

Also, a bill (H. R. 9991) granting a pension to Sadie A. Nolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9992) granting an increase of pension to Earl Roice; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 9993) granting a pension to Mary E. Walp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9994) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Buckmaster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9995) granting a pension to Sarah A. Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9996) granting a pension to Sarah Bendle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9997) granting a pension to Harry E. Galusha; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9998) granting a pension to Hattie L. Cowles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9999) granting a pension to James R. Hinds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 10000) granting a pension to Eugene A. Rentz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10001) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Hester; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10002) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 10003) granting an increase of pension to Virginia S. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10004) granting an increase of pension to Allen F. McAfee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH: A bill (H. R. 10005) granting a pension to Eugene Promie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10006) for the relief of Ernestine McBride; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10007) granting a pension to George A. Newton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10008) granting a pension to Mary Jane Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10009) granting an increase of pension to Emily F. DuBois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10010) granting a pension to Emma Jane Whipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10011) granting a pension to Mary J. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10012) granting a pension to Clara Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 10013) granting an increase of pension to Mary N. Hoagland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10014) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10015) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jakes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10016) granting an increase of pension to Maria Kienle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 10017) granting an increase of pension to Thomas I. Kitzmiller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10018) granting an increase of pension to Louis Roth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10019) granting a pension to Mary K. Stegle; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

3035. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Riverside Post, No. 118, G. A. R., Riverside, Calif., concerning the Stone Mountain Confederate Association and the 50-cent memorial coins authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3036. Also (by request), petition of executive committee of the La Salle County, Ill., Farm Bureau, favoring legislation that will prevent the continued use by the city of Chicago of the Illinois River for sewage purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3037. Also (by request), petition of John A. Stewart, New York City, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Washington commemoration bill; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

3038. Also (by request), petition of Bradford Baptist Association, Canton, Pa., urging the repeal of that part of the immigration law that discriminates against the Japanese people; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3039. Also (by request), petition of John F. Matthews, urging the enactment into law of either H. R. 2719 or S. 1535; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3040. Also (by request), petitions of Garfield Post, No. 25, G. A. R., Wichita, Kans., and Wilde Post, No. 25, G. A. R., Chester, Pa., concerning the Stone Mountain Confederate Monumental Association and the 50-cent memorial coins authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3041. Also (by request), petition of the council of the American Institute of Consulting Engineers, opposing the enactment into law of the Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3042. Also (by request), petition of Lyon Post, No. 8, G. A. R., Oakland, Calif., urging the repeal of the law authorizing the issue of 5,000,000 memorial pieces, the profits from the sale of this issue to be turned over to the Stone Mountain Monumental Association, of Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3043. Also (by request), petition of members of the Central Christian Church of Flint, Mich., favoring action by the President and Congress to appoint a day to be known as defense day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3044. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the Exchange Club of Jamaica, urging the enactment of the game refuge public shooting ground bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3045. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of officers and members of Seyburn-Liscum Camp, No. 12, U. S. W. V., Department of New York, indorsing the provisions of Senate bill 1898; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3046. Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, urging Congress to enact into law Senate bill 1898; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3047. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the American Federation of Labor, urging the Congress to speedily enact Senate bill 1898, the postal salary increase bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3048. Also, petition of the New York State League of Savings and Loan Associations, urging the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, to make an inter-censal survey covering building and loan associations in the United States and the Congress to make the necessary appropriation to make the survey; to the Committee on the Census.

3049. Also, petition from J. D. Rising, vice president of the National Park Bank of New York, favoring the change of name of Mount Rainier (in Washington) to Mount Tacoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3050. Also, petition of the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the repeal of section 257(b) of the revenue act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, December 2, 1924

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

Our Father, through the many years Thou hast proven Thyself to be a father. Thou hast borne with us under many distressing circumstances and Thou art always ready to hear the cry of the humble and contrite heart. Grant that this moment it may be not lip service but the yearning of souls after Thee for Thy guidance, for Thy strength, for every inspiration that will help in the performance of known duty. Hear us and be with us constantly till life's work is done. Through Christ our Lord we ask it. Amen.

