe out any profit to the farmer. Every extra hog you raise that goes for export, of course, increases the loss, and the loss has to be laid on somebody at home; and the more you export, the more you increase the production, the more the loss is going to be to the American farmer and consumer. To my mind this is just a Utopian dream on the part of some gentlemen advocating this bill. Now let us go into the operation of this bill on hogs.

This bill does not permit the corporation that is proposed to be created here to buy or build a slaughtering plant. When the emergency is declared, when hogs are selling under this bill at 11 cents a pound, live weight, the corporation is commanded by the terms of the bill to buy all hogs that are offered in the United States at that price. Just think of it, friends! How could any corporation carry out such a command as that? This corporation by law is commanded to buy all hogs offered at \$11 per hundred in the principal markets in the United States, the difference in freight being allowed for.

Mr. VESTAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. For a short question.

Mr. VESTAL. As I understand the gentleman's argument, this bill would prevent the making of any contract for the purchasing of hogs? There could be no individual contract to buy any number of hogs, but they would have to pay this certain price?

Mr. VOIGT. The bill says that when the emergency is declared the price is fixed by operation of law, and this corporation must buy all hogs that are offered at that price. Now, of course, that means that all hogs that are not needed for domestic consumption are going to be sold to this corporation. Anyone may sell privately, of course, but what this corporation will get is the exportable surplus, because, if the world buys hogs at, say, \$7 a hundred no one is going to buy hogs at \$11 a hundred for export. Consequently nobody will buy hogs for slaughtering in this country unless he knows he can get rid of the hog product in this country on an \$11 basis. The surplus we are going to raise, the millions of hogs that will be raised by reason of this inducement of 60 per cent increase in the price, of course, have got to be exported, not in the live form but as hog products.

These hogs which will go for export will be forced upon the corporation, and it must maintain buyers in every hog market in the United States to stand ready every hour in the day to take these hogs at \$11 per hundred, and the moment the corporation ceases to do that, then your scheme collapses. This corporation has no power under the bill to build a slaughtering plant. Now let us see what will happen. In the Chicago stockyards last year, 1923, there arrived over 10,000,000 hogs. There arrived in the Chicago stockyards in 1923 over 18,000,000 food animals—hogs, calves, sheep, and cattle.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. I will.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Do those hogs bring the same price regardless of grade?

Mr. VOIGT. No; the hogs that would be below the standard grade would be somewhat cheaper, and vice versa. This would be the average run of hogs, I take it.

Mr. REECE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. For a short question.

Mr. REECE. What would be the effect of a situation like this: Suppose the packers and livestock dealers should in May contract for hogs at a certain price to be delivered in November and in the meantime an emergency was declared to exist and the price should be fixed by the Government?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

Mr. VOIGT. Just allow me to answer this question. This bill exempts existing contracts, but if the price should be raised by operation of law after that contract was made, of course the court would declare the contract void because a law had intervened and injected a new element into the contract.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I suggest to the gentleman that he say to the House that he does not yield to anybody, but proceed with his speech.

Mr. VOIGT. I thank the gentleman.

Now, let us see what will happen here. This corporation can not build a packing plant or a slaughterhouse. It is barred from that by the terms of the bill. The stockyards in Chicago—there are many other stockyards in the country, but those are the largest stockyards—are owned by the five big packers in Chicago. On one day last year 86,000 hogs arrived there. Over 100,000 food animals arrived in the Chicago yards in one day in July, 1923. This corporation, under the bill, can not even rent a packing plant, unless it first determines that it can not get facilities at reasonable rates. It can not commandeer a packing plant, nor has it the power of eminent domain.

What will be the consequence? Suppose a day arrives when there are 86,000 hogs in the yards. This corporation must have its buyers there ready to buy these 86,000 hogs at \$11 a hundred.

Let us see. The big five Chicago packers that operate the yards say, "We can take 50,000 hogs for home consumption, but there are 36,000 that must go for export." Now, they will say to this corporation, "We will take those hogs at 4 cents a pound. We can not pay more on account of the condition of the export market." They cost the corporation 11 cents.

Now, what is this corporation going to do about that? They have got 36,000 hogs there in the yards of the packers. They must be taken away in the regular process of slaughter. You can not store them; you can not take them out of those yards; you can not ship them back. Consequently this corporation will take any price which the Chicago packers will pay for those hogs.

If there is any gentleman present—any gentleman on the committee—who can tell me a different solution, I should like to have him speak up.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, the only thing they would do would be to pass them on to the next town, to the next packer. [Laughter.] If further packers are found they would export the hogs.

Mr. VOIGT. All right. I will take your proposition.

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

Mr. VOIGT. I will yield after a while.

Now, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture say that the corporation, if they were not satisfied with the price offered by the packers there, would reload those hogs and ship them on to the next town. What town?

Mr. HAUGEN. Most of them go to Buffalo. The gentleman knows that all the hogs that go to Chicago are not all slaughtered in Chicago. They are in transit, many of them, and go right through.

Mr. VOIGT. The Chicago packers, according to the report of the Federal Trade Commission made some years ago, handle about 60 per cent of the entire hog slaughter in the United States. You could not reship those hogs. You could not find packers to take them, because they have no facilities for slaughtering them. The big packers, and possibly a few others, are the only people engaged at the present time in the export business. The small packer can not use them. He has no foreign market where he can send the surplus hog products.

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

Mr. VOIGT. No.

I say, gentlemen, this corporation would be absolutely at the mercy of the big five packers of the country. I can not see any escape from that conclusion—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has used 30 minutes.

Mr. VOIGT. I yield myself five minutes more.

I am not willing to vote for a bill that will authorize transactions that will cost the farmers and consumers millions of dollars and put this corporation absolutely at the mercy of the big five packers.

A gentleman who has spoken on the bill says the big five packers are opposed to this bill. Let me tell what happened in the committee about that. A young man came before the committee from the American Institute of Meat Packers. He argued against this bill.

I never received any letter from any packer in the United States protesting against this legislation. When we had the packer legislation before our committee several years ago the packers came down here in droves. The head officials came here. Their high-priced attorneys came here. None of them appeared here and objected to this legislation. So, gentlemen, if I were a packer—

Mr. HAUGEN. I can supply the gentleman with the names of a number of packers who evidently do not think it necessary to correct the gentleman. Let me make just this one correction: The gentleman knows that the packing houses are now run on short time and at 60 per cent of their capacity. He knows the idle packing houses throughout the country. So that there is no trouble as far as the processing of hogs is concerned.

Mr. VOIGT. I want to say on that that we all know—those who are at all familiar with the slaughtering business—that the only people who are engaged in the export business are the big five packers, and they are the only people who can handle these millions of hogs. The only solution the gentleman has in case these packers ask an enormous profit is that they could ship the hogs to the next town, where you could not find adequate packing plants.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. For a short question.

Mr. CARTER. Would the corporation be any more at the mercy of the packers than the farmers and stockmen are now?

Mr. VOIGT. There is not any use of going into that. I am just saying here that I am not willing to vote for any legislation like this, and I think this corporation would be a great deal more at the mercy of the packers.

Mr. FUNK. Tell us why. That is a fair question.

Mr. VOIGT. I have tried to tell the committee just why, because there is nobody in this country, except the big five, that can take these hogs for export, and consequently they are going to buy them on their own terms.

Let me show you where this corporation will go broke in less than 60 days, and how during that short time it would do incalculable harm to the farmers, to consumers, and business in general. The packers of this country have four or five hundred million dollars worth of products on hand, not to say anything about the grain dealers and millers. They have a profit overnight of a couple of hundred millions. The corporation must declare the emergency, and the law says it must buy all these

products at the fixed ratio price. Now, what would a packer do? I don't say he will do it because he is a packer; any man would do it. He would unload at once on this corporation and take his profit, because he can duplicate his stock at the same ratio price. The packers would run a race to the office of this corporation, to see which one could get his hands first on the \$200,000,000 of its capital, and the capital would be exhausted long before it could meet the obligations imposed on it by the law. The bill says the corporation may borrow a billion dollars, but it also says that the Government is not liable for anything it borrows. What banker would loan this corporation money? Under the scheme outlined in this bill, this corporation must die immediately after it is born, leaving a legacy of ruin and panic.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. No; I decline to yield further. Let me show you another thing about this hog proposition. Under this bill any farmer can slaughter his own hogs for home consumption without paying the so-called equalization fee. Under this bill as it now stands a man has the right to buy a hog from a farmer, slaughter that hog himself, and escape the payment of the equalization fee. If you are a farmer and I am a city fellow and you slaughter a hog and sell him to me, I am obliged to pay the so-called equalization fee, which I estimate would run, on a 200-pound hog, anywhere from \$2 to \$5. Now, men are not going to pay that tax unless they are legally obliged to.

Here is the way the bill works out, according to the legal talent we have had before the committee: If I buy a dressed hog from a farmer, I am obliged to pay the so-called equalization fee. If I buy that hog from a farmer and slaughter the hog myself or have the hog slaughtered, I do not have to pay the fee. If I buy that hog from a farmer and pay the farmer 25 cents for slaughtering the hog for me as my property and have it delivered to me, I do not have to pay any equalization fee. Now, there are three cases where the net result of the operation is the same. In one case there is an equalization fee payable, and in two cases there is not.

Suppose that under this bill a farmer slaughters a half dozen hogs and turns them into sausage and smoked meat and ham, and figures he is going to use them for his own use. Then he finds he has too many hams on hand or he finds he has made too much sausage and he wants to take it to town and sell it.

Under this bill he would not have to pay any equalization fee on the products he sells, because when he slaughtered the hogs he did not slaughter them for market. Now, then, whether that equalization fee is payable or not, and whether the Government is going to collect a tax on that or not remains within the breast of the man who does the slaughtering. If he thinks he is slaughtering for market then there is an equalization fee payable, but if he thinks he is slaughtering for home use and uses his liberal judgment in his own favor there is no fee payable.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. What will be the penalty if he practices fraud?

Mr. VOIGT. I can not take the time now to answer that. That same thing runs all through this bill. It applies to wheat, and it applies to all other products in the bill, so that there would be any quantity of the commodities mentioned in this bill which, by that simple operation, would escape the payment of the equalization fee.

Now, I say to you gentlemen, if by that easy process people can escape the payment of the equalization fee we are going to increase tremendously the local slaughter of hogs. People will not pay that tax if they can escape it, and they can escape it under the bill. Among those hogs which go to the packers you are going to have a very large percentage for export. On that portion which actually goes to the packers you have got to collect the equalization fee on this tremendous overproduction for export. That fee will be so large that there will be nothing left for the farmer and there will be no profit in the transaction for the farmer.

So I say to you gentlemen that to work this thing out on hogs simply can not be done, and the same applies to cattle, calves, and sheep, and all the argument I have made on hogs applies to all these animals.

Now, please bear this in mind: Some of the friends of this bill say that this corporation can start in by trying this thing out first on wheat. They say, "If it works on wheat, we will try it on hogs; if it works on hogs, we will take cattle; and then we will take corn," and so forth.

Now, that will not work for this reason: This corporation can not refuse, in my judgment, to declare an emergency on hogs, for instance, because the moment this bill becomes a law all the facts that call for the declaration of an emergency

exist, and the directors can not justly refuse to declare it. Now, if you declare an emergency on hogs, you must immediately declare an emergency on cattle and sheep.

If you put up the price of pork 60 per cent, people are going to eat more beef. You are going to find that if you raise the price of pork 60 per cent, people are going to eat more poultry, fish, and other food, because the relative price will be cheaper. This will increase the amount of hog products for export.

In order to prevent this, the corporation will immediately have to declare the emergency on beef and sheep, although we are not at the present time exporting any beef. We are on an importing basis as to beef.

This bill will create an exportable surplus.

If you declare the emergency on pork, you must immediately declare the emergency on pork products. If you do not, then you make the packers of this country an immediate present overnight of at least \$200,000,000.

Let us see about that. If you raise the price of hogs 60 per cent to-morrow, and that is the absolute price, because this corporation is commanded by law to buy all the hogs that are offered at \$11 a hundred, then, of course, all the pork products that are in the country are going up at least 60 per cent in price, are they not? If you are a butcher and you have 10,000 pounds of pork on hand and the price of live hogs is raised 60 per cent, your stock is going up at least 60 per cent, and probably more. According to the last report of the big five packers of Chicago—I looked it up in Moody's book the other day—they had stocks on hand of \$252,000,000. Most of that was pork, and if you increase the hogs 60 per cent, you are going to at least increase that \$250,000,000 by 50 or 60 per cent, are you not. That is a pure present to the big five packers, and we have 200 other packers in the United States. The big five are interested in a couple of hundred subsidiary corporations, which will also reap a harvest. Therefore, unless you do something by way of levying a tax on the stock which the packers have on hand, you are going to make them a present of several hundred million dollars. You must immediately declare the emergency on hog products and cattle products and sheep products in order to prevent that gigantic gift to those interests.

That is not all. All other food products are going to rise in price when you raise pork 60 per cent. When you raise beef and mutton, other food products are going to rise in price sympathetically.

I dare say that if you put this bill in effect to-morrow, you would make a gift, not to the farmer, not to the man you are trying to help with this bill, but to the nonproducer, to the business man and speculator, who has the stocks on hand—you will make the business interests of this country an immediate present overnight of \$500,000,000 by the operation of this bill.

I want to say a word about some of the other products in this bill. Corn is mentioned in this bill. The original bill had cotton in it; and the gentlemen representing the cotton States here had a meeting, I understand, and they unanimously decided—and they acted wisely—that this bill could not apply to cotton, because we export 65 per cent of our cotton, and they asked us to take cotton out. The result would be that if you had a ratio price of 20 cents on cotton, exporting 60 or 65 per cent of the product, if the world price should go down to 15 cents, there would be an equalization fee of 5 cents a pound on cotton. In other words, the people of the United States would pay 25 cents a pound for cotton and we would supply the world with cotton at 15 cents, and we would immediately lose the export of \$200,000,000 worth of cotton manufactures, because no manufacturer here could manufacture cotton goods out of 25-cent cotton when the man in England or in Germany or in France could make them out of 15-cent cotton. We would lose that \$200,000,000 of exports. That is a phase of this bill I have not time to touch on, but it is a very interesting question—how far a man is affected who is in the exporting business in this country and who is obliged to buy some of these commodities on which a ratio price has been set, or who is obliged to use part of these goods in the composition of anything he exports. He will be out of business in the export world, and there is not a word in this bill to save him. There is no fund established to which he can go. The only people that are provided for explicitly in this bill are the packers and the millers, and those interests have not put up more than a formal objection to this bill. They could not very well urge its passage openly.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. No; I can not yield.

I have said I would vote for the principle of this bill applied to wheat. I would put an artificial price—not a ratio price—on wheat for say two years, and then decrease the price for, say two years. But I would tax every bushel of wheat except

that used for seed. Such a bill would be open to the objections against price fixing and would bring about overproduction. My only reason for supporting such a measure would be to give to the wheat growers of the country what I am satisfied they were deprived of during the war period. We fixed the price of wheat by law, and we intended the price to be a minimum guaranty, but the grain corporation by a system of licensing made that price the maximum price, and by that unjust operation deprived the wheat farmers of many hundred millions of dollars. Some have estimated it as high as \$2,000,000,000. Equal and exact justice requires that we make that loss to the wheat farmers good, and I am willing to be a party to any plan that will give them what they are entitled to, whether that plan be economic or not. I just want some plan that will work temporarily to accomplish this object but I would not recommend such a plan as permanent legislation.

Now, let us see whether the bill could apply to corn. You will find a very interesting table in the Department of Agriculture year book for 1921, page 165. This table analyzes the corn crop and tells us where it goes. I shall not read all the uses that corn is put to but I will say that all the corn according to this table except about 9 per cent is fed to stock and other animals. According to the Haugen bill all corn used for feed is not liable for any equalization fee. Now, you have the same situation in regard to corn that you have in the case of cotton. You would have 8 or 9 per cent of the entire corn crop of the United States, on which you could collect an equalization fee to meet the loss on the corn that you export. What is the use of holding forth such a camouflage to the farmers of the country? I am unwilling to do that. I am a friend of the farmer, but I will not advocate a scheme, I will not hold out any hope to them, that I know can not be fulfilled. [Applause.]

It might perhaps be better political strategy on my part to favor this bill, but I think it is about time that the truth were told about what the trouble is with the farmer, and how far we can go by way of remedy. I want to say this, that I have studied the matter of agricultural relief for the past three years, and it is a mighty difficult matter for anybody to prescribe for the farmers' ills. We have examined in our committee one plan after another, and there is no plan that is going to give to the farmer an increased price which is economical and sound. You can not take a farm commodity or any other commodity and put an artificial price on it and say that you have something that will hold water, something that is economically sound. The two things do not go together. [Applause.]

One great trouble with us is that we can not find a market for our surplus at a profitable price, because our customer—Europe—has no buying power. The people in Europe are not consuming normal quantities of food. Even in France the per capita consumption of wheat is 2 or 3 bushels less than it was before the war. In my judgment our Government injured the American farmer to the extent of several billion dollars by failing to use its full moral influence to bring about economic restoration in Europe. The United States Steel Corporation has profited many millions by disorganization over there, because its competitors were put out of business, and possibly a few other lines have benefited, but the American farmer surely has been the sufferer.

The farmer should be relieved from legislation which is oppressing him. Reduce the tariff on many things he buys. I am not a free trader, but believe with many friends of the tariff that the existing tariff is an undue burden on our people. Repeal the Esch-Cummins law, on those portions which produce exorbitant freight rates, or by reclassification give the farmer preferential freight rates. Break up the unlawful trusts and price-fixing combinations which have been and are robbing the farmer and the city man as well. Assist the farmer by creating for him a great national cooperative organization, with State and local branches. Pass the Norris-Sinclair bill, or the Aswell bill, or a combination of these bills. Give the farmer economic equality, and he will take care of himself.

In addition to this, and as strictly emergency legislation, I am willing to vote for a bill which will give export certificates for 10 or 15 per cent of the value of wheat, rye, barley, and rice, which shall be good for the payment of import duties. Such a plan can not be applied to animal products, in my judgment. Try this for two years; in the third year make it half the amount, then a quarter, and then stop it. This plan alone will do more good than can be hoped for with the Haugen bill, and it is worthy of serious consideration.

Now they put rice and sheep into this bill, and they want to declare an emergency on them. The fact of the matter is that we have been on an importing basis on mutton for the last 10 years. How in all the world can you operate an export cor-

poration to export mutton and sheep when you have been importing mutton year after year for 10 years? I call that camouflage.

We have got beef in the bill. According to the report of the Tariff Commission we imported millions of dollars worth of beef last year more than we exported. We are on an importing basis. That is a good thing for the farmer, and I hope that it will remain so, so that the farmer will not be dependent on the world price for beef. You are actually going to create an exportable supply of beef, to create the very situation for the farmer that you are trying to avoid, and you are doing it with other commodities mentioned in this bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will not the gentleman discuss his view of the tariff feature before he gets through?

Mr. VOIGT. Look at the bill. You have got sheep in there, and then to cap the climax the authors of the bill have put in wool. As a matter of fact, we import one-half of all the wool used in the United States. The ratio price of wool, if the bill should take effect, is almost 25 cents a pound below the present market price. I will leave it to you to guess why wool was put into the bill.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. What was the ratio price of wool when President Harding was inaugurated on the 4th of March, 1921?

Mr. VOIGT. I do not care what it was.

Mr. TINCHER. Why can you not have a ratio price?

Mr. VOIGT. I shall answer the gentleman's question. When Mr. Harding was inaugurated we were not exporting any wool. We are not a wool-exporting Nation. How could the directors of this corporation sign a document and notify the President that we have an exportable surplus of wool? How could they have done it at any time in the past 25 years? So, then, it does not make any difference what the price of wool was. In 1922 we imported over 250,000,000 pounds of wool; and there is more camouflage in this bill.

I want now to go into the tariff feature. The men who framed this bill originally did not have the slightest idea, in my judgment, about the tariff complications incident to the bill. They provided in the original bill that a tariff or embargo could be levied on the commodities mentioned in it, but they did not seem to think that if we put up the price of lard 4 or 5 cents a pound probably some people would be importing oils from other countries. Coconut oil, for instance, is used as a substitute for lard. Consequently this bill will affect several hundred items that are now on the tariff list, or if they are not on the tariff list we shall have to put them on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 20 additional minutes.

Mr. VOIGT. I shall take 10 minutes more. If you raise the price of pork 60 per cent, of course you are immediately going to be flooded in this country by every conceivable article of food which may be used as a substitute for pork, and consequently all such articles will have to be guarded against so far as import is concerned. It is going to be an almost impossible job for this corporation or for the Tariff Commission to keep on adjusting these tariff rates on hundreds of articles so as to prevent those articles and substitutes and derivatives from coming into the country. But it will have to be done or the purpose of the bill will be defeated.

I have advanced some views of my own in addition to the minority report. I have said that I should vote for this bill if the bill with some modifications were applied to wheat only. Under the present bill I think that at least 200,000,000 bushels of wheat would escape the payment of the equalization fee. We use in this country something like seventy or eighty million bushels of wheat for animal feed. If you raise the price of wheat 50 per cent of course no one is going to feed it if he can find something else to feed to his animals. The moment this thing goes into effect, people will feed substitutes, which they can buy 50 per cent cheaper. What will happen? Under this bill that which is now used for feed will enhance the exportable surplus of wheat.

Under this bill the producer of wheat has a right to grind his own wheat into flour for his own use. The farming population, if you speak of it as one-third of our population, eats one-third of the flour which is made in the United States. That one-third will escape the payment of the equalization fee. If a farmer takes his wheat to a mill to have it ground for his own use and he finds that he has had too much flour ground, he has the legal right to sell anyone that flour, and the buyer need not pay the equalization fee, because when the wheat was milled it was not milled for sale. How many people are going to take advantage of that? How many people are going to honestly overestimate their requirements? Right

there 150,000,000 bushels of wheat under this bill will escape the payment of the equalization fee.

I have said that if these things were guarded against I would be willing to vote for this bill applied to wheat only, but let us not fool ourselves about this. These other commodities are put in here for logrolling purposes. Can anybody tell me why rice was put into this bill? Why was rice put in, and why was rye left out, and why was barley left out? Last year we exported about \$28,000,000 worth of rye and about \$11,000,000 worth of rice. Why not put those things into the bill? Those farmers have a right to be recognized if you are going to frame a logrolling bill here. The majority report says that the operation of this bill will cause a well-balanced agriculture, and that for that reason there will be no overproduction. Let us see about that. If I am a farmer and I can get by operation of law 60 per cent more for hogs than I can get at the present time and have it guaranteed to me by the Government, am I going to raise potatoes?

Why, no; we are all going to raise more hogs and less potatoes. The potato farmer will turn to raising hogs and we will have a tremendous export of hogs, and by reason of the scarcity of potatoes we are going to have a fairly high price for potatoes.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. If the gentleman will permit, will not that in consequence put the price of potatoes rather out of sight?

Mr. VOIGT. It will certainly raise the price of potatoes, but I can not say how high they would go. Now, the legal talent that we have in the committee informed us that the words in this bill, "cattle, sheep, or swine, or any food product, derived therefrom," did not cover milk from the cow.

The chairman this afternoon said it did cover milk from the cow. That is a very important matter. The dairy products in this country amount to something like \$2,000,000,000 per year.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman recall that he himself offered an amendment to include milk?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes; I offered amendments to include the exportable surplus of practically all farm commodities, so as to bring forth some sort of a balanced bill here. If milk is a food product derived from cattle under the meaning of this bill, of course that would take in butter and cheese. If the emergency is declared on food products of cattle, and that should include milk from the cow, then every woman or housewife who buys a pint of milk will have to pay the equalization fee on that pint or quart of milk. The whole thing is unworkable.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman if under this bill hogs are worth 11 cents a pound on the basic price of these 400 commodities, and if the number of hogs increase, say, double in two years, would the corporation still have to pay the 11 cents a pound?

Mr. VOIGT. The corporation would pay 11 cents, but when the price got above 11 cents there would be no emergency.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Another question. If the average price of these 400 commodities goes up—

Mr. VOIGT. If the price goes up, of course your 11 cents will rise proportionately.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And you would pay probably 12 cents by raising three times as many hogs?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes; it does not make any difference how many million additional hogs you raised, this corporation has to buy at 11 cents; if the index rises, your 11 cents will rise.

Mr. ASWELL. I do not know whether the gentleman is tired or not, but a great deal of interest has been manifested with reference to the increased cost of living, and the gentleman knows more about that than anybody. Will the gentleman discuss that phase?

Mr. VOIGT. I will take a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed one hour.

Mr. VOIGT. I will take five minutes more. Of course no one can say what this scheme would cost the people of the United States. The chairman did not go any further this afternoon than to say that it might increase the price of a loaf of bread one-half a cent. Now, I look at it in this way, gentlemen: The total farm crop of the United States is worth about \$8,000,000,000. The major portion of that \$8,000,000,000, with the exception of cotton, consists of the food animals, dairy products, and grains. The corn crop of the United States and the hog crop are the two biggest sources of food supply we have in the country. Now, the annual value of the crop on which this bill will operate is probably between four and five billion dollars. Now, pork is increased 60 per cent, corn increased about 20 per cent, and it is proposed to increase wheat 50

per cent. Now, suppose we strike an average, and say it is on an average 40 per cent. That would be 40 per cent of, say, four or five billion dollars. I am satisfied that if this scheme were even put in practice—and I have no fear it will be, gentlemen—it would cost the consumers of this country an additional \$2,000,000,000 per annum. Of course the farmer will pay more for wages and everything he buys. We consumed in the United States last year between nine and ten billion pounds of pork. The rest was exported.

Now, if you figure 4 cents a pound live weight—and, of course, when the hog is slaughtered it amounts to more than 5—you get the sum of \$490,000,000 which it will cost the people of the United States, exclusive of those who raise the pork. Of course there is not much use talking about this increased cost, because this bill will never get that far. No President could sign this bill, and everything President Coolidge has said indicates that he would not sign it if passed up to him. It is a pity that we could not have devoted our efforts in framing a workable bill which at least would have given some relief. I am in favor of staying here all summer if necessary and do it.

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

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman advance as an argument against this bill the idea that the consuming public could not afford to pay to the American farmer the ratio price?

Mr. VOIGT. I have not made any such argument. Somebody asked me to state what in my judgment the cost of this operation would be to the American consumer. I have not made that statement as an argument against this bill. Somebody has asked me what I thought the cost would be and I have stated it.

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

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman has stated as one of the dangers that he sees in the enactment of this bill the possibility of increase in production all along the line. The only purpose of the bill is simply to give the producer, as I understand it, the same actual price as the producer received on the average during the period from 1905 to 1914, inclusive. What, then, will be the actual incentive to increase the production above what it was during that period?

Mr. VOIGT. I will say to the gentleman, take the case of hogs: If the farmers in this country produced for slaughter 81,000,000 hogs in 1923 at 7 cents per pound, how many hogs will they produce if you guarantee them 11 cents a pound? I think that answers the gentleman's question. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman not overlook the fact that a good many of those produced last year were produced at a loss?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes. Let us assume that. How much more pork will they raise if you increase the price and guarantee an advance of 60 per cent by law?

Mr. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman think it would give the farmer an unusual profit?

Mr. VOIGT. No. I am not here to complain that this would give the farmer too much money. I am just stating what the bill would do.

This bill in no way cures the farmer's real troubles. If this thing should work temporarily it will do away with cooperative associations among farmers. The object of cooperation is to secure a better price, but if the Government fixes one price, and no one can get any more or any less, what is the use of cooperation? This bill would do more damage than the farmers could repair in years, and the farmer's great hope lies in the field of cooperation.

Dante M. Pierce, publisher of the Wisconsin Farmer and Iowa Homestead, who enjoys the absolute confidence of farmers, condemns the bill. Edward Nordman, commissioner of agriculture of Wisconsin, writes me that this bill "will simply fool the farmers into believing that something is being done for them, whereas the effect of such a bill will be to do agriculture infinitely more harm than good."

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

Mr. VOIGT. I will grant myself five minutes more.

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

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I wonder if the condition we find ourselves in is not due to this fact, which the friends of the farmer will not face, namely, we want to restore to the farmer, first, the power of his dollar, and we have taken from the farmer

that purchasing power by virtue of the fact that we have increased the price of other articles that the farmer buys, and because of that we now want to give him increased prices for the commodities which he produces to the extent, as the gentleman says, of \$1,500,000,000. Why do not these friends of the farmers advocate some scheme such as was suggested in the question of the leader on this side, which will reduce the prices on the articles which the farmer buys? [Applause.]

Mr. VOIGT. There is a great deal in what the gentleman says. I want to say this: I am satisfied that the present high tariff is a detriment to the American farmer. There is no question about that. [Applause.]

Now then the real remedy for this trouble is not your loading up the farmer and consumer here with this exorbitant tariff and then put on top of that what you might call an internal tariff. The people who advocate this bill propose, in order to right this wrong which they say exists against the farmer, which is a wrong against the consumer as well, to pile another wrong on both of them. They propose to cure one wrong by inflicting another.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Another question: Is it not a fact that, according to all the laws of economics, if you add two billion or a billion and a half of value—I think your figures are right; I think two billions or a billion and a half would be right—is it not a fact that if you increase values by two billions or a billion and a half you would increase the prices of these 400 articles so that your index number would change with the value of the article? You are going around a vicious circle all the time.

Mr. VOIGT. If you increase the price of these farm products a couple of billion dollars the general index number will rise; and when that number rises, of course, the price of these farm products will go up, and in each case your index number will go up, so that they will all be chasing each other around a circle.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. In other words, you will be going around a vicious circle all the time.

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman referred to the probability that the increased price of hogs of 11 cents a pound would greatly increase the number of hogs produced by the farmers. How does the gentleman explain the fact that during the war, when hogs were 15 to 19 cents a pound, we did not produce as many hogs as are now being produced at 7 cents a pound? Are there not other factors entering into that proposition? For instance, does not the price on corn determine the number of hogs that are produced?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes. Surely the price of corn determines whether it is profitable to produce hogs, and there is a very close relationship between the price of corn and the price of hogs.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. So that many other factors enter into the price of hogs?

Mr. VOIGT. Certainly. Of course during the war all other commodities were relatively high and transportation facilities were disturbed and we could not get the meat out of the country, but with an open market conditions have changed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I say that I agree with the very fine compliments which have been paid the gentleman with reference to his knowledge of this bill, and that is the reason I am asking this question. Very early in the gentleman's discussion he said that later on he would tell about this proposition of price fixing in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL]. May I supplement his inquiry by this one: Did not the gentleman confuse the idea of price fixing with the idea of the ratio price, which everybody admits is a fixed price? This ratio price is not the price the producer would receive for his product, nor is it the price that the purchaser would pay. Either of these prices is a matter of individual contract between purchaser and seller.

Mr. VOIGT. I am very glad the gentleman asked that question. The majority of the committee say this is not a price-fixing measure, because anyone is at liberty to sell for any price and anyone is at liberty to buy for any price. Let us examine into that.

The price of hogs is fixed by the law at \$11. Now, theoretically, of course, the farmer has the right to sell those hogs for \$10, but no one will say that if the Government corporation stands ready to pay him \$11 that he is going to sell for \$10, and who is going to pay \$12 for hogs when the established

market price is \$11? Now, \$11, or whatever it may be, is going to be the absolute price of that article. [Applause.]

Mr. VESTAL. I do not know whether the gentleman understood my question or not. The proposition I want to get in my mind is this: Let me put a concrete proposition. Suppose the ratio price of corn, for instance, was 80 cents, and on my little farm I want to feed some stock. I want to buy some corn from my neighbor, who has 1,000 bushels of corn to sell. I want to know whether under this bill I can contract with my neighbor at a cash price for less than 80 cents, which is the ratio price.

Mr. VOIGT. Oh, yes.

Mr. VESTAL. Can I go in there and buy this corn from him and pay him cash for it at 70 cents, if he wants to make that contract?

Mr. VOIGT. Oh, yes; you have this situation. The Government stands ready to buy that man's corn at 80 cents. If he is willing to sell to you at 70 cents, he has a right to do that, of course.

Mr. VESTAL. But if the Government buys it at 80 cents, is there not an equalization fee of some kind to be paid?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. VESTAL. Suppose he wants to contract with me, can I buy it without any equalization fee?

Mr. VOIGT. If you are going to use that corn for animal feed then there is no equalization fee. As I said before, there is only 5 or 6 per cent of all the corn raised in the country on which you could collect that fee.

Mr. VESTAL. All I wanted to find out was whether I could make such a contract.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman referred to the tariff and its relation to the farmer. The gentleman must know that nearly all of the products on the farm or that the farmer purchases, including steel products, footwear, and the implements he uses are all on the free list, even the fertilizer. [Applause.]