WOODBIDGE N. FERRIS, a Senator from the State of Michigan, appeared in his seat to-day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a resolution (H. Res. 357) informing the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had appeared and that the House was ready to proceed to business.

The message also announced that the House had passed a resolution (H. Res. 356) providing for the appointment of three Members on the part of the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President and inform him that a quorum of the two Houses had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 30) providing for a joint session of the two Houses for the purpose of holding appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Woodrow Wilson, former President of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9138) to authorize the discontinuance of the seven-year regauge of distilled spirits in bonded warehouses, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. EDWARD CAMPBELL LITTLE, late a Representative from the State of Kansas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. SYDNEY E. MUDD, late a Representative from the State of Maryland, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WILLIAM STEDMAN GREENE, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House unanimously adopted as a tribute to the memory of the Hon. LEBARON BRADFORD COLT, late a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

The message further communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House unanimously adopted as a tribute to the memory of the Hon. FRANK BOSWORTH BRANDEGEE, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

The message also communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House unanimously adopted as a tribute to the memory of the Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, late a Senator from the State of Massachusetts.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. ROBINSON appeared, and

Mr. CURTIS said: Mr. President, your committee which was appointed to join a similar committee from the House to advise the President that a quorum of the two Houses was present and ready to receive any communication he desired to make have performed that duty. The President advised the joint committee that he will communicate in writing to the two Houses to-day the Budget message and to-morrow will submit in writing his regular message.

CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of Iowa certifying to the election of SMITH W. BROOKHART as a United States Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1925, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To SMITH W. BROOKHART, *Greeting:*

It is hereby certified that at an election holden on the 4th day of November, A. D. 1924, you were elected to the office of United States Senator of said State, for the term of six years from and after the 4th day of March, A. D. 1925.

Given at the seat of government this 24th day of November, A. D. 1924.

N. E. KENDALL,
Governor of the State of Iowa.

Countersigned:

[SEAL.]

W. C. RAMSAY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I present the certificate of election of my colleague, Senator HEFLIN, for the six-year term commencing the 4th of March, and ask that it be filed with the Secretary.

The certificate was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

THE STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, S. H. BLAN, secretary of state, in accordance with the provisions of section 516 of the Code of Alabama, do hereby certify that, as shown by the returns of election on file in this office, Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN was elected to United States Senate from the State of Alabama at the general election held in this State on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1924.

Witness my hand this 25th day of November, 1924.

[SEAL.]

S. H. BLAN,
Secretary of State.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that in accordance with the provisions of section 5581 of the Revised Statutes, he has appointed REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah, a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator LODGE.

COMMISSION FOR THE EXTENSION AND COMPLETION OF THE CAPITOL BUILDING

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Elihu Root resigning his membership in the Commission for the Extension and Completion of the Capitol Building, constituted under the provisions of the act approved April 28, 1904, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORT OF THE SURGEON GENERAL, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency, covering activities of the Currency Bureau for the year ended October 31, 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

WAR DEPARTMENT REPORTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing expenditures from the appropriation for the encouragement of breeding of riding horses for the fiscal year 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a comprehensive housing program containing a series of charts showing the new construction required at military posts in the United States, Hawaii, and Panama, together with classified lists of surplus military reservations, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

CONTRACTS WITH RAILROADS FOR CARRYING THE MAILS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the fixing of rates of compensation to be paid to railroad companies for the transportation of the mails and special contracts therefor, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ADMINISTRATION OF WAR MINERALS RELIEF ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in compliance with law, a report covering all operations, including receipts and disbursements, arising out of the so-called war minerals relief act, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

DEPRESSION IN THE DOMESTIC LEATHER INDUSTRY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce concerning Senate Resolution 256, directing the Secretary of Commerce to furnish the Senate with data relative to depression in the domestic leather industry and the competition from foreign calf upper leathers, stating that all information which can

be obtained, both at home and abroad, will be collected and furnished the Senate as expeditiously as possible, and so forth, which was ordered to lie on the table.

RULES AND REGULATIONS, STEAMBOAT INSPECTION SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in compliance with law, a complete set of general rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, Steamboat Inspection Service, and approved by the Secretary of Commerce, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

(1) General rules and regulations, ocean and coastwise, edition of April 4, 1924.