Mr. VOIGT. I will say to the gentleman that I understand there is a tariff on steel.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no tariff on steel.

Mr. VOIGT. There is a tariff on certain steel products.

Mr. MORGAN. Only on certain products that enter into steel production, which is a very small per cent.

Mr. VOIGT. That may be, but that enters into the price of the wagons and the other implements that the farmer buys.

Mr. MORGAN. It is a very small per cent and does not amount to much.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman does not want to ruin the farmers' home market.

Mr. VOIGT. There is not much danger of ruining the home market. People must eat, and the farmer feeds us all. Mr. H. E. Miles, director of the Fair Tariff League, says that the steel and wire industries under the Fordney tariff law were given the privilege of adding \$351,000,000 to their prices, to cost consumers twice this sum at retail, or \$702,000,000. He says the tariff costs Kansas farmers over \$41,000,000 and Texas farmers over \$86,000,000 a year. In fact, all farm organizations who argue for the Haugen bill claim the tariff discriminates against them, and I voted against the Fordney tariff bill because I believed that to be true.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. Sanders, of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9033) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, was the hour of meeting fixed at 11 o'clock for to-morrow or Thursday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thursday.

TO PROVIDE FOR SCIENTIFIC AND SKILLFUL FARMING

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in these times of agricultural depression I am impressed with the importance of enacting into law H. R. 157, reported favorably by the Agricultural Committee, to authorize the more complete endowment of agricultural experiment stations.

A State or nation advances with the development of its natural resources. To use only part of these resources limits the prosperity, opportunity, and progress of any country.

Timber, minerals, water power, coal, oil, and gas have all been considered as valuable capital, yet there is no greater resource than the soil. Particularly suited to the oldest occupation of man, this Nation has recognized the value of the soil and has applied science to the promotion of better agriculture. The development of high-yielding grains, the improvement of livestock, the clearing of cut-over lands, the drainage of marsh soils, the development of rural sanitation, and the fostering of a better rural social life have all made up a part of the Nation's program of advancement.

We must constantly look ahead. Through the application of science to the everyday efforts of country life, new opportunities for progress are constantly open to the farmers of the United States.

True, since 1921 the farming industry suffered the most severe depression which has occurred in a generation. The situation in which the farmer now finds himself, in common with all other producers of raw materials, whether of food, fuel, shelter, or clothing, is that the commodities which he has to sell have gone down in price more than the finished products which he has to buy.

It is to be hoped that the relative price of farm products has reached its lowest level; but whether that is so or not, this outstanding fact remains—the agriculture of to-morrow must more than ever utilize the findings of science in conducting our farming operations. When the margins between costs of production and crop returns are wide, less care is likely to be exercised in applying all of those methods which cut out waste, eliminate leaks and losses, and consequently lower costs of production. Profitable farming in the future must utilize to the fullest all practicable measures to cut not only costs of production but costs of distribution as well. For unless farming can be made profitable and can insure a reasonable living standard the Nation can neither hope to hold its best farmers on the land nor can it expect to attract our best young men and women into farming as a vocation.

Progress in agriculture is possible only through the use of better methods, and these methods can come only by finding and trying out new ideas. The individual farmer has neither the time nor the money to work out many new ideas. Realizing this, our Federal Government, in conjunction with the several States, founded and has supported in the past the State experiment stations. The Purnell bill, under discussion now, calls for an increase in the funds to support experimental work in these stations, for the existing funds are proving entirely inadequate for their needs. And why? First of all, the development of the extension services of these States has multiplied the demands on the institutions for information and service. It must also be remembered that the purchasing power of money has so greatly diminished that the funds now available to each State will do vastly less work than when the early laws were passed. Then, too, new problems in agriculture, such as the distribution and marketing of farm products and the improvement of the rural social life, have arisen and are demanding exhaustive research.

Let us take the typical farm, go the rounds, and see wherein that farm has felt the results of research. A silo stands at one end of the barn. Whence came the silo? Research established the fact that corn preserved in an air-tight, circular container made a nutritious and palatable food for livestock during the winter. A uniform type herd of dairy cattle is grazing in a field of clover. The basis of selection of those animals for high milk production traces back to work in breeding for dairy type at experiment stations. The mouthfuls of clover they are consuming are very likely the result of combining the use of pure seed bred at a college station, good cultural methods established by experimental trials, proper fertilization founded on experimental evidence, and systematic rotation of crops based on experiment station teachings.

Look at the lengthy, upstanding, arch-back "porkers" over in the feed lot helping themselves to a balanced ration from a self-feeder. Where is the chunky, short pig of our forefathers' day? Experiments in feeding and breeding of swine at our experiment stations have shown that economical pork production demands the "1924 model" hog. Why the balanced ration and self-feeder? Feeding trials proved that the old method of raising hogs on corn and water in a dark, dingy pen was obsolete. A potato sprayer is operating in the near-by field. Grandfather would have sneered at the practice of sprinkling the

potato field, but plant pathologists have proven that the yield per acre can be increased at least one-third by proper spraying to control plant diseases. And remember an increased yield means a lowered cost of production and a greater margin of profit to the producer. And so on down the line of farm practices we find the touch of the experiment station's hand, often unknown to the farmer himself. You might ask the farmer where he gained his information for improved practices. His answer might be, "From my neighbor or from my farm paper." But trace these improved practices to their true source and you will find that they emanated from an experiment station in some section of the country.

Thus far, I have been speaking largely in terms of generalities. Now, I am going to give you a few concrete examples of just how our own experiment station in Pennsylvania has been of service to the people of our State.

Take for instance the fertilizer experiments on the college farm that have been running for 40 consecutive years. Incidentally, they are the oldest in America. I am told that the lessons on crop rotations, manure and commercial fertilizers brought out by these experiments have been worth far more to Pennsylvania farmers than the entire cost of experimental work at the college.

The development of one variety of wheat, "Pennsylvania 44," has meant an increased yield per acre of over 5 bushels wherever it was sown. Last year over 100,000 acres were sown to this variety, which was bred by a plant-breeding expert on the experimental staff. Figures show that if this seed was used over the entire State, the value of the wheat crop would be increased \$10,000,000 annually over the annual income derived from wheat before this variety was developed. And remember, it does not take any more labor to raise "Pennsylvania 44" wheat than it did to produce the old common varieties.

Experiments in plant breeding at our college have resulted in three other noteworthy contributions to the agricultural prosperity of the country. One strain and two new varieties of tomatoes and a superior strain of cabbage have been of great value to the truck growers and consumers of Pennsylvania. The Penn State Earliana tomato, developed at the college, has given an increased yield of more than 2½ tons per acre in many instances. Recent tests conducted with Penn State ballhead cabbage, which originated on the station farm, show that it produced 20 tons per acre where supposedly good commercial strains under similar conditions yielded only 17 tons.

Nearly three-fourths of Pennsylvania apple orchards are in permanent sod, and the investigations carried on by the station have proven conclusively the value of nitrogenous fertilizers in sod orchards. As a result, hundreds of fruit growers in the State are using nitrate of soda and are finding it profitable.

Result of research work in animal husbandry have revolutionized the steer-feeding industry in Pennsylvania by proving the value and economy of feeding silage with a proper protein supplement. The value of forage crops for swine and the types best suited for this purpose were also determined and the majority of the hog men of the State have followed the recommendations with great success.

Southwestern Pennsylvania is the most important sheep-producing center in the State. Practically all the sheep grown are fine wools, so that the major portion of the income from these flocks is wool. To find another source of income for these farmers an experiment was started in 1915 to study the value of grade Merino ewes as a farm flock when bred to high-class mutton rams for the purpose of producing "hothouse lambs." I understand that this experiment resulted in these farmers securing a maximum amount of wool and at the same time marketing a high-class lamb at an early age.

Investigations in plant-disease control, carried on for several years, have led to campaigns of disease control out in the State that have saved thousands of dollars to the tillers of the soil. Potato spraying alone has reduced the cost of production per bushel to such an extent that the industry has been practically saved from ruin. Diseases of truck crops have been investigated at our branch station at Bustleton, Pa., and the results have led to the control of lettuce and rhubarb diseases that threatened the industry.

Lancaster, the county which I have the honor to represent, has been, as many of you know, the richest and most productive agricultural county in the United States for more than

half a century, as the tabulated statement at the conclusion of these remarks indicates. For more than 200 years, these soils have been pouring forth bountiful crops and to-day most of the land is in a high state of fertility. The 10,000 or more farms in Lancaster County, with their neat, well-kept buildings, their trim fence rows, their bounteous crops, and improved herds, reflect the industry, the intelligence, and the foresight of the pioneers who settled the county more than two centuries ago. Probably in no other part of the world have the abundant gifts of nature been so well preserved for future generations.

And yet Lancaster County, with its naturally fertile fields and its intelligent, industrious class of farmers, will have to credit part of its success to the application of scientific principles in farming. Furthermore, farmers of Lancaster County realize that now, more than ever before, they must depend on science to enable them to maintain the leadership they have held so long and the prosperity that has been theirs.

We have an immense steer-feeding industry within the county turning out from 60,000 to 80,000 choice beefs in a year. For years the practice was to feed corn, bran, and hay as a fattening ration. It remained for science to prove the economy of feeding silage and cottonseed meal, and my constituents tell me that this substitution has really saved the industry in our present economic depression. Truly, it can be said that the many silos dotting the farmsteads stand as monuments to science. The open-shed method of cattle feeding, proven sound and economical by the experiment station, has replaced the old method in Lancaster County and in the leading beef sections of the country.

This county ranks among the leaders in the United States in tobacco production. Where most districts have shown a marked decrease in the yield per acre since 1890, a comparison of these early figures with the United States Government annual report of 1922 shows that the Lancaster County yield has shown a marked increase. And why? Tobacco growers tell me it has been due partly to the farming system practiced and partly to an improved strain developed by the experiment station. More than 50 per cent of the acreage at the present time is planted to this improved strain, which not only yields better but is also of high curing quality. Right in this connection I might say that the steam sterilization of tobacco beds in Lancaster County was originated by an experiment station staff member. This practice has now been adopted in every tobacco-growing district in the country.

Wheat is a part of the crop rotation on many of the farms in our county. For years we raised a score or more of different varieties, some of them ill adapted to our conditions. Then came the development of "Pennsylvania 44" at the station farm, and to-day Lancaster is headed toward a standardization of wheat that will mean not only a better yield but also a uniform, marketable product. Already 2,500 acres of this improved variety is being grown in the county, and the acreage is doubling each year.

Although only a small part of the experimental work has been cited, it is sufficient to prove the immense value this work has been to the producers and consumers. And yet, with all this work, the farmers are ever presenting unsolved problems to the experiment station. Most of the examples I have related have been along the line of production. There are those who argue that too much work has been performed on this side which has resulted in our present depression. I want to say that the main object and ultimate results of this work have not been greater production but more economic production.

Right along this trend of thought are the problems of distribution and marketing of farm products, which are demanding solution in our State and which are the subject of so much discussion all over the country. At the present time our station has a comprehensive research program planned on problems of distribution, marketing, and rural social life, which can not be carried out because of a lack of funds. Would it not be well for us to vote reasonable amounts of money, as carried in the pending bill, to support careful, sane, accurate studies on these problems?

Gentlemen, the future prosperity of the agricultural industry and the maintenance of the present standard of living of our ever-increasing urban population depend primarily on more economical production and proper distribution of our farm products. Just when there is a crying need for research in agriculture, when the very lifeblood and backbone of our farming population are despondent and migrating to cities, we can not afford to refuse to give our support to experiment stations that can do much to place agriculture back on its feet.

Agricultural statistics of the 10 leading counties in the United States, Census of 1920

| Counties | Total land area | All land in farms | Value of farm property | Value of crops | Value of livestock products | Value of animals sold or slaughtered | Aggregate value of farm products | Value of products per acre | Rank |
|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| Lancaster, Pa. | 602,240 | 554,776 | \$119,842,187 | \$32,803,002 | \$8,585,613 | \$6,759,527 | \$48,148,142 | \$86.78 | 1 |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | 2,602,880 | 882,333 | 396,915,164 | 62,212,843 | 9,537,695 | 1,601,615 | 73,352,143 | 83.13 | 2 |
| San Bernardino, Calif. | 12,900,480 | 415,738 | 99,648,710 | 26,681,925 | 1,324,443 | 391,540 | 28,397,908 | 68.31 | 3 |
| Aroostook, Me. | 4,129,920 | 850,208 | 77,759,326 | 52,541,205 | 1,713,022 | 1,245,143 | 55,499,370 | 65.27 | 4 |
| San Joaquin, Calif. | 926,720 | 706,308 | 140,600,079 | 39,748,032 | 3,060,576 | 1,482,206 | 44,329,814 | 62.76 | 5 |
| McLean, Ill. | 726,240 | 714,400 | 267,332,051 | 26,887,618 | 2,186,278 | 5,892,034 | 34,965,930 | 48.94 | 6 |
| Champaign, Ill. | 667,520 | 604,827 | 233,673,411 | 23,688,925 | 1,782,850 | 2,354,726 | 27,826,501 | 46.07 | 7 |
| La Salle, Ill. | 733,440 | 668,560 | 213,717,733 | 24,191,389 | 2,178,056 | 2,924,537 | 29,292,982 | 43.81 | 8 |
| Tulare, Calif. | 3,107,840 | 1,084,234 | 198,312,596 | 33,329,607 | 3,414,764 | 2,893,918 | 39,638,289 | 36.55 | 9 |
| Whitman, Wash. | 1,349,120 | 1,252,485 | 135,765,506 | 30,824,407 | 989,568 | 1,632,412 | 83,446,387 | 26.10 | 10 |

HAUGEN-M'NARY BILL

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

We have now reached a stage where agriculture has been taxed so long to support other industries that it has become almost useless to try to produce a profit on the farm.

I believe, however, that the great majority of the farmers of the country will refuse to be deceived any longer and will turn their attention to the real opportunities of relief that lie before them of cheaper transportation, and especially water transportation, and to cheaper fertilizers; to cooperation in marketing, to reduction of taxes, and to other feasible plans of relief whereby all the people will be afforded a distinct advantage over present conditions.

The farmer never has and never will ask for charity, for he is not a beggar. All he wants is an equal opportunity with other classes and not to be discriminated against to the advantage of other industries and to his detriment. He is tired of selling his product in the open market and being required to buy his necessities in a protected market, thereby selling at a low price and buying at a high price. The situation of the farmer is worse to-day than at any period in the history of the farming business in this country. It is a gloomy picture that is presented by everyone who has traveled through the Western States and is familiar with the agricultural situation. The wheat farmer is not the only one in trouble. Virtually every farmer is in a bad predicament and facing ruin. They find themselves unable not only to pay their taxes and debts, but they can not even pay their interest.

According to the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1923:

In 15 corn and wheat producing States 24 1/2 per cent of owners of farms were, in fact, bankrupt; practically one out of every four bankrupt.

One million two hundred thousand left the farm to better their financial conditions in 1922.

In New York alone for the year ending February, 1923, 26,000 moved from the farms to the cities.

In Michigan 10 per cent of the Michigan farms are vacant, and 13 per cent more are only partly worked.

According to the annual report of the Attorney General on bankruptcy among farmers:

The number of Iowa farmers in bankruptcy increased from 60 in 1913 to 489 in 1923.

Farmers' percentage of all cases in bankruptcy increased from 16.8 per cent in 1913 to 52.3 per cent in 1923. In other words, 52 farmers to 43 of all other classes in bankruptcy. The number of farmers in all cases in bankruptcy in all the States increased from 942 in 1913 to 5,940 in 1923, an increase of 4,998 in 10 years.

Bank failures in the United States have increased by leaps and bounds. More State and National banks were closed in the last seven months than in the previous five-year period.

Many suggestions as to what ought to be done to relieve the distressing situation and insure a profit to the farmer for his wheat have been offered by men who assume a knowledge of conditions.

The great need of the farmer to-day is a steady market for his product and a relief from the burdens of the high protective tariff. The great underlying principle that governs the value of wheat in this country is the law that operates in supply and demand. I intend to vote for the McNary-Haugen bill, because it seems to be the only farmers' measure for which I will have an opportunity to vote. However, I am accepting this just as the farmer is accepting it. In their desperation and dire extremity they are like the drowning man grasping at a straw, their plight can be made no worse by this legislation. It is

patent that they are not going to get much consideration from this session, so if there is any virtue in this bill let us have it.

I believe a study of the following statistical tables compiled by the Department of Agriculture will convince anyone that we have many customers in the world's markets who are large buyers of our wheat and flour and have been and are now buying in large quantities of these commodities:

Wheat exports from the United States, year ending June 30

| Country to which exported | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | 1913 | 1914 | Average 1910-1914 |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> |
| Belgium | 5,976,110 | 2,470,787 | 4,054,171 | 10,601,248 | 12,873,372 | 7,195,138 |
| Denmark | 839,499 | 198,220 | 483,319 | 415,479 | 870,433 | 561,390 |
| France | 855,668 | 3,648,407 | 35,977 | 4,951,708 | 5,536,731 | 3,001,698 |
| Germany | 5,367,325 | 721,240 | 1,588,666 | 12,112,223 | 10,983,060 | 6,154,505 |
| Greece | 11,957 | 36 | 298,937 | — | — | 62,102 |
| Italy | 1,900,044 | 286,171 | 533,009 | 7,247,479 | 1,839,830 | 2,367,307 |
| Netherlands | 2,935,352 | 890,221 | 3,386,444 | 14,832,000 | 19,949,519 | 8,350,709 |
| Norway | 147,060 | — | — | — | 71,895 | 43,791 |
| Portugal | 7,863 | 100,000 | 184,800 | 710,329 | 1,753,801 | 551,859 |
| Spain | — | — | — | — | 127,871 | 25,574 |
| Sweden | — | — | — | — | 272,500 | 54,600 |
| Switzerland | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| United Kingdom | 22,393,361 | 11,298,036 | 15,765,454 | 31,548,507 | 28,025,206 | 21,806,112 |
| Canada | 2,111,370 | 1,256,783 | 537,240 | 851,139 | 4,124,701 | 1,776,247 |
| Mexico | 3,179,096 | 273,313 | 1,491,156 | 644,377 | 306,378 | 1,178,864 |
| Cuba | 10,172 | 11,915 | 23,200 | 45,889 | 52,315 | 28,698 |
| Brazil | 17 | 21 | 11 | 81 | 4,203 | 867 |
| Chile | 7 | — | — | — | — | 3 |
| Peru | 329,786 | 79,745 | 189,656 | 190,305 | 21,433 | 162,185 |
| Venezuela | — | — | 35 | 37 | 121 | 39 |
| Hongkong | — | 39,193 | — | — | — | 7,839 |
| Japan | 127,498 | 2,048,382 | 707,982 | 4,179,296 | 4,627,600 | 2,338,152 |
| Australia | 4 | — | — | — | — | 1 |
| Philippine Islands | — | 45 | — | — | — | 9 |
| British South Africa | 39,919 | — | 4,000 | 191,362 | 89,826 | 65,021 |
| Other countries | 627,728 | 406,793 | 1,176,092 | 2,832,570 | 862,982 | 1,181,030 |
| Total | 46,679,876 | 23,729,302 | 30,160,212 | 91,602,974 | 92,393,775 | 56,913,228 |

| Country to which exported | 1915 | 1916 | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 | Average 1915-1919 |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> |
| Belgium | 5,320,685 | 2,682,919 | 2,698,044 | 6,007,986 | 25,972,439 | 8,536,415 |
| Denmark | 2,754,746 | 1,655,391 | 1,157,321 | — | — | 1,113,492 |
| France | 49,878,655 | 21,802,818 | 16,253,262 | 3,837,927 | 13,297,243 | 21,013,981 |
| Germany | 2,652,128 | — | — | — | — | 530,426 |
| Greece | 8,768,549 | 11,688,691 | 4,811,158 | — | 96,225 | 5,072,525 |
| Italy | 47,122,740 | 31,441,667 | 13,746,412 | 6,766,191 | 32,689,845 | 26,351,391 |
| Netherlands | 31,651,992 | 21,070,335 | 19,127,675 | 155,550 | 3,904,617 | 15,162,034 |
| Norway | 2,504,051 | 1,838,380 | 3,156,279 | 1,014,329 | — | 1,702,908 |
| Portugal | 859,237 | 1,863,212 | 600,980 | 27,505 | 1,448,493 | 659,885 |
| Spain | 7,155,971 | 7,041,608 | 851,550 | — | 248,683 | 3,059,562 |
| Sweden | 4,093,080 | 4,786,497 | 5,385,480 | — | — | 2,853,011 |
| Switzerland | 520,720 | 182,613 | 6,048,799 | 496,709 | 5,447,881 | 2,638,744 |
| United Kingdom | 65,911,501 | 53,550,376 | 67,976,120 | 15,129,803 | 66,147,422 | 53,743,011 |
| Canada | 19,664,674 | 6,244,732 | 4,714,836 | 253,540 | 28,484,027 | 11,472,162 |
| Mexico | 296,581 | 17,624 | 54,597 | 2,126 | 1,609 | 74,507 |
| Cuba | 53,604 | 250,500 | 30,398 | 26,014 | 2,101 | 76,523 |
| Brazil | 1,511,361 | 1,154,715 | 166 | 16,576 | — | 536,596 |
| Chile | 3,580 | 526,942 | — | — | — | 106,114 |
| Peru | 1,018,645 | 1,325,040 | 246,034 | 69,270 | — | 531,598 |
| Venezuela | 199 | 480 | 218 | — | — | 179 |
| Hongkong | 118 | 162 | — | — | — | 56 |
| Japan | 758,517 | 14,828 | — | — | — | 154,669 |
| Australia | 1,087,829 | 1,507,680 | — | — | — | 519,102 |
| Philippine Islands | — | 60 | — | — | — | 12 |
| British South Africa | 1,951,017 | 389,978 | 5,058 | 24 | 28 | 469,221 |
| Other countries | 4,204,353 | 2,237,767 | 2,949,892 | 326,303 | 2,842,050 | 2,512,073 |
| Total | 259,642,533 | 173,274,015 | 149,831,427 | 34,118,553 | 178,582,673 | 159,089,900 |

Wheat exports from the United States, year ending June 30—Con.

| Country to which exported | 1920 | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Belgium | 13,459,601 | 26,287,508 | 17,526,947 | 11,345,230 |
| Denmark | 96,000 | 354,778 | 52,171 | 171 |
| France | 27,118,375 | 24,394,485 | 5,694,328 | 14,750,870 |
| Germany | 862,649 | 25,526,694 | 21,782,679 | 8,492,567 |
| Greece | 766,184 | 4,825,243 | 8,024 | 898,671 |
| Italy | 27,235,629 | 57,123,068 | 25,656,391 | 33,771,801 |
| Netherlands | 166,877 | 21,279,062 | 19,267,764 | 12,246,739 |
| Norway | 186,833 | 1,054,288 | 262,671 | 1,241,986 |
| Portugal | — | 1,537,565 | 808,666 | — |
| Spain | 52,266 | 9,164,153 | 2,448,805 | 23,997 |
| Sweden | — | 1,487,800 | 319,168 | 472,696 |
| Switzerland | 2,154,598 | 395,363 | 40,364 | — |
| United Kingdom | 39,788,117 | 88,784,515 | 48,808,181 | 28,237,471 |
| Canada | 8,356,252 | 10,746,837 | 29,341,235 | 31,992,628 |
| Mexico | 244,986 | 1,145,733 | 3,000,640 | 1,290,531 |
| Cuba | 93,761 | 27,000 | — | 22,231 |
| Brazil | 199 | 2,977,639 | 1,517,398 | 185 |
| Chile | 4 | 2,000 | 600 | — |
| Peru | — | 637,948 | 1,141,991 | 59,350 |
| Venezuela | 82 | 1 | 23 | 2,325 |
| Hongkong | — | — | — | 46,667 |
| Japan | 10,141 | 1,205,791 | 11,002,363 | 5,253,422 |
| Philippine Islands | — | 3,267 | — | — |
| British South Africa | 18,467 | 521,223 | 16,700 | 333 |
| Other countries | 2,575,303 | 14,003,137 | 9,129,328 | 4,703,959 |
| Total | 122,430,724 | 293,267,637 | 208,321,091 | 154,950,971 |

SOURCE: Official reports of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Wheat flour exports from the United States, year ending June 30

| Country to which exported | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | 1913 | 1914 | Average 1910-1914 |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|
| Belgium | 13,451 | 16,991 | 5,196 | 20,850 | 12,724 | 12,624 |
| Denmark | 192,344 | 242,849 | 285,045 | 243,849 | 288,299 | 244,417 |
| France | 714 | 4,368 | 6,739 | 9,440 | 13,349 | 6,918 |
| Germany | 238,899 | 226,227 | 180,328 | 170,345 | 176,488 | 187,437 |
| Greece | 336 | 218 | 2,273 | 2,418 | 170 | 1,068 |
| Italy | 9,030 | 13,288 | 3,589 | 11,418 | 18,914 | 11,260 |
| Netherlands | 739,146 | 860,590 | 675,429 | 859,987 | 958,063 | 848,637 |
| Norway | 180,431 | 168,908 | 176,484 | 266,287 | 301,397 | 212,713 |
| Portugal | 2,274 | 2,122 | 3,057 | 1,844 | 2,125 | 2,284 |
| Spain | 589 | 1,678 | 1,931 | 1,376 | 2,777 | 1,550 |
| Sweden | 62,314 | 24,864 | 16,328 | 50,680 | 62,939 | 43,406 |
| Switzerland | 3 | — | — | — | 100 | 24 |
| United Kingdom | 3,161,435 | 2,790,998 | 2,372,797 | 2,428,167 | 2,869,800 | 2,712,639 |
| Canada | 49,981 | 42,947 | 99,760 | 98,665 | 122,752 | 82,821 |
| Mexico | 28,469 | 32,165 | 22,993 | 25,738 | 47,241 | 31,314 |
| Cuba | 791,850 | 846,684 | 842,168 | 907,786 | 892,708 | 850,289 |
| Brazil | 339,708 | 320,084 | 625,399 | 583,418 | 748,612 | 567,444 |
| Chile | 4,271 | 18,034 | 35,357 | 28,781 | 132,324 | 47,733 |
| Peru | 109,496 | 160,485 | 88,586 | 94,343 | 118,159 | 130,345 |
| Venezuela | 120,617 | 140,806 | 174,572 | 208,517 | 188,780 | 160,671 |
| Hongkong | 668,692 | 1,003,529 | 1,491,073 | 1,301,306 | 1,141,095 | 1,121,139 |
| Japan | 217,758 | 458,397 | 716,347 | 878,623 | 799,269 | 612,879 |
| Australia | — | — | 303 | — | — | 101 |
| Philippine Islands | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| British South Africa | 250,442 | 226,629 | 308,671 | 370,939 | 236,602 | 278,717 |
| Other countries | 8,462 | 9,990 | 6,781 | 14,606 | 5,576 | 9,491 |
| Total | 1,865,545 | 2,293,146 | 2,943,204 | 2,815,817 | 2,756,904 | 2,534,923 |

| Country to which reported | 1915 | 1916 | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 | Average, 1915-1919 |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|--------------------|
| Belgium | 724,116 | 68,559 | — | 524,017 | 792,199 | 427,778 |
| Denmark | 487,477 | 286,305 | 166,405 | 30,831 | 160,767 | 224,637 |
| France | 2,149,031 | 2,896,757 | 1,429,128 | 4,845,858 | 3,984,365 | 3,068,628 |
| Germany | 8,240 | — | — | — | — | 1,695 |
| Greece | 350,906 | 453,367 | 388,708 | 47,937 | 129,841 | 275,974 |
| Italy | 111,891 | 1,074,319 | 987,686 | 3,385,773 | 2,393,974 | 1,590,728 |
| Netherlands | 1,725,807 | 210,644 | 591,182 | 69,258 | 1,117,018 | 744,881 |
| Norway | 967,888 | 912,743 | 715,077 | 214,816 | 185,345 | 599,173 |
| Portugal | 2,187 | 5,705 | 4,585 | 89,540 | 42,867 | 28,977 |
| Spain | 23,024 | 49,744 | 5,615 | 78,300 | — | 26,549 |
| Sweden | 114,611 | 95,043 | 21,882 | 49 | 18 | 46,319 |
| Switzerland | 1,173 | — | 55 | 182,058 | 601,391 | 166,617 |
| United Kingdom | 4,186,937 | 3,145,080 | 3,015,525 | 10,055,827 | 10,896,719 | 6,253,840 |
| Canada | 110,698 | 50,424 | 77,115 | 38,334 | 83,701 | 71,162 |
| Mexico | 198,056 | 728,143 | 930,894 | 398,550 | 384,040 | 521,676 |
| Cuba | 924,959 | 1,124,562 | 1,016,675 | 679,689 | 1,058,028 | 960,782 |
| Brazil | 707,703 | 794,726 | 301,614 | 101,927 | 81,639 | 375,579 |
| Chile | 284,953 | 493,403 | 79,997 | 2,598 | 200 | 186,228 |
| Peru | 49,347 | 98,594 | 181,023 | 54,765 | 3,658 | 77,477 |
| Venezuela | 154,607 | 171,758 | 146,812 | 24,403 | 74,533 | 114,423 |
| Hongkong | 629,978 | 856,263 | 61,800 | 1,230 | 1,506 | 209,589 |
| Japan | 68,542 | 54,475 | 4,082 | 69 | 27 | 25,499 |
| Australia | 366 | 161 | 15 | — | — | 111 |
| Philippine Islands | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| British South Africa | 303,792 | 385,371 | 70,089 | 549 | 6,039 | 154,368 |
| Other countries | 45,493 | 23,944 | 10,955 | 10 | 88 | 16,998 |
| Total | 1,905,432 | 2,080,709 | 1,728,187 | 1,049,500 | 2,264,104 | 1,809,586 |

Wheat flour exports from the United States, years ending June 30—Continued

| Country to which exported | 1920 | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Belgium | 1,201,191 | 565,191 | 123,479 | 42,072 |
| Denmark | 18,576 | 87,173 | 359,403 | 194,699 |
| France | 2,832,952 | 11,385 | 10,174 | 11,529 |
| Germany | 278,136 | 1,968,070 | 1,516,353 | 1,062,694 |
| Greece | 155,001 | 419,917 | 63,810 | 317,738 |
| Italy | 2,484,823 | 215,277 | 50,968 | 54,280 |
| Netherlands | 117,234 | 1,263,405 | 917,560 | 682,736 |
| Norway | 11,428 | 242,134 | 408,419 | 216,355 |
| Portugal | 57,998 | 805 | 3,270 | 3,821 |
| Spain | 96,407 | 174,665 | 860 | 1,274 |
| Sweden | 102,102 | 223,432 | 137,734 | 105,507 |
| Switzerland | 11,577 | 2 | 1,125 | 564 |
| United Kingdom | 4,743,341 | 3,090,158 | 3,190,762 | 1,913,833 |
| Canada | 16,313 | 35,501 | 68,216 | 66,936 |
| Mexico | 201,054 | 339,693 | 245,665 | 365,664 |
| Cuba | 1,698,144 | 988,341 | 1,088,721 | 1,088,582 |
| Brazil | 381,851 | 622,065 | 327,078 | 477,568 |
| Chile | 520 | 2,607 | 10,668 | 28,612 |
| Peru | 15,634 | 92,109 | 66,367 | 111,374 |
| Venezuela | 126,276 | 148,855 | 77,308 | 83,061 |
| Hongkong | 158,180 | 142,495 | 978,255 | 825,197 |
| Japan | 106,933 | 18,598 | 629,012 | 394,900 |
| Australia | 85 | — | 5 | 2,681 |
| Philippine Islands | 98,669 | 107,704 | 333,046 | 469,838 |
| British South Africa | 947 | 44,235 | 1,785 | 11,395 |
| Other countries | 6,767,319 | 5,248,465 | 6,213,855 | 6,199,754 |
| Total | 21,651,961 | 16,179,956 | 15,796,819 | 14,882,714 |