(2) General rules and regulations, Great Lakes, edition of April 4, 1924.

(3) General rules and regulations, bays, sounds, and lakes other than the Great Lakes, edition of April 4, 1924.

(4) General rules and regulations, rivers, edition of April 4, 1924.

REPORT ON HOUSE-FURNISHINGS INDUSTRIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the commission on the house-furnishings industries, dealing especially with kitchen utensils and domestic appliances, submitted in further response to Senate Resolution 127, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, dated January 4, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement indicating the cost of distribution of the 14 publications issued by the Federal Trade Commission during the fiscal year 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORTS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail the travel expenses of all officials and employees (other than special agents, inspectors, or employees who in the discharge of their regular duties are required to constantly travel) who have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing employment under the appropriation for the valuation of carriers for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, the names of all persons employed, alphabetically arranged, the State from which each was appointed, the rate of compensation paid to each, together with a full itemized statement showing how the moneys appropriated for the fiscal years 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, and 1924 have been expended, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the make, model, and serial number of each office machine exchanged during the fiscal year 1924, the period of its use, the allowance therefor, and the article, make, and model thereof and price, including exchange value paid for each article procured through such exchange, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the following final valuations of properties of certain carriers:

Valuation Docket No. 151, Florida East Coast Railway Co. and Atlantic & East Coast Terminal Co.

Valuation Docket No. 4, the Kansas City Southern Railway Co. et al.

Valuation Docket No. 2, Texas Midland Railroad.

Valuation Docket No. 127, Ann Arbor Railroad Co. and Menominee & St. Paul Railway Co.

Valuation Docket No. 232, Danville & Western Railway Co.

Valuation Docket No. 191, Southern Railway Co. in Mississippi.

Valuation Docket No. 16, Bowdon Railway Co.

Valuation Docket No. 77, Wood River Branch Railroad Co.

Valuation Docket No. 183, the Rhode Island Co. and the Narragansett Pier Railroad Co.

Valuation Docket No. 188, Durham & South Carolina Railroad Co.

Valuation Docket No. 306, Knoxville, Sevierville & Eastern Railway.

Valuation Docket No. 94, Hoosac Tunnel & Wilmington Railroad Co.

Valuation Docket No. 131, Union Freight Railroad Co.

Valuation Docket No. 169, Paris & Mt. Pleasant Railroad Co.

Valuation Docket No. 63, Gainesville Midland Railway.

Valuation Docket No. 289, the Cumberland Railroad Co.

Valuation Docket No. 280, Nevada Copper Belt Railroad Co.

Valuation Docket No. 24, the New Mexico Midland Railway Co.

Valuation Docket No. 93, Gulf Terminal Co.

Valuation Docket No. 219, Raritan River Railroad Co.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF ADJUSTED COMPENSATION ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the administration of the adjusted compensation act by the United States Veterans' Bureau to date, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Eighth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the acting president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of that government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Eighth Annual Report of the United States Shipping Board covering the period June 30, 1923, to and including June 30, 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the vice chairman of the United States Shipping Board transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of travel performed by the officers and employees of the United States Shipping Board during the fiscal year 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TYPEWRITERS, ETC., CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year 1924, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the office of the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE SENATE CHAMBER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, in compliance with Senate Resolution 231, agreed to June 7, 1924, a report relative to the improving of the living conditions of the Senate Chamber and including a plan to place the Senate Chamber in direct contact with the outer walls of the building, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed with the illustrations.

UNITED STATES BOTANIC GARDEN—TRAVEL EXPENSES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report of the Director of the United States Botanic Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement relative to travel

performed from Washington, D. C., in connection with official business of his office during the fiscal year 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REPORTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report giving the aggregate number of publications issued by the Library of Congress proper during the fiscal year 1923-24, the cost of paper used, the cost of printing, the cost of preparation, and the number distributed, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail the travel performed by officers and employees of the Library of Congress on official business to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1924, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISMISSAL OF CAUSES BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, informing the Senate that the cause of Hyland C. Kirk et al., assignees of Addison C. Fletcher, versus the United States, congressional No. 15369, was dismissed by the court for nonprosecution on May 19, 1924, on motion of the defendant, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, informing the Senate that the cause of Alfred A. Thresher versus the United States, congressional No. 17297, was dismissed by the court on May 5, 1924, for nonprosecution on motion of the defendant, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

ACTS OF THE PORTO RICAN LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate certified transcripts of acts and resolutions of the special session of the Tenth Legislature of Porto Rico, 1924, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

REPORT ON COOPERATION IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, submitting, pursuant to the provisions of section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission act, a report on cooperation in foreign countries.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to inquire whether the report will be printed; and if so, how many copies of it will be printed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has not ordered it printed. There ought to be some action on the part of the Senate if such reports are to be printed, because they are very voluminous.

Mr. NORRIS. Before disposition is made of that particular report I would like to ask some action of the Senate. I have no desire to do it at this moment unless it is agreeable to the Senate, but I do not want the report taken off the President's desk until I can make some request with reference to it. It is a very important report connected definitely with agricultural problems and the only use of it will come from a perusal of it. It ought to be printed. I think there will be a great demand for copies of it. I have not yet myself been able to secure a copy of it so that I can examine it. I have only read the description of it contained in the letter of transmittal, a copy of which I have on my desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How many copies does the Senator propose to have printed?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that he let it go to the committee, and then the committee will ask that an appropriate number of copies be printed. I do not know what it will cost. Under the law the Senate can only order the printing of a certain number of copies without a concurrent resolution. If there is no objection, and I presume there will be none, I suggest that that course be followed.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there will be objection, but it occurred to me that possibly a concurrent resolution would be the proper solution of the question. I ask now that the communication of the Federal Trade Commission on the subject mentioned, together with the letter of transmittal, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that under the rule the committee itself has authority to print a certain number of copies.

Mr. SMOOT. A thousand copies can be printed under the law.

Mr. FLETCHER. The committee can do that without any further action by the Congress, and then if it is desired to have more copies printed it will require the passage of a concurrent resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, before we can definitely settle the question as to the number of copies that shall be printed we will have to examine the report itself. I do not want to have a lot of reports printed unless that is the proper course; but from my reading of the outline of this report it is one that will be greatly in demand from all parts of the country. My idea is that probably we ought to have concurrent action of the House and Senate before we finally determine on the number to be printed.

Mr. SMOOT. May I suggest to the Senator that they be printed under authority of a concurrent resolution and not by committee order? If we have a committee print, it has no number, while if we have it printed by authority of a concurrent resolution it will have a number. We do not want to have two documents. It seems to me the proper way to dispose of it will be by a concurrent resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senate will agree to the request I have submitted, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at the very first opportunity will look into it and ascertain what their judgment is and report back to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand that any objection has been made. Without objection, the report will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR LODGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., in honor of the memory of the life, character, and public service of HENRY CABOT LODGE, late a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, which were ordered to lie on the table.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR BRANDEGEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Court of Common Council of the City of Hartford, Conn., in honor of the memory of the life, character, and public service of FRANK B. BRANDEGEE, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

STATE OF ARKANSAS, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Little Rock, June 30, 1924.

Senator ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take pleasure in inclosing you herewith certified copy of house concurrent resolution No. 1, ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which shall give the Congress the power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

Respectfully,

THOMAS C. McRAE, Governor.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Ira C. Hopper, secretary of state of the State of Arkansas, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached instrument of writing is a true and perfect copy of house concurrent resolution No. 1, ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, approved June 28, 1924, the original of which was filed for record in this office on the _____ day of _____, 192—.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at office in the city of Little Rock, this 30th day of June, 1924.

[SEAL.]

IRA C. HOPPER,
Secretary of State.
By B. T. HOFF, Deputy.

House concurrent resolution 1, amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution

"Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concur

ring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article, except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress."

Therefore be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas:

SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of Arkansas.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington, D. C., to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Approved: June 28, 1924.