SOURCE: Official reports of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Wheat, including flour, in bushels, exported from the United States, year ending June 30

| Country to which exported | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | 1913 | 1914 | Average 1910-1914 |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------|
| Belgium | 6,036,640 | 2,520,247 | 4,077,148 | 10,685,073 | 12,930,630 | 7,251,948 |
| Denmark | 1,705,047 | 1,291,040 | 1,681,021 | 1,511,449 | 2,167,779 | 1,661,267 |
| France | 688,881 | 3,667,995 | 6,671,675 | 4,674,188 | 6,696,801 | 3,032,828 |
| Germany | 6,416,871 | 1,739,262 | 2,175,142 | 12,528,775 | 11,777,242 | 6,998,088 |
| Greece | 13,490 | 1,017 | 10,228 | 309,818 | 1,924,765 | 67,065 |
| Italy | 2,060,679 | 945,957 | 549,205 | 7,268,880 | 1,417,933 | 1,417,933 |
| Netherlands | 6,021,519 | 4,762,741 | 6,426,874 | 16,701,842 | 24,399,893 | 12,604,576 |
| Norway | 824,006 | 769,356 | 794,178 | 1,188,252 | 1,428,181 | 1,001,001 |
| Portugal | 18,996 | 109,889 | 196,556 | 718,627 | 1,765,363 | 501,638 |
| Spain | 2,686 | 4,851 | 8,099 | 6,192 | 540,367 | 33,850 |
| Sweden | 280,413 | 111,889 | 73,462 | 227,637 | 558,226 | 249,826 |
| Switzerland | 14 | — | — | — | 450 | 93 |
| United Kingdom | 36,619,819 | 23,857,521 | 26,443,040 | 42,475,521 | 40,869,990 | 34,012,960 |
| Canada | 2,226,284 | 1,450,045 | 960,360 | 1,265,251 | 2,146,911 | 1,468,911 |
| Mexico | 3,307,396 | 418,055 | 1,594,467 | 760,199 | 518,960 | 1,310,777 |
| Cuba | 3,573,497 | 3,821,997 | 3,812,956 | 4,090,926 | 4,069,487 | 3,881,773 |
| Chile | 1,618,703 | 2,340,399 | 2,814,307 | 2,625,462 | 3,822,957 | 2,534,996 |
| Peru | 10,227 | 81,188 | 189,806 | 129,522 | 686,868 | 214,893 |
| Venezuela | 821,168 | 936,703 | 588,246 | 614,849 | 658,149 | 702,832 |
| Hongkong | 542,776 | 633,910 | 785,099 | 938,303 | 714,031 | 723,668 |
| Japan | 3,000,114 | 4,845,073 | 6,709,828 | 5,838,877 | 5,194,928 | 6,032,964 |
| Australia | 1,107,409 | 4,111,168 | 3,981,544 | 8,132,160 | 8,197,340 | 5,096,196 |
| Philippine Islands | 4 | — | 2,264 | — | — | 454 |
| British South Africa | 1,126,989 | 1,019,875 | 1,389,020 | 1,609,226 | 1,066,039 | 1,254,234 |
| Other countries | 78,133 | 44,966 | 43,514 | 257,084 | 114,618 | 107,729 |
| Total | 9,022,680 | 10,725,952 | 14,419,512 | 15,009,746 | 13,269,662 | 12,568,188 |

| Country to which exported | 1915 | 1916 | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 | Average 1915-1919 |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------|
| Belgium | 8,579,207 | 3,126,435 | 2,698,044 | 8,366,062 | 29,537,334 | 10,461,417 |
| Denmark | 4,948,392 | 2,943,813 | 1,915,163 | 91,490 | 223,451 | 2,194,353 |
| France | 59,549,295 | 34,793,224 | 22,694,338 | 25,662,096 | 31,226,885 | 34,778,156 |
| Germany | 2,689,208 | — | — | — | — | 537,842 |
| Greece | 10,885,531 | 13,726,933 | 6,569,544 | 275,716 | 689,599 | 6,514,407 |
| Italy</ | | | | | | |

Wheat, including flour, in bushels, exported from the United States, year ending June 30—Continued

| Country to which exported | 1915 | 1916 | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 | Average 1915-1919 |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Philippine Islands | 1,367,064 | 1,734,230 | 842,400 | 2,470 | 27,176 | 694,688 |
| British South Africa | 2,155,735 | 497,726 | 54,356 | 69 | 424 | 541,682 |
| Other countries | 12,778,797 | 11,600,955 | 10,726,732 | 5,049,052 | 13,120,518 | 10,655,211 |
| Total | 332,464,975 | 243,117,026 | 203,573,928 | 132,578,632 | 287,401,579 | 239,827,227 |

| Country to which exported | 1920 | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | Average, 1920-1924 |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|--------------------|
| Belgium | 18,864,960 | 28,830,868 | 18,082,608 | 11,534,554 | ----- | ----- |
| Denmark | 83,592 | 488,278 | 1,972,092 | 929,216 | ----- | ----- |
| France | 39,866,659 | 24,445,717 | 5,740,121 | 14,802,750 | ----- | ----- |
| Germany | 1,554,461 | 84,473,309 | 28,006,267 | 13,274,645 | ----- | ----- |
| Greece | 1,403,688 | 6,714,870 | 295,169 | 2,328,492 | ----- | ----- |
| Italy | 38,417,332 | 58,541,814 | 35,881,652 | 34,016,061 | ----- | ----- |
| Netherlands | 714,385 | 27,064,384 | 23,386,784 | 16,669,042 | ----- | ----- |
| Norway | 238,259 | 2,143,891 | 2,100,516 | 2,216,484 | ----- | ----- |
| Portugal | 260,856 | 1,541,188 | 823,381 | 17,194 | ----- | ----- |
| Spain | 486,098 | 9,950,146 | 2,452,676 | 29,730 | ----- | ----- |
| Sweden | 459,459 | 2,493,469 | 1,138,971 | 947,478 | ----- | ----- |
| Switzerland | 2,206,694 | 335,372 | 45,426 | 2,588 | ----- | ----- |
| United Kingdom | 61,133,151 | 102,690,226 | 63,166,610 | 36,849,720 | ----- | ----- |
| Canada | 8,429,660 | 10,906,611 | 29,648,237 | 32,293,840 | ----- | ----- |
| Mexico | 1,419,729 | 2,765,251 | 4,106,138 | 2,906,019 | ----- | ----- |
| Cuba | 7,225,409 | 4,465,534 | 4,806,244 | 4,920,850 | ----- | ----- |
| Brazil | 1,716,729 | 5,776,936 | 2,988,979 | 2,149,191 | ----- | ----- |
| Chile | 2,344 | 11,032 | 48,156 | 128,754 | ----- | ----- |
| Peru | 70,443 | 1,052,438 | 1,436,143 | 500,533 | ----- | ----- |
| Venezuela | 613,324 | 669,849 | 347,909 | 376,300 | ----- | ----- |
| Hongkong | 711,810 | 641,228 | 4,379,648 | 3,730,054 | ----- | ----- |
| Japan | 491,340 | 1,290,482 | 13,832,917 | 6,453,942 | ----- | ----- |
| Australia | 382 | ----- | 23 | 12,064 | ----- | ----- |
| Philippine Island | 443,966 | 892,935 | 1,498,707 | 2,114,271 | ----- | ----- |
| British South Africa | 21,579 | 720,381 | 26,732 | 51,610 | ----- | ----- |
| Other countries | 83,028,239 | 37,171,230 | 32,591,676 | 32,607,852 | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 219,864,548 | 366,077,439 | 279,406,777 | 221,923,184 | ----- | ----- |

Wheat, wheat flour, and wheat, including flour: Domestic exports from the United States, year ending June 30, 1910-1923

| Year ending June 30— | Wheat | | Wheat flour | Wheat, including flour |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|
| | Bushels | Barrels | | |
| 1910 | 46,679,876 | 9,040,987 | 87,364,318 | |
| 1911 | 23,729,302 | 10,129,435 | 69,311,760 | |
| 1912 | 30,160,212 | 11,006,487 | 79,689,404 | |
| 1913 | 91,602,974 | 11,394,805 | 142,879,696 | |
| 1914 | 92,393,775 | 11,821,461 | 145,590,350 | |
| Average 1910-14 | 56,913,228 | 10,678,635 | 104,967,085 | |
| 1915 | 259,642,533 | 16,182,765 | 332,464,975 | |
| 1916 | 173,274,015 | 15,520,669 | 243,117,026 | |
| 1917 | 149,831,427 | 11,942,778 | 203,573,928 | |
| 1918 | 34,118,853 | 21,879,961 | 132,578,632 | |
| 1919 | 178,582,673 | 24,181,979 | 287,401,579 | |
| Average 1915-19 | 159,080,900 | 17,941,627 | 239,827,227 | |
| 1920 | 122,430,724 | 21,651,961 | 219,864,548 | |
| 1921 | 293,267,637 | 16,179,956 | 366,077,439 | |
| 1922 | 208,321,061 | 15,796,819 | 279,406,777 | |
| 1923 | 154,950,971 | 14,882,714 | 221,923,184 | |

Compiled from Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1914-1918, and Monthly Summaries of Foreign Commerce of the United States, June, 1919-1923.

We should endeavor to increase this list of buyers by every legitimate means. The disposal of our surplus products in foreign markets at a fair price is the one vital thing necessary for prosperous times among the farmers. Temporary advantages may be gained by placing fictitious values on grain or by storing great quantities of it, but eventually this surplus must be disposed of or it will come back upon the home market if stored in this country or upon the foreign market if allowed to accumulate there. As soon as this condition arises the price of the farmer's product will fall or the markets both foreign and domestic will be glutted. So it is the duty of this Nation to see to it that the surplus is not only exported but consumed. The farmer is not greatly impressed with the idea that the Government can fix the price on his wheat by simply placing a fictitious and arbitrary price thereon, then relieve his anxiety by buying up his wheat and his troubles at fancy prices and dumping the surplus on a foreign market at whatever price can be obtained and without regard as to whether that particular country needs it or not.

What the farmer wants is to get down to the only real practical solution of the difficulty and that is to so cut down the cost of production and delivery to a market that is able and ready to eat and pay for what he produces so that there will be left to him a profit.

We must have an honest demand from foreign countries for our wheat as it comes upon the market. It must be kept moving toward the point of consumption in order to avoid congestion of both our home and foreign markets because congestion would cause a depression and lower prices. It is obvious the more active the demand for our wheat from outside buyers the stronger the markets here at home.

First, it is necessary for us to do all that can be done through our Government to broaden and expand a foreign demand for our wheat. Teach these people to eat more wheat bread. If there is no other way, I would favor an active, intensive advertising campaign throughout foreign countries to instruct and enlighten the people concerning the benefits to be derived from eating the derivatives of American wheat. This would stimulate the markets here at home and make for higher prices to the producer.

Second, we must lessen the cost of production and reduce the taxes, both Federal and State. Let Congress repeal the Fordney-McCumber tariff law, which is one of the greatest evils that was ever foisted upon the American farmer. This law levies a tax upon him every minute in the day by adding to the cost of everything he buys from his hat upon his head down to the shoes upon his feet. It decreases the demand for the farmer's wheat abroad, which is evinced by the falling off in our exports for the years 1922 and 1923 as against 1921, as follows: Wheat: Exports, 1921, 293,267,637 bushels; 1922, 208,321,091 bushels; 1923, 154,950,971 bushels; a difference of 138,316,666 bushels, or nearly one-half. Wheat flour: Exports in 1921 were 16,179,956 barrels; in 1922, 15,796,819 barrels; and in 1923, 14,882,714 barrels; a difference of 1,297,242 barrels. Wheat, including flour: Exports in 1921 were 366,077,439 bushels; 1922, 279,408,777 bushels; 1923, 221,923,184 bushels; a difference of 144,154,255 bushels.

It increases the cost of production. This is shown by the following table, which gives the cost of farm machinery for the year 1923 as far in excess of that for the year 1914, when the farmer's wheat was sold at practically the same price.

STATEMENTS SHOWING THE COST OF PRODUCING AND DELIVERING TO MARKET FOR THE DIFFERENT YEARS MENTIONED A BUSHEL OF WHEAT IN SOUTHERN INDIANA ON LAND OF A HIGH AVERAGE PRODUCING QUALITY

These statements are based upon the cash value of the land for the year mentioned, taking 15 acres of land with an average yield of 18 bushels per acre as a basis.

For the crop harvested in 1914 on land valued at \$100 per acre; assessed at \$66 per acre

| | |
|--|---------|
| Interest at 6 per cent, on \$1,500 | \$90.00 |
| Taxes at \$2, on \$990 | 19.80 |
| Plowing at \$1.25 per acre | 18.75 |
| Harrowing and rolling four times | 9.00 |
| Drilling at 26½ cents per acre | 4.00 |
| Cutting at 50 cents per acre | 7.50 |
| Twine, 2 pounds per acre at 10 cents | 3.00 |
| Putting in shock—two men, one day each | 4.00 |
| 1½ bushels of seed per acre at \$1.10 per bushel | 20.625 |

| | |
|---|---------|
| Total cost of production | 176.675 |
| Threshing 270 bushels at 8 cents per bushel | 21.60 |
| Use of 135 bags two days at one-half cent per day | 1.35 |
| Hauling to market, 3 miles, at 3 cents per bushel | 8.10 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| Total cost of production and delivering to market 270 bushels of wheat | 207.725 |
| Average cost per bushel | 0.7693 |
| October, 1914, selling price of wheat | 1.00 |
| Cost of production and delivering to market | 0.769 |

Profit to the farmer

For the crop harvested in 1917 on land valued at \$100 per acre; assessed at \$66 per acre

| | |
|--|---------|
| Interest, at 6 per cent on \$1,500 | \$90.00 |
| Taxes, at \$2 on \$990 | 19.80 |
| Plowing, at \$1.50 per acre | 22.50 |
| Harrowing and rolling four times | 12.00 |
| Drilling, at 33½ cents per acre | 5.00 |
| Cutting, at 66 cents per acre | 10.00 |
| Twine, 2 pounds per acre, at 25 cents | 7.50 |
| Putting in shock, two men one day each | 6.00 |
| 1½ bushels seed per acre, at \$2.20 | 41.25 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total cost of production | 214.05 |
| Threshing 270 bushels, at 10 cents per bushel | 27.00 |
| Use of 135 bags two days, at one-half cent per day | 1.35 |
| Hauling to market, 3 miles, at 3 cents per bushel | 8.10 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total cost of production and delivering to market 270 bushels of wheat | 250.50 |
| Average cost per bushel | 0.927 |
| October, 1917, selling price of wheat | 2.00 |
| Cost of production and delivering to market | 0.927 |

Profit to the farmer

For the crop harvested in 1924 on land valued at \$100 per acre; assessed at \$100 per acre

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Interest, at 6 per cent on \$1,800 | \$108.00 |
| Taxes, at \$2.20 per acre | 33.00 |
| Plowing, at \$1.75 per acre | 26.25 |
| Harrowing and rolling four days, at \$4 per day | 16.00 |
| Drilling, at 40 cents per acre | 6.00 |
| Cutting, at 80 cents per acre | 12.00 |
| Twine, 2 pounds per acre, at 25 cents | 7.50 |
| Putting in shock, two men one day each | 10.00 |
| 1 1/2 bushels seed per acre, at \$1.20 per bushel | 22.50 |
| Total cost of production | 241.25 |
| Threshing 270 bushels, at 10 cents per bushel | 27.00 |
| Use of 135 bags two days, at one-half cent per day | 1.35 |
| Hauling to market, 3 miles, at 3 cents per bushel | 8.10 |
| Total cost of production and delivering to market 270 bushels of wheat | 278.70 |
| Average cost per bushel | 1.032 |
| Average selling price for crop | 1.00 |
| Loss to farmer | 0.032 |

Comparative cost of machinery for producing wheat for the above-named crops and the equivalent in bushels of wheat

| FOR THE CROP HARVESTED IN 1914 | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| | Cost | Number of bushels of wheat |
| Sulky plow | \$35.00 | 35 bushels at \$1. |
| Harrow | 28.00 | 18 bushels at \$1. |
| Drill | 75.00 | 75 bushels at \$1. |
| Roller | 25.00 | 25 bushels at \$1. |
| Binder | 125.00 | 125 bushels at \$1. |
| Wagon | 80.00 | 80 bushels at \$1. |
| Labor, common | 1.00 | 1 bushel at \$1. |
| Labor, harvesting | 2.00 | 2 bushels at \$1. |

FOR THE CROP HARVESTED IN 1917

| | Cost | Number of bushels of wheat |
|-------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Sulky plow | \$65.00 | 32 1/2 bushels at \$2. |
| Drill | 135.00 | 62 1/2 bushels at \$2. |
| Harrow | 35.00 | 17 1/2 bushels at \$2. |
| Roller | 38.00 | 19 bushels at \$2. |
| Binder | 165.00 | 82 1/2 bushels at \$2. |
| Wagon | 90.00 | 45 bushels at \$2. |
| Labor, common | 1.56 | 1 bushel at \$2. |
| Labor, harvesting | 3.00 | 1 1/2 bushels at \$2. |

FOR THE CROP HARVESTED IN 1923

| | Cost | Number of bushels of wheat |
|-------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Sulky plow | \$64.00 | 54 bushels at \$1. |
| Drill | 125.00 | 125 bushels at \$1. |
| Harrow | 27.00 | 27 bushels at \$1. |
| Roller | 36.00 | 36 bushels at \$1. |
| Binder | 225.00 | 225 bushels at \$1. |
| Wagon | 135.00 | 135 bushels at \$1. |
| Labor, common | 1.35 | 1 1/4 bushels at \$1. |
| Labor, harvesting | 5.00 | 5 bushels at \$1. |

It increases the cost of living in every way, not only of farm machinery but of everything else that the farmer has to use in the manufactured line. This all goes to make up a high cost of living, which prevents the farmer from enjoying a profit for his labor on the farm.

The farmer's dollar—The purchasing power of the farmer's dollar since 1890 (includes food and farm products with all other products)

| Year | Cents |
|------|-------|
| 1890 | 83 |
| 1891 | 89 |
| 1892 | 87 |
| 1893 | 87 |
| 1894 | 85 |
| 1895 | 85 |
| 1896 | 81 |
| 1897 | 86 |
| 1898 | 88 |
| 1899 | 83 |
| 1900 | 86 |
| 1901 | 92 |
| 1902 | 95 |
| 1903 | 88 |
| 1904 | 93 |
| 1905 | 90 |
| 1906 | 88 |
| 1907 | 90 |
| 1908 | 93 |
| 1909 | 100 |
| 1910 | 98 |
| 1911 | 97 |
| 1912 | 101 |
| 1913 | 100 |

| Year | Cents |
|------|-------|
| 1914 | 105 |
| 1915 | 103 |
| 1916 | 97 |
| 1917 | 107 |
| 1918 | 112 |
| 1919 | 112 |
| 1920 | 96 |
| 1921 | 89 |
| 1922 | 84 |
| 1923 | 89 |

1913-1922, REVISED
Source: The Agricultural Crisis and Its Causes. Report of the Joint Commission on Agricultural Inquiry, Part 1.

Third: The transportation rates from the country elevator, where the farmer's wheat is marketed, to the great seaboard shipping points are too high. No matter how high or how low these rates may be the farmer pays the freight; so if these rates can be reduced, the farmer is benefited to the extent of the amount of that reduction. Reduce transportation by completing the inland waterway system which will give an outlet from the great wheat-producing States of the central, west, and northwestern part of our country directly to the Gulf and to foreign markets at a great saving to the shipper. We must have cheap transportation to meet the competition of the wheat-producing countries of the world. This competition is enormous, as shown by the following tables.

Production of wheat in undermentioned countries

| Country | 1914 | 1915 | 1916 | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| NORTHERN HEMISPHERE | | | | | | |
| <i>North America</i> | | | | | | |
| Canada | 1,000 bushels 261,290 | 1,000 bushels 398,543 | 1,000 bushels 262,781 | 1,000 bushels 233,743 | 1,000 bushels 189,075 | 1,000 bushels 198,260 |
| United States | 891,017 | 1,025,801 | 696,818 | 636,655 | 621,438 | 967,970 |
| Mexico | | | | | | 14,239 |
| <i>Europe</i> | | | | | | |
| United Kingdom: | | | | | | |
| England and Wales | 58,456 | 67,720 | 54,680 | 57,320 | 84,240 | 63,808 |
| Scotland | 2,561 | 2,959 | 2,264 | 2,432 | 3,216 | 3,094 |
| Ireland | 1,415 | 3,238 | 2,827 | 4,573 | 5,690 | 2,452 |
| Norway | 369 | 284 | 346 | 430 | 1,087 | 1,071 |
| Sweden | 8,906 | 8,060 | 9,698 | 6,920 | 8,888 | 9,351 |
| Denmark | 5,788 | 7,982 | 6,044 | 4,296 | 6,330 | 5,923 |
| Netherlands | 5,779 | 7,090 | 4,786 | 3,949 | 5,431 | 5,856 |
| Belgium | 13,972 | 7,916 | 6,487 | 5,014 | 4,919 | 10,565 |
| Luxembourg | 530 | 532 | 433 | 345 | 509 | 466 |
| France | 282,689 | 222,776 | 204,908 | 137,096 | 228,688 | 187,031 |
| Spain | 116,089 | 139,298 | 152,329 | 142,674 | 135,709 | 129,250 |
| Portugal | 7,418 | 6,522 | 7,419 | 7,429 | 9,584 | 8,178 |
| Italy | 160,582 | 170,541 | 176,530 | 139,969 | 183,294 | 160,760 |
| Switzerland | 3,278 | 3,057 | 4,082 | 3,031 | 5,273 | 3,891 |
| Germany | 145,944 | 141,678 | 113,393 | 81,791 | 85,905 | 79,791 |
| Austria | 38,024 | 32,931 | 27,811 | 5,903 | 5,159 | 5,114 |
| Czechoslovakia | | | | | | |
| Hungary | 117,777 | 157,647 | | | | |
| <i>Yugoslavia</i> | | | | | | |
| Serbia | 9,555 | 8,451 | 9,186 | 8,818 | | |
| Greece | 13,111 | 9,050 | 8,106 | 11,505 | 13,722 | 9,808 |
| Bulgaria | 23,298 | 35,527 | 29,600 | 29,067 | 23,203 | 29,775 |
| Rumania | 49,270 | 80,241 | 78,521 | | 21,460 | 66,030 |
| Poland | | | | | | |
| Lithuania | | | | | | 2,046 |
| Latvia | | | | | | |
| Estonia | | | | | | |
| Finland | 196 | 260 | 247 | 228 | 218 | 472 |
| Russia, including Ukraine and Northern Caucasus | 673,884 | 629,981 | | | | 262 |
| <i>Africa</i> | | | | | | |
| Morocco | | 17,882 | 18,382 | 15,656 | 22,697 | 16,391 |
| Algeria | 33,241 | 33,849 | 20,151 | 28,979 | 40,290 | 21,003 |
| Tunis | 2,295 | 8,267 | 5,811 | 7,218 | 11,944 | 6,481 |
| Egypt | 32,850 | 39,144 | 36,543 | 29,834 | 32,140 | 30,137 |
| <i>Asia</i> | | | | | | |
| Turkey | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | 1,776 | 2,598 | 1,779 |
| Persia | | | | | | |
| India | 812,868 | 376,992 | 323,045 | 382,144 | 370,421 | 280,261 |
| Russia (Asiatic) | 254,372 | 173,479 | | | | |
| <i>Japanese Empire:</i> | | | | | | |
| Japan | 22,975 | 26,778 | 30,137 | 34,745 | 32,923 | 32,561 |
| Chosen | 8,343 | 8,666 | 9,065 | 9,158 | 9,887 | 8,553 |
| Formosa | 181 | 161 | 138 | 125 | 132 | 180 |
| Kwantung | 33 | 35 | 39 | 27 | 52 | 31 |
| SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE | | | | | | |
| Peru | | | | 2,621 | 2,282 | 2,267 |
| Chile | 19,000 | 20,214 | 22,498 | 23,120 | 20,280 | 19,920 |
| Uruguay | 3,506 | 9,897 | 5,890 | 18,061 | 6,896 | 5,948 |
| Argentina | 149,174 | 149,049 | 180,115 | 225,636 | 180,162 | 216,934 |
| Union of South Africa | | | | 9,790 | 7,979 | 5,129 |
| Tava and Madura | | | | | | |
| Australia | 24,892 | 179,066 | 152,420 | 114,794 | 75,638 | 45,975 |
| New Zealand | 6,864 | 7,108 | 5,651 | 6,808 | 6,569 | 4,560 |

Production of wheat in undermentioned countries—Continued

| Country | Production | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 1920 | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 |
| NORTHERN HEMISPHERE | | | | |
| <i>North America</i> | | | | |
| Canada | 1,000 bushels | 1,000 bushels | 1,000 bushels | 1,000 bushels |
| United States | 263,189 | 300,858 | 309,786 | 474,109 |
| Mexico | 833,027 | 814,905 | 867,598 | 785,741 |
| Guatemala | 114,951 | | 13,626 | |
| Total comparable with 1923 | 1,094,215 | 1,115,763 | 1,267,386 | 1,259,940 |
| <i>Europe</i> | | | | |
| United Kingdom: | | | | |
| England and Wales | 53,362 | 69,776 | 61,312 | 54,816 |
| Scotland | 2,089 | 2,583 | 2,520 | 2,329 |
| Ireland | 1,403 | 1,481 | 1,417 | 1,269 |
| Norway | 999 | 972 | 643 | 587 |
| Sweden | 10,322 | 12,385 | 19,381 | 11,082 |
| Denmark | 7,290 | 11,143 | 9,249 | 8,845 |
| Netherlands | 5,983 | 8,562 | 6,161 | 6,678 |
| Belgium | 10,274 | 14,495 | 10,615 | 12,590 |
| Luxemburg | 451 | 621 | 173 | 540 |
| France | 236,989 | 323,467 | 243,315 | 290,474 |
| Spain | 138,605 | 145,150 | 125,499 | 157,110 |
| Portugal | 10,376 | 9,418 | 9,782 | 12,994 |
| Italy | 144,337 | 194,071 | 161,641 | 224,836 |
| Switzerland | 3,586 | 3,574 | 2,348 | 3,693 |
| Germany | 83,583 | 107,798 | 71,933 | 106,439 |
| Austria | 5,434 | 6,530 | 7,422 | 8,826 |
| Czechoslovakia | 26,362 | 38,682 | 35,621 | 36,226 |
| Hungary | 28,294 | 52,715 | 54,729 | 67,677 |
| Yugoslavia | 43,011 | 51,809 | 44,472 | 61,893 |
| Greece | 11,188 | 11,170 | 9,553 | 13,359 |
| Bulgaria | 20,005 | 29,290 | 37,704 | 36,223 |
| Rumania | 61,809 | 78,503 | 92,908 | 102,311 |
| Poland | 22,741 | 37,409 | 42,372 | 53,351 |
| Lithuania | 2,199 | 2,840 | 3,274 | 2,965 |
| Latvia | 389 | 784 | 983 | 1,641 |
| Estonia | | 427 | 761 | 1,737 |
| Finland | 267 | 230 | 298 | 472 |
| Russia, including Ukraine and Northern Caucasus | | | 158,416 | 192,000 |
| Total comparable with 1923 | 1,215,251 | 1,643,135 | 1,279,831 | |
| <i>Africa</i> | | | | |
| Morocco | 17,947 | 23,247 | 12,894 | 20,050 |
| Algeria | 8,433 | 34,908 | 18,238 | 35,610 |
| Tunis | 5,239 | 10,619 | 3,674 | 9,921 |
| Egypt | 31,710 | 37,010 | 36,648 | 40,554 |
| Total comparable with 1923 | 63,319 | 105,776 | 71,449 | 106,135 |
| <i>Asia</i> | | | | |
| Cyprus | 2,266 | 2,425 | 2,496 | 2,611 |
| India | 377,988 | 266,387 | 366,987 | 369,152 |
| Russia (Asiatic) | | | 45,359 | |
| Japanese Empire: | | | | |
| Japan | 80,165 | 28,575 | 27,617 | 28,409 |
| Chosen | 10,994 | 10,705 | 9,622 | 8,101 |
| Formosa | 141 | 110 | | |
| Kwantung | 30 | 62 | | |
| Total comparable with 1923 | 421,298 | 292,062 | 407,092 | 408,267 |
| SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE | | | | |
| Peru | 3,001 | 2,800 | | |
| Chile | 23,190 | 23,636 | 23,815 | 25,097 |
| Uruguay | 7,768 | 9,944 | 5,152 | (5,000) |
| Argentina | 186,183 | 191,012 | 195,942 | 269,834 |
| Union of South Africa | 7,323 | 8,419 | 6,697 | 6,027 |
| Australia | 145,874 | 129,089 | 109,261 | 127,390 |
| New Zealand | 6,872 | 10,568 | 8,395 | 4,250 |
| Total comparable with 1923 | 277,096 | 347,160 | 349,162 | 428,961 |
| Grand total | 3,102,117 | 3,138,132 | 3,481,234 | |

¹ Commercial estimate.
² Old boundaries.
³ All Russia, including Ukraine.
⁴ Exclusive of native districts which produced 359,000 bushels in 1918 and 290,000 bushels in 1921.

SUMMARY

Therefore, reduce taxes; lower transportation rates; repeal the Fordney-McCumber tariff law; broaden our marketing conditions; stimulate more consumption of wheat abroad.

The farmer is no fool, he is not asking for advice or special favor, he has been as patient as Job. Too much agitation keeps his mind disturbed; too many measures introduced or talked about build up hope for relief in his mind only to be followed by disappointment at failure of realization. For three years Congress has held out "farm-relief measures" to the farmer and with no results.

We are within 10 days of adjournment and still no downright whole-hearted action on the part of the administration to solve the farmer's problem. The farmer is tired of "sop" for political prestige. He knows better how to handle the problems out on the farm than the man in the office or on the street. He is tired of being told that he ought to diversify his crops, or that he ought to produce less of this or more of that—all he wants or expects from this Government, that he so nobly supports, is just an equal chance with his fellowman. He wants a square deal. I am sure if he gets that he will be able to take care of himself.

This agricultural bill for the relief of the farmer has met with only lukewarm assistance from the leaders of the majority side of this Chamber. I have a 100 per cent roll-call average and have been on the floor of the House every day during this session. Anyone sitting here in Congress can very easily see that the majority party, which is responsible for legislation, is not a fire with that unbounded enthusiasm about the farmer's dire distress, even at this eleventh hour of the session, that characterized their every ingenuity and resourcefulness to come to the aid of the wealth of this country in the early days of this session.

The farmer, by his experience during the last two years or more has learned this fact, which is now deep-seated in his mind—that in so far as any kind of special legislation in his behalf is concerned, there is none to be expected.

There has been nothing, so far, of a practical nature submitted to Congress for the relief of the farmer, nor is there likely to be until the political complexion of the two branches change, for the measures that are necessary to bring such relief to the farmer are in themselves political.

It is of great importance to the welfare of the Nation that the farmer gets some real relief from the situation that is not only facing him but is now upon his back like a ferocious wild animal crushing the very life out of him.

I appeal to the Members of this House to place the farmer upon an equal basis with the rest of the business world. Legislate for him as you do for other lines of business, so he, too, may enjoy some of the blessings of prosperity. If you will do this you will soon find this Nation happy and prosperous.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the question is asked, Why not include fruit, alfalfa, and truck crops in this bill? The McNary-Haugen bill in its direct application is limited to major farm products that dominate farm prices that enter largely into foreign trade and the prices of which are fixed in foreign markets. But the very evident fact should not be overlooked that when you give a fair price to two and a quarter million wheat farmers and millions of corn, hog, and cattle growers you increase the purchasing power of many millions of people who become better customers for other farm commodities.

Again, the application of this bill can not be localized. In many States the farmer can with about equal financial returns devote his acreage to producing the things named in this bill or he can turn his attention to dairying, fruit growing, trucking, and so forth. Evidently, a fair price for corn, livestock, and wheat will prevent undue encroachment upon other specialized farming.

My friends, let us not forget that our interests are all interrelated. For many years I worked on a diversified farm—grew corn and wheat, oats and hay, milked the cows, suckled the calves, fed the hogs, and gathered the eggs. Later I carved a cotton plantation out of the jungles of Mississippi where cane and timber stood thicker than the hair on my head and mosquitoes were more numerous than the locusts of Egypt; later I grew barley and spuds, and developed from raw land an irrigated ranch on which we grew apples and berries and alfalfa; on another ranch we grew nothing but wheat. Naturally I am for the farmer. However, the observation I wish to make is this—that when the big branches of agriculture are prosperous their prices are generally reflected to other farm crops and we all prosper. Forty million people connected directly with agriculture in the United States form the best market in the world for our factories and wholesalers and retailers. No class, no industry can long prosper alone. Labor and capital, farmer and manufacturer, city and country are each dependent upon the other; in justice we should and economically we shall move up and down together.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has given thoughtful consideration to the economic system under which the farmers of the country are laboring must realize that the farmer is greatly handicapped under present conditions and is entitled to

any relief and encouragement that can be afforded by Congress. I believe that the bill under consideration will bring relief and hope to the farmer, where dismay and discouragement now prevail.

Having been born and reared on a farm, familiar with the implements of tillage, conversant with the conditions that enter into the life of the great army of producers on the soil and fortified by a degree of practical knowledge gained by experience and study, I feel that I am speaking advisedly.