THOMAS C. McRAE,
Governor of the State of Arkansas.
IRA C. HOPPER,
Secretary of the State of Arkansas.
R. K. MASON,
President of the Senate.
HOWARD REED,
Speaker of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Legislature of Georgia, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Whereas the Southern States have been passing through a period of great financial depression; and

Whereas on account of freight rates the growers of peaches, watermelons, and other crops have been unable to profitably ship their produce; and

Whereas under the discriminating rates now in force, produce may be shipped into Georgia from great distances at a lower rate than the same articles can be shipped from point to point within the State; and

Whereas the State public-service commission is powerless to regulate interstate rates and provide any relief: and

Whereas the prosperity of the entire State is largely dependent on a downward revision of freight rates and surcharges to a figure more nearly in line with the normal rates prior to the World War: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Georgia, That we do most earnestly request of the Interstate Commerce Commission that they take immediate action to remedy these conditions; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the clerks of the house and senate to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the House and Senate of the United States, and to each Member of the House and Senate of the United States from Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Legislature of Georgia, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Whereas our National Congress has taken, or is likely to take, steps to create, locate, and open a national park in the Southern Appalachian Mountains: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That we urge our Congressmen and Senators to use their best efforts in having such park created, located, and laid out in the Southern Appalachian Mountains, where the States of Georgia, the Carolinas, and Tennessee join;

Resolved further, That we commend and approve the efforts of the Southern Appalachian Park Association and kindred organizations for their efforts in the promotion and creation of additional parks by our National Government in the Southern Appalachian Mountains to the end that there may be mobilization of out-of-doors recreation and nature conservation for the promotion of the health, happiness, and prosperity of the people.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the President of the United States, Secretary of Interior, to the clerks, respectively, of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives, and also to the United States Senators and Congressmen of Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of Maryland, which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, E. Brooke Lee, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 59 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution No. 4 of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland at the regular session of January, 1924, as the same is taken from and compared with the original joint resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state, at Annapolis, Md., this 14th day of April, in the year 1924.

[SEAL.]

E. BROOKE LEE,
Secretary of State.

Joint resolution recommending to the Congress of the United States that appropriate action be taken to make the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem of the United States

Whereas the Star-Spangled Banner is universally recognized by tradition and by custom as the national anthem of the United States; and

Whereas the American Legion, representing the thought not only of the men who served in the World War but also of the many other patriotic organizations and of the great majority of American citizens at large, has gone on record as being in favor of making the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem by an official act of Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be requested to take appropriate action to make the Star-Spangled Banner officially and legally the national anthem of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit, under the great seal of this State, a copy of the foregoing resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in both Houses of Congress.

Approved, April 9, 1924.

[THE GREAT SEAL OF MARYLAND.]

ALBERT C. RITCHIE, *Governor.*
FRANCIS P. CURTIS,
Speaker of the House of Delegates.
DAVID G. MCINTOSH, Jr.,
President of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of Maryland, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, E. Brooke Lee, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 59 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution No. 20, of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, at the regular session of January, 1924, as the same is taken from and compared with the original joint resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state, at Annapolis, Md., this 12th day of April, in the year 1924.

[SEAL.]

E. BROOKE LEE,
Secretary of State.

Joint resolution and memorial of the General Assembly of Maryland to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled requesting the repeal of all laws which authorize appropriations to the several States in the form of Federal aid on the condition that the States make similar appropriations, and to abolish all offices, boards, and bureaus created to administer or supervise such appropriations

Whereas the enactment of laws of Congress authorizing appropriations to the several States on condition that similar appropriations be made by the States compels each State to undertake work which it may not wish to undertake or lose its share of the Federal appropriation, in which case it would be compelled to contribute in taxes to the work in other States, of which its people disapprove and from which they derive no benefit; and

Whereas such Federal appropriations are becoming burdensome, amounting to millions of dollars each year, with similar amounts from the States; and

Whereas in practically every case the work thus undertaken properly belongs to the several States and should be done by them without interference or control from a centralized government; and

Whereas it is time to cease centralizing power and authority in the National Government in matters which are primarily of local concern and which can generally be best done under local authority and supervision; and

Whereas there is a demand on the part of the people of Maryland for a return to the fundamental principles of our Government, namely, the performance of State duties and functions by the several States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled be, and they are hereby, requested and urged to repeal all laws which authorize appropriations to the several States in the form of Federal aid on condition that similar appropriations are made by the respective States; and be it further

Resolved, That all offices, boards, and bureaus created to administer or supervise such appropriations be abolished; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives from the State of Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to urge and support the repeal of the above-mentioned laws; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit under the great seal of this State a copy of the foregoing resolution and memorial to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Approved, April 9, 1924.

[THE GREAT SEAL OF MARYLAND.]

ALBERT C. RITCHIE, Governor.

DAVID G. MCINTOSH, Jr.,

President of the Senate.

FRANCIS P. CURTIS,

Speaker of the House of Delegates.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of Maryland, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Silver Spring, Md., June 14, 1924.

HON. ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
Acting Chairman of the Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Inclosed are copies of the resolutions which I am directed by the 1924 session of the General Assembly of Maryland to mail to you.

Very truly yours,

E. BROOKE LEE.

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, E. Brooke Lee, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 59 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution No. 12 of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland at the regular session of January, 1924, as the same is taken from and compared with the original joint resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state at Annapolis, Md., this 12th day of April, in the year 1924.

[SEAL.]

E. BROOKE LEE,

Secretary of State.

Joint resolution relating to Federal legislation for regulating and controlling the sale of farm and garden seeds

Whereas the farmers and the vegetable growers of the United States annually suffer great losses because of decreased yields due to the purchase and use of seeds of inferior quality and of unsuitable origin which are sold in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the efforts of the individual States to provide adequate protection to farmers and vegetable growers are defeated by the said interstate commerce in farm and vegetable seeds of inferior quality and of unsuitable origin: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested and urged to enact legislation regulating and controlling the interstate sale of farm seeds in conformity with the uniform State seed law as approved by the Association of Official Seed Analysts of North America, and of garden seeds under such rules and regulations as will provide adequate protection to vegetable growers; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of Maryland to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to the President of the United States Senate.

Approved, April 9, 1924.

[THE GREAT SEAL OF MARYLAND.]

ALBERT C. RITCHIE, Governor.

FRANCIS P. CURTIS,

Speaker of the House of Delegates.

DAVID G. MCINTOSH, Jr.,

President of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of Maryland, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, E. Brooke Lee, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 50 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution No. 22 of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, at the regular session of January, 1924, as the same is taken from and compared with the original joint resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state, at Annapolis, Md., this 12th day of April, in the year 1924.

[SEAL.]

E. BROOKE LEE,

Secretary of State.

Joint resolution requesting Congress to modify the immigration laws

Whereas emergencies arise in regard to the employment of labor on farms; and

Whereas the present immigration laws make it very difficult to secure immigrants who are experienced in agricultural labor: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested and urged to amend the immigration laws by exempting experienced agricultural workers from the contract-labor provisions of the law so as to permit the bringing in of experienced agricultural laborers in case of emergencies in the farm-labor situation, such emergency or emergencies to be determined by the United States Secretary of Labor, any workers who are brought in under the above-mentioned conditions to be in addition to the quota allowed for such country or countries and to be allowed to come in such number or numbers as said Secretary of Labor shall designate; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives from the State of Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to cooperate to the fullest extent in having the immigration laws amended as above suggested; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit under the great seal of the State a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Department of Labor, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Approved, April 9, 1924.

[THE GREAT SEAL OF MARYLAND.]

ALBERT C. RITCHIE, Governor.

DAVID G. MCINTOSH, Jr.,

President of the Senate.

FRANCIS P. CURTIS,

Speaker of the House of Delegates.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate resolutions of Andrew Mather Post No. 14, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of West Virginia, of Parkersburg, W. Va.; of Wild Post No. 25, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Chester, Pa., and of Riverside Post No. 118, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California and Nevada, of Riverside, Calif., praying for the repeal of the law authorizing the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the work on Stone Mountain, Ga., which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Bradford Baptist Association, at Canton, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation prohibiting Japanese immigration into the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of the Society of Friends of New York, favoring the United States Government calling an international economic conference, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present a letter and some resolutions adopted by the Unitarian Laymen's League. I ask that the letter and resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITARIAN LAYMEN'S LEAGUE,
EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
Boston, Mass., November 25, 1924.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: I am directed, by vote of the council of the Unitarian Laymen's League, to transmit with its approval to the Senate the inclosed resolution adopted at the annual convention of chapter officers of the league at their meeting in Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada, on September 13 last.