It was declared by the late James J. Hill, the "empire builder," that we solve problems not by side-stepping but by grappling with them, by arousing public interest, forming public opinion, and engaging the thoughtful consideration of all who may be interested in the public welfare.

There must be something economically wrong, in the light of present-day conditions, when the consumer is required to pay more than he should pay in a market of abundant commodities, while producers—the farmers—are facing bankruptcy.

The prosperity of the manufacturers and lack of it in the farming section is proof that a disarrangement of our economic system exists. What logical or satisfactory answer can be made to the farmer who asks why he should pay greatly increased prices for agricultural implements, harness, shoes, and, in fact, everything that he and his family must buy, while his wheat has steadily declined from \$2 a bushel to 70 cents, and during this time he must face a substantial increase of his taxes?

There must be found an adjustment of this unfair discrimination, and, in my opinion, the provisions of this bill, if honestly and faithfully carried out, will solve the problem.

This measure creates an agricultural export corporation, with an authorized capitalization of \$200,000,000, which is under the management of a board of directors and an administrative director appointed by the President.

It is proposed that this corporation shall purchase and export surplus wheat and other commodities of the farm in the world markets, which will have the effect of increasing the price of those commodities in the domestic market.

A CRUCIAL TEST

Opposition to this bill has been expressed in some quarters on the ground that it is paternalistic and is a price-fixing proposition; that it will encourage the overproduction of wheat and other products in disregard of the normal demand.

Much of this opposition comes from grain speculators and exporters. They predict that the bill, if enacted into law, will interfere with their prosperity; that by artificial methods which will interfere with the law of supply and demand business will be completely demoralized.

It is argued by some well-informed authorities that exporting of surplus farm products under the provisions of the proposed law is impracticable and unprofitable. They assert that unprofitable production rights itself by driving the surplus producers out of business.

On the other hand, it is contended by those thoroughly familiar with the workable basis of the measure that it is practicable, and that once in operation would add \$2,000,000,000 to the buying power of the farmers. After an analytical study of the bill, I share this latter opinion.

The corporation would fix ratio prices, make purchases and sell abroad. To guard against loss a certain percentage would be deducted from the ratio price when purchases are made. The amount returned would depend upon the sales abroad.

There is a further strengthening of the system by giving to the President the power to impose embargoes on importations of foreign commodities when foreign competition threatens to reduce domestic prices below the ratio figure.

There is strong sentiment for this bill, not only among individual farmers of the West, but from nearly all the large farm associations such as the Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers' Union, and the grange.

The argument is advanced, and justly so, that the Government has helped the railroads and the wage earners, and it is high time that the farmers should now be helped; that the farmer should get American prices for his products when sold in America.

The farmer is surfeited with advice about the kinds of crops he should plant. He is told to diversify his products. He is urged to align himself with cooperative marketing associations. I dare say there is no one who has greater faith in the efficacy of cooperative commodity marketing than I have; but the very first step necessary to put the farmer on his feet is the enactment of this measure and the speedy application of its provisions.

DESERTING THE FARMS

According to the statistics compiled by the Sears-Roebuck Agricultural Foundation, since last year another million people left the farms for the cities. This, too, in the face of an increase in population of 1,400,000. This means that there were 2,400,000 more persons to feed and a million less producers to do the feeding.

The report states that—

this condition warrants industrial and commercial leaders doing something definite to help the farmer get on his feet.

What is the significance of this desertion of the farm for the city? What is causing the farmers to leave the homes and flock to the industries where good wages enable him and his family to live in comfort? It is not so much overproduction as the need of cheaper distribution.

In 1922, 1,120,000 persons left the farm, and 7.3 per cent of the habitable farmhouses were standing vacant, while the cities are having a building boom for needed homes.

Bank failures in agricultural regions have been greater in the first seven months of this fiscal year than the combined failures for the five previous years.

As a result of this great exodus to the cities, what will be the inevitable outcome? Underproduction. Unless relief, such as this bill provides, is extended to the farming industry, we are liable to awaken to find ourselves in the throes of economic disaster.

RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES

One of the greatest handicaps under which the farmers of the West have been placed in the matter of getting their products to market is excessive freight rates.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) passed the Senate on May 12, 1924, directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to adjust freight rates to relieve depression in any basic industry, particularly agriculture. It was reported to the House on the 27th instant.

On the 19th instant the Senate passed Senator GOODING'S bill (S. 2327) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act, which will be considered by the House at the next session.

The readjustment of freight rates, as proposed in these measures, will enable western farmers to transport their products on a fair and equitable basis, thereby rendering great aid to the farmer.

With reduced freight rates and the proper functioning of the pending bill when enacted, a foreign market will be opened up for the farmers who are producing more than our market will consume, and through the application of the provisions of this measure the foreign market can be reached.

A BASIS OF PERMANENT SUCCESS

Mr. Speaker, while I earnestly hope the enactment of this bill will afford immediate temporary relief to the farming industry, I am mindful of the fact that permanent rehabilitation of agriculture, so essential to the farmers' success, can be accomplished only through the establishment of a system of cooperative commodity marketing.

By means of the organization of a cooperative marketing system, the great spread between the farmer and the consumer must necessarily be eliminated. Not counting cotton or tobacco, the consumer paid the farmer in 1922 for his crop \$22,500,000,000. Out of this stupendous sum the producer, or the agriculturist, received only \$7,500,000,000. The middlemen, railroads, commission merchants, and so forth, pocketed the rest.

Turning to a serious consideration of the system of cooperative commodity marketing, we are forced to a realization that we are living in the midst of a thoroughly organized and highly trained business world. In the industrial world, labor is holding a commanding position by reason of its perfect organization. Every line of worth-while business and industry is organized. The farmer must be educated to the advantages of cooperation, accept the principle and put it in practice.

Efforts to organize from the standpoint of production have not been satisfactory, but organized from the standpoint of marketing is quite a different proposition and can be and is being made a success.

Cooperatives in California dispose of their products every year in excess of \$250,000,000. Why is it not just as practicable to organize the potato growers as it has been to organize the tobacco growers?

The farmer is receiving about \$1 for potatoes for which the consumer pays \$3. Does it not stand to reason that the farmer should receive more of the price the consumer pays?

A few weeks ago I saw an article in the Evening Star of this city giving the results of an experiment of cooperative

commodity marketing tried out by the growers and canners of tomatoes of eastern Maryland. One of the outstanding features of the experiment showed that it did not result in higher prices to the ultimate consumer. Success was due to the fact that the plan eliminated waste, allowing canned tomatoes to be sold at prevailing market prices, but with a large profit to the producers.

Both growers and canners were allowed cost of production, and profits were then divided on a basis of 60 per cent to the grower and 40 per cent to the canner. The canner paid one-half of the cost of hauling the tomatoes to the cannery. Heretofore the farmers had to bear the entire cost of hauling.

After full settlement was made the farmer found that he had received 27 cents a basket for his tomatoes. This price was 2 cents above the highest contract price and considerably more than 2 cents above the average contract price.

Judging from popular opinion it is very evident that the plan will be tried elsewhere in Maryland during the coming summer. It means higher return to the grower through elimination of waste. That is efficiency—the same thing that every manufacturer is striving for.

Mr. Speaker, the time, study, and consideration given to the system of cooperative commodity marketing as a means of solving many of the difficulties under which the farming industry is now laboring convinces me that the farmers would be benefited by its adoption.

I am so thoroughly convinced of its practicability that I shall ask the indulgence of the House while I present an analysis of the more important phases that enter into a discussion of the question.

A VERY EFFECTIVE MEASURE

Among the deluge of agricultural bills introduced in the present Congress in my opinion one of the outstanding bills is that introduced and sponsored by Representative ARTHUR B. WILLIAMS of Michigan.

Application of the provisions of this bill would result in eliminating waste in the marketing of farm products. Prices would be stabilized to the benefit of the farmer and the consumer. Distribution would be so regulated that community needs will be satisfactorily met. Gluts and famines would be avoided.

As a basis for carrying out President Coolidge's recommendations as to cooperative marketing I regard this bill as a practical application of principles involving the very best interests of the farming industry.

A practical farmer, successful manufacturer, and financier, Representative WILLIAMS of Michigan has embodied in his bill the result of years of study from every angle of the agricultural problem. If enacted, it would enable the administration to fulfill the desired permanent relief of the farmer.

Individuals and associations that have considered measures of relief so far introduced are loud in their praise of the Williams bill as a solution of the marketing problems of the farmer, and especially cooperative marketing. This method is presented in a simple yet comprehensive manner. The fundamental basis of success is the establishment of a marketing agency. This agency functions in carrying products from local cooperatives to the consuming public.

In general the farming industry is divided into production districts. The marketing agencies gather up produce from the cooperatives within these districts and ship the same to the big terminal markets, such as Chicago, New York, and other established centers. The district marketing agencies are in league with the terminal marketing associations handling agricultural products.

This enables the district cooperative agencies to keep closely in touch with prices, and eliminates the hazards that have surrounded such shipments when the farmers, ignorant of marketing conditions, ship their products without a sale in advance.

There is a provision for inspection as to grading, quality, and condition at points of origin, and, if necessary, in transit and at terminal marketing destinations.

All of these associations are under charter; that is, a certificate of approval is issued by the Federal Marketing Bureau upon condition that the associations will agree to the provisions set out in the act. Each association agrees to arbitrate rules prescribed by the Federal Marketing Board as regards disputes that may arise as to inspection or condition of products shipped. In such case the shipper is protected at terminal markets, even without a sale in advance. The buyer is likewise protected in purchasing at long distance, because he knows what he is to receive.

Commodity organization, which experience has shown is the only kind of organization that can best serve in the cooperative movement, is the basic theory of the bill.

Administration of this act is vested in a Federal Marketing Board of seven members. Five of these members are appointed by the President. The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture are ex officio members.

Commodity boards of one or three members may be appointed by the Federal Marketing Bureau. These boards may be discontinued as Federal boards if the commodity is sufficiently well organized to establish and maintain its own board.

Members constituting the Federal Marketing Board shall be men known to be interested and friendly to the cooperative marketing idea. In cases of vacancies nominations are to be submitted to the President by cooperative marketing associations as to three of the members and by the terminal marketing associations as to the other two members. In this way the board will be made up of men familiar with the problems involved within the scope of the act.

There are many other splendid features of the Williams bill having for their object the stimulation, encouragement, and development of these various organizations.

An appropriation of \$7,500,000 is authorized under the act for each of the two following years, and any unexpended balance may be used by the Federal Marketing Board as a revolving fund from which to make loans payable within a limited period to cooperative marketing and clearing house associations for the purpose of extending their membership.

It is well understood that great waste is now going on due to oversupply in some markets and undersupply in other markets. Such conditions result in deterioration of products and price fluctuations leading to speculation. This must be paid for either by the consumer or the farmer.

The Williams bill would provide for orderly distribution and marketing of farm products and bring the farmer into intimate contact with marketing problems. This will enable the farmer to gain greater knowledge bearing upon diversification and adaptation of products to demand. The handling of products will be reduced to a minimum. Cross hauls, where products are looking for a market, will be eliminated. The great spread between the producer and the consumer will be greatly curtailed.

If for any reason it should be determined that the McNary-Haugen bill can not reach enactment, I am strongly in favor of substituting the Williams-Capper bill as the most feasible solution of the farmer problem. I believe, too, that it would not be necessary to set up any new Federal agency. This could be handled very efficiently by the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Department of Commerce.

The Williams-Capper bill is a sound, practical measure, designed to meet conditions as they now exist, have been existing, and are likely to continue to exist if steps are not taken to adopt remedial provisions.

COOPERATIVE MARKETING IN DENMARK

Cooperative marketing is not a new and untried innovation. Not only in this country but in other countries of the world ample proof of its success is a matter of record.

In this connection I wish to quote briefly from "Cooperative marketing in Denmark," by Mr. Chris L. Christensen, investigator, Division of Cooperative Marketing, United States Department of Agriculture:

In less than 50 years Denmark has changed from a nation of peasant agriculture to the most highly organized agricultural nation in the world. More than 92 per cent of the farmers in Denmark own the land they cultivate.

On his farm, ranging from 5 to 60 acres in size, organized on an efficient business basis for the production and marketing of butter, bacon, and eggs, the Danish farmer is not only self-sustaining but is financially independent. Through cooperative marketing he places on the market a highly standardized product that finds ready demand. His marketing organization costs have been cut to a minimum, so that he receives the largest possible share of the consumer's dollar.

More than 86 per cent of the 205,000 Danish farmers are members of local cooperative marketing organizations which assemble and process the farmers' products.

The major portion of Denmark's surplus production of butter, bacon, and eggs is consumed by the English market. The consumer knows that any product with the Danish stamp is of high quality, and that a regular supply may be depended upon.

The present position of Denmark in the agricultural world is remarkable, by reason of the apparently short time in which it has been attained. With similar cooperative marketing methods this country is capable of attaining the same degree of success.

There was a time when the disorganized efforts of individual Danish farmers to meet the English consumer's demand for a high quality of butter resulted in the shipping of quantities of

mediocre products which affected the prices of the higher grades. In other words, there was not a sufficient quantity of uniform standardized grade to make proper merchandizing possible.

After several years the farmers realized that concerted action to meet the demand was needed. An organized effort to produce and market a uniform product regularly throughout the year met with large success, and by 1890 there were 600 cooperative creameries. The secret of the project was that every effort was devoted toward furnishing the consumer with the high grade of product that he demanded, and for which he was willing to pay high price. There are now 1,335 cooperative creamery associations in Denmark.

Compare 250 cooperative organizations of various kinds in 1885 with more than 5,000 at the present time, and we have food for thought in the farming industry of Denmark. In my opinion, only through such methodical, businesslike cooperative marketing organization will the greatest amount of benefit result to the agricultural interests of the United States.

We are all familiar with the high standard of the Danish bacon. Before they set up a cooperative organization the Danes were forced to market their pigs in Hamburg, Germany, where they were slaughtered and the bacon shipped to England. To shorten the market lane and to receive more of the prices paid by the consumers the hog raisers decided to assemble their products locally, combine the process of killing the pigs and curing the bacon in their own cooperatively owned plants, sending the finished product direct to the English market.

The first cooperative bacon factory was organized in 1887. To-day there are 46 such factories distributed throughout Denmark.

Similar marketing problems confronted the egg producers. A standard quality product was demanded in the foreign markets. There are now 550 egg-collecting associations federated into one central selling agency, which annually markets 300,000 cases of eggs on the basis of 360 eggs to the case.

There are agricultural societies organized to promote the technical and educational side of agriculture and which do not engage in marketing. Fully 90 per cent of the Danish farmers have membership in these societies, which have been an important influence in the production of standardized products.

COOPERATIVE MARKETING AS A BUSINESS PROPOSITION

For years cooperative marketing has engaged the attention and study of men deeply interested in the subject. They are familiar with it as a business organization; they understand it from an economic point of view; they know its scope and limitations.

If a business enterprise formed and organized by groups or associations of farmers for the purpose of marketing their commodities can attain a higher degree of success than could be obtained by individuals working independently, it is inevitable that the system of organization will ultimately be adopted. All that is needed is leadership in the movement. These leaders, however, must be men versed in every detail of cooperative marketing.

In this connection I am taking the liberty of quoting from an address delivered at Cornell University February 12 of this year by Mr. Lloyd S. Tenny, one of the foremost authorities in this country on the all-absorbing subject of cooperative commodity marketing. In part he says:

In the United States Department of Agriculture we have collected information regarding 9,000 active cooperative organizations. These organizations did approximately \$1,700,000,000 worth of business for the farmers in 1923. As far as form of organization is concerned, there is no single fundamental plan that runs through these 9,000 organizations.

Too much emphasis has been placed on forms of organization. The impression that the building of a cooperative machine is the primary essential is too widespread. The first essential is getting farm people ready to work together. Then comes the organization, and then the more important problems of guiding and directing this machine in such a way that you will reach the goal you are seeking.

The first cooperative associations developed around local shipping points. This was a logical starting point. Ten or fifty people with common problems cooperating—working together—to meet these problems. Cooperation could not begin between a dozen men here and a dozen somewhere else, or between a thousand men scattered over a large territory. Cooperation comes from contact. It develops from problems that you can not solve as individuals, but may hope to solve collectively.

It is further stated by Mr. Tenny that cooperative commodity marketing is a recent development in cooperation. It represents in many respects an ideal development.

Through centralization of authority certain things can be accomplished that are fundamental to ultimate success in marketing. For example, a group of farmers in the dairy business

combine to build and operate a factory for the manufacture of butter. Collectively they are able to standardize their product, and do many other things that they could not do individually.

These farmers are able to secure better prices for butter, because their product is standardized, and because it can be sold in large uniform blocks. They have improved conditions, but this can not generally affect the market for that commodity.

A small group can not control the distribution of the commodity, and is unable to attain the commanding position in the market that the farmer should have. Only when industry is organized and a large volume of business secured and controlled will the farmers be able to secure the full benefit of collective activity.

The commodity marketing organization, therefore, represents from a business standpoint the highest development of cooperation and is in the main the kind of organization best adapted to meet the larger problems of marketing.

In his very able address Mr. Tenny makes plain so many important points along the line of cooperative commodity marketing that I should like to incorporate, if space would permit, many of his splendid practical observations.

He has such an excellent grasp of the subject as to impress me with the fact that it is not essential to success to set up a separate, expensive agency to handle work that is now being so efficiently performed by the Division of Agricultural Cooperation of the Department of Agriculture.

By enlarging the scope of this important division and making more liberal appropriations of money for the carrying on of its vast and highly useful activities, a great and lasting benefit to the farming industry would be the inevitable result.

THE LARGEST INDUSTRY IN AMERICA

Agriculture is the biggest industry in this country. The development of big commodity organizations, representing large farm interests, is proper and encouraging. When the farmers can say that they are members of an organization that has banking facilities, that has agents all over the world, a new life comes into agriculture. It takes on a new dignity and importance.

At a recent conference in New York 16 of the largest bankers in the city were present. They were there to discuss marketing credit. They said their resources were at the disposal of farmers' cooperative organizations that could furnish as collateral the receipts of warehouses licensed under the Federal warehouse act. The large cooperative commodity marketing organizations have given cooperative marketing standing in the business world. This is an important step forward.

Large commodity marketing organizations are able to secure the economies that come from large-scale organization and operation. Many of these larger cooperative organizations, it is true, have not demonstrated their ability to secure the saving they might have. When these organizations are efficiently directed and managed they will get the advantages and savings of large-scale operation.

It is further stated by Mr. Tenny, and we who are familiar with the subject of marketing will subscribe to his premises, that one of the most important problems in marketing a commodity is distribution. Standardization is even more important, because a product can not be distributed and sold successfully if it is not standardized.

The consumers are educated by manufacturers of every product, from automobiles to breakfast foods, to buy by brand. These brands have been standardized; each represents a product of a certain quality. Consumers have come to depend on these standardized products, and it would be impossible to get them to experiment with miscellaneous products of uncertain quality. They are developing the same attitude toward farm products, and the larger cooperatives are taking steps to cater to this demand.

As a result we have oranges, raisins, butter, eggs, and so forth, represented by brands, products that have been brought to a high degree of standardization. The large cooperative marketing associations can standardize farm products not only by communities but on a larger scale by commodities. The farmer, the dealer, and the consumer are all benefited.

Another advantage of a big organization is that it is possible to secure good business management and good sales management. Such things are specialties. It takes different types of men to manufacture and to sell. Not many farmers are good salesmen. This is not a criticism of the farmer, because salesmanship represents specialized knowledge.

Big organizations, if properly conducted and managed, can get good salesmen. They can employ men who are trained to interpret crop and marketing information, who can look outside the community and determine what effect the activities of other

farmers in the United States and in foreign countries may have on marketing conditions.

These large organizations can establish brands for farm products. These brands have a definite value. The values of our farms are not determined entirely by the number of dairy cows or fruit trees on them. There are other things that go to make value. For instance, brands and trade-marks that represent the products produced. A large cooperative organization makes it possible to establish brands and to make these brands assets of the farmer.

Large cooperative marketing organizations can produce economic advantages through the distribution of the product in respect to time and place. Take eggs for example. Consumption goes on regularly throughout the year; not so production. Eggs are produced in the largest quantity during certain months and consumed in fairly uniform quantities every month of the year.

How can the farmer expect to get the full market value for eggs when he sells them at the time they are produced without regard to supply or demand? An organization that distributes the product uniformly throughout the year is able to overcome, to the extent that its shipments affect the total supply, the alternating periods of oversupply and shortage which the individual farmer can not influence.

This is distribution with respect to time. Distribution with respect to place means putting the products where people are, with all the complex factors of transportation, financing, and wholesale and retail distribution that enter into it. The advantages a large organization enjoys in dealing with the agencies that transport and handle farm products are apparent.

In big cooperative marketing associations there is an over-emphasis of the question of control and price. Control, if properly developed as to time and place, is splendid.

But there is always danger in beginning these new movements for the idea to get abroad that it is possible to control price; that during this control in some mysterious way the farmers will obtain larger returns for their commodities. Control of the product from an economic standpoint must be classed among the outstanding advantages of commodity cooperative marketing.

There is danger, however, of spreading broadcast the impression that arbitrary price fixing is feasible. Prices are always relative and not absolute. If the producers feel that through large organizations these prices may be made absolute without regard to the law of supply and demand; if they go beyond the price control that may be obtained through orderly distribution, irreparable damage will be done to the cause of cooperative marketing.

Those of us who have studied the subject know, as Mr. Tenny well expresses it, that—

there are great possibilities in cooperative marketing. It must be directed intelligently, however, and strong leaders are needed. We can raise our whole industry, our standard of living, our vision and outlook on life by doing our part to establish and maintain our cooperative marketing organizations.

PROGRESS OF THE COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT

A casual review of statistics collected and disseminated by the Division of Agricultural Cooperation, United States Department of Agriculture, should convince those skeptical of the success of cooperative marketing that since 1918 progress in this great field of human endeavor has been phenomenal.

On page 124 of Agricultural Cooperation of April 7, 1924, the number of selling and buying associations reported as active in 1924 is 10,160. This is an increase of nearly 2,000 organizations in less than three years.

Progress has been so rapid that the number of cooperators, the number of commodities handled, and the volume of business done are now enormous. Just how much can not be definitely determined, even after careful study, because of the size and rapid expansion of the movement.

Farmers are turning to cooperation as a solution of their marketing problems. The great amount of energy now being expended in cooperative efforts presages a further expansion of the amount of business done by cooperative organizations. The high type of men in leadership in the various phases of agricultural cooperation is an absolute guaranty of the permanent success of the cooperative movement.

In an address delivered February 8, 1924, before the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Associations in this city, Secretary of Agriculture H. C. Wallace gave such pertinent facts relating to cooperative marketing that I earnestly commend his observations to those seeking enlightenment on this very absorbing subject.

Among other things Secretary Wallace says:

There are limits beyond which the department can not properly pass in the field of organization of cooperative associations. It can not take part in the work of organization of business activities, cooperative or otherwise. We can properly seek out and make available sound principles upon which successful cooperation depends. We can point out conditions which make for success and those which make for failure. We can present historical facts which ought to help those who are interested in the organization and conduct of cooperative enterprises to profit from the experience of similar efforts in the past, both in this country and abroad.

Secretary Wallace states that the department believes in the cooperative marketing of farm products, desires to be helpful to the largest possible degree in giving information as to the sound organization of cooperatives, and proposes to be of the largest possible service to them when organized.

Again the able Secretary of Agriculture says:

Success in cooperation, as in everything else, depends mainly upon the skill, energy, and efficiency of the management. Therefore, we think that one of the most important services we can render is to help establish and maintain operation.

Among the services we are rendering to cooperatives of various kinds are—

Estimates, forecasts of crop and livestock production, an absolutely essential service to the business administration of cooperative enterprise.

Prompt publication of volume of crops harvested, with comparisons with different years.

A comprehensive marketing news service, reporting shipments, receipts, prices, condition of commodities, etc., distributed by telegraph, by leased wire, by radio, by mail, and through press releases.

The establishment of well-defined and generally accepted standards for farm products. The standards already established are now being used for many of the most important fruits and vegetables.

The Secretary refers to the licensing of public warehousemen under the United States warehouse act, administered by the department, as being of great assistance to cooperative marketing associations, not only in securing improved credit facilities but in contributing toward more orderly marketing.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is designed to relieve a condition in the farming industry that unfortunately for several years has been exceedingly distressing.

There is no question before the Congress of greater importance to the prosperity and welfare of the country than that of farm relief legislation. It is highly essential to place the farmer on his feet and get him going. In order to enable him to get the start he needs all the aid the Government can give along sound and practical lines, and now is the accepted time to render that assistance.

Apples of the Delicious variety grown in my orchard in Idaho last fall would not command more than a cent apiece, boxed ready for shipment. On the menu in a café in Chicago, where I ate breakfast on my way to Washington, the price of a baked apple was 35 cents. And this unwarranted spread in price between producer and consumer prevails in all lines of commodities, except, perhaps, in the case of producers who are members of cooperative marketing associations.

I have gone somewhat into detail on the great advantages to be derived from a system of cooperative commodity marketing in the hope that after the present emergency has been met there will be an impetus to follow out this line of endeavor as a means of protecting the products of the farm against sudden slumps and price fluctuations. The only thing needed to make farming one of the most profitable industries of the country is a well-organized system of marketing.

Mr. Speaker, we of the West have been patient and forbearing. We have looked on with a complacency that at times belied our feeling at the assistance given other industries since the signing of the armistice.

We have felt that the depression in the great agricultural industry would appeal to all fair-minded men that some measure of speedy relief should be our due. So far we have waited in vain. The propitious moment has arrived when temporary relief afforded by this measure will give to the membership of this great body an opportunity to demonstrate that the farming industry of America is no longer to be ignored.

I trust that by your votes, emphatically expressed in support of this bill, a new era of prosperity, happiness, and contentment will be vouchsafed to that industry that is the sustaining force of our physical life—our very existence.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 21, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. BEERS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 703. An act making an adjustment of certain accounts between the United States and the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7757. A bill for the abandonment of a portion of the present channel of the south branch of the Chicago River; with an amendment (Rept. No. 791). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINEBERGER: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. S. 1942. An act to protect navigation from obstruction and injury by preventing the discharge of oil into the coastal navigable waters of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3211. An act authorizing the sale of Gasparilla Island Military Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2704. An act to amend paragraph (3), section 16, of the interstate commerce act; without amendment (Rept. No. 796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3556. A bill for the relief of Herman R. Woltman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8192. A bill for the relief of Frank Rector; without amendment (Rept. No. 793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5257. A bill for the relief of Alonzo C. Shekell; without amendment (Rept. No. 797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6775. A bill for the relief of Francis Forbes; without amendment (Rept. No. 798). 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. 7631) for the relief of Charles T. Clayton and others; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 9088) granting an increase of pension to Ruth M. E. Standage; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9274) granting a pension to Henry F. C. Toedt; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged; and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 9342) for the purchase of a site for public building at Sturgis, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 9343) authorizing the adjudication of claims of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9344) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,"

approved October 15, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9345) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Vanderburgh County, Ind., and Henderson County, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF: A bill (H. R. 9346) to permit a rural letter carrier to engage in any business or other occupation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 267) to amend section 2 of an act to revise and equalize rates of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and the war with Mexico, to certain widows, including widows of the War of 1812, former widows, dependent parents, and children of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to certain Army nurses, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in cases approved May 1, 1920; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) for the participation of the United States in an international exposition to be held at Seville, Spain, in 1927; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. MEAD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting that Congress make liberal appropriations for the carrying out of the spirit of the national defense act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9347) for the relief of the United States Portable Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9348) granting a pension to Joe S. Castor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 9349) granting an increase of pension to Martha Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 9350) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Fosse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 9351) granting an increase of pension to Adeline Ringelstein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9352) granting a pension to Sarah Morley Gillette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9353) for the relief of the Rochester Merchandise Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 9354) for the relief of William P. Quarles, known as Qualls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9355) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pinion; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 9356) granting an increase of pension to Mary Bershig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 9357) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Bumpass, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9358) granting a pension to Adah I. Tomlinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 9359) granting insurance to Lydia C. Spry; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9360) granting an increase of pension to Mary Collins; 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:

2817. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of employees of the Maintenance of Equipment Department, Pennsylvania Railroad system, southwestern region, protesting against the Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2818. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of the executive committee of the Marion County (Ill.) Farm Bureau, in favor of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2819. Also, petition of the Richland County Farm Bureau, Ill., favoring the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2820. Also, petition of the Crawford County Farm Bureau of Illinois, indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2821. Also, petition of the executive committee of the Clinton County Farm Bureau, Ill., favoring the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2822. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of the Romeo Monday Club, protesting against the drainage of the Winneshiek bottom lands along the upper Mississippi; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2823. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Fairview, Okla., urging that sufficient appropriations will be made by Congress to carry out the provisions of the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2824. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Tioga, Pa., opposing any bill proposing a modification of the existing prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2825. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of board of aldermen, city of New York, N. Y., indorsing congressional bill for increase in salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2826. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of S. R. Simonson and 222 other residents of Benson, Swift County, Minn., urging Congress to protect eggs as a source of farm income by an adequate tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2827. By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: Petition of the La Grange Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, indorsing bill for the conservation of the upper Mississippi known as the game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2828. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Dona Ana County Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Thomas Branigan, president, Las Cruces, N. Mex., favoring results obtained by the special commission on narcotics, recommending that conference be held in England; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2829. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of W. D. Allen Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., opposing passage of Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2830. Also, petition of L. D. Pike, commander Glendale Camp, No. 67, United States War Veterans, indorsing passage of Bursum pension bill over President's veto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2831. Also, five letters from residents of Tacoma, Wash., in re bill to change the name of Mount Rainier to Mount Tacoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2832. Also, petitions of A. Goodman, secretary Golden Gate Brass Manufacturing Co., Los Angeles, Calif., and Hans Barkan, M. D., San Francisco, Calif., indorsing San Carlos Dam bill (S. 966); and Wm. A. Brunnette, president White Earth Reservation, Mahanomen, Minn., opposing passage of bill giving \$50 per capita payment to the Red Lake Indians only; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

2833. Also, petition of Robert D. McCrimmon, Tacoma, Wash., and Fred L. Arndt, Groveland, Calif., in re bill to change name of Mount Rainier to Mount Tacoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2834. Also, 35 letters and telegrams in regard to the Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, May 21, 1924

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 20, 1924)

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

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that it might be well to have a quorum.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator withhold that just a moment? Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. EDGE. The pending question is the motion made by myself that Senate bill 1898 shall be made the unfinished business. If the Senator will yield for the purpose, I shall appreciate it very much, that the motion may be put so the matter can be settled; and I shall then yield to the Senator from Nebraska, of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we had better have a quorum. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Adams | Fernald | Ladd | Shields |
| Ashurst | Ferris | Lenroot | Shipstead |
| Ball | Fletcher | Lodge | Shortridge |
| Bayard | Frazier | McKinley | Simmons |
| Borah | George | McLean | Smith |
| Brandegee | Gerry | McNary | Smoot |
| Broussard | Glass | Mayfield | Spencer |
| Bruce | Gooding | Moses | Stanfield |
| Bursum | Hale | Neely | Stevens |
| Cameron | Harrell | Norbeck | Sterling |
| Capper | Harris | Norris | Swanson |
| Caraway | Harrison | Oddie | Trammell |
| Colt | Heflin | Overman | Underwood |
| Copeland | Howell | Pepper | Wadsworth |
| Cummins | Johnson, Calif. | Pittman | Walsh, Mass. |
| Curtis | Johnson, Minn. | Raibson | Walsh, Mont. |
| Dale | Jones, N. Mex. | Ransdell | Warren |
| Dial | Kendrick | Reed, Pa. | |
| Edge | Keyes | Robinson | |
| Edwards | King | Sheppard | |

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are attending a meeting of a special investigating committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House 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. 6820) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30, 31, 44, 45, 55, and 59 to the aforesaid bill; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 25, 28, 40, 43, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 60, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8905) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Hungary to the United States of America, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

POSTMASTERS AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] that the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1898.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I have the floor, have I not? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. But the Senator from Nebraska yielded to the Senator from New Jersey to allow the Chair to put the motion that has just been stated by the Chair.

Mr. HOWELL. Very well; let the motion be put. Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to enable me to introduce a bill?

Mr. EDGE. I hardly feel, under the arrangement entered into with the Senator from Nebraska, that I really have a right to yield. It is through his courtesy that I have been able to ask for a vote on my motion, which will only take a moment. Then I am quite sure the Senator from Nebraska will yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1898) to readjust the compensation of postmasters and reclassify and readjust the salaries and compensation of employees in the Postal Service, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

THE FARMERS' PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LADD

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on the 3d instant by my colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], on "The Farmers' Problems," before the Political Study Club, in the city of Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the address will be printed accordingly.