We feel justified in hoping that the foreign policy of the United States may exemplify the inspired statesmanship referred to in the resolution.

Cordially yours,

GEORGE G. DAVIS,
Vice President.

Resolution adopted September 13, 1924, by the annual convention of chapter officers of the Unitarian Laymen's League at Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada

Whereas war inevitably causes unspeakable horrors, incalculable suffering, and irreparable waste, dulls the moral perceptions, and breeds the ugliest passions; and

Whereas history records that international disputes of the most acute nature can be arbitrated to the ultimate satisfaction and benefit of all concerned, as is witnessed by the fact that Great Britain and the United States have preserved, unbroken, more than 100 years of peace, and have mutually shown their confidence and trust by maintaining between Canada and the United States, unfortified by land and water, the longest international boundary line in the world; and

Whereas the aim of every church should be the creation of such a passionate concern for truth and justice, for love, honor, and mutual helpfulness, for every divine attribute, that men shall no longer resort to or tolerate injustice or aggression; be it

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to unremitting effort on the part of our churches to function in creating a sentiment that shall make war impossible; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the council of our league to express to the Premier and Parliament of the Dominion of Canada and to the President and Senate of the United States our profound conviction—

First, That resort to arms is never justifiable save as a last desperate measure to restrain and control gross injustice; and

Second, That by patient negotiation and inspired statesmanship some international agency can and must be created for the peaceful adjudication of all international disputes.

Mr. ROBINSON presented letters in the nature of petitions of sundry citizens of Pine Bluff, Ark., praying for the passage of Senate bill 1898, granting increased compensation to postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of sundry citizens in the State of Texas praying for the relief of Indians in Polk County, Tex., which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR presented a petition of the Waverly Place Methodist Church, of Nashville, Tenn., praying for the entrance of the United States into the World Court, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Memphis, Ooltewah, and vicinity, all in the State of Tennessee, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McNARY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Waltherville and vicinity, in the State of Oregon, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ASHURST presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Globe, Ariz., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Joint Postal Committee of Greater Kansas City, Mo., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution of the Topeka Industrial Council, of Topeka, Kans., favoring the passage of legislation granting increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LADD presented resolutions adopted by the house of delegates of the North Dakota State Medical Association at Bismarck, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the so-called Cramton bill governing the use of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes by physicians, and also favoring a reduction of the war tax on narcotics, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Postal Club, of Mandan, N. Dak., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1898, granting increased compensation to postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3493) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a commission authorized under certain conditions to refund or convert obligations of foreign governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved February 9, 1922, as amended February 28, 1923; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3494) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Utah National Park in the State of Utah"; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 3495) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, a certain tract of land in the District of Columbia for the enlargement of the present site of the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3496) to authorize the removal of the gates and gate posts at the head of West Executive Avenue in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3497) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Marshfield, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3498) granting a pension to Nicholas Bier;

A bill (S. 3499) granting a pension to Esther Ann Hill Morgan; and

A bill (S. 3500) granting a pension to William J. Hirschberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 3501) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to render judgment in the matter of the claim of Addison B. McKinley, of Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3502) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Sparks, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 3503) for the relief of Emma Zembsch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 3504) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Tonery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 3505) for the relief of Canadian Car & Foundry Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3506) granting a pension to Mary Ann Raper (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3508) for the relief of John B. Evans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DIAL:

A bill (S. 3509) to change the time for the holding of terms of court in the eastern district of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 3510) for the relief of James Doherty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3512) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Franklin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3513) granting an increase of pension to George E. Ryan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3514) authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of H. C. Ericsson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 3515) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Chick; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3516) for the relief of James Craig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LADD:

A bill (S. 3517) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of imitated or misbranded articles of commerce, and regulating the traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 3518) granting an increase of pension to Elise Pinard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3519) granting an increase of pension to Nettie Lamprey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3520) granting an increase of pension to Myra McDonald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3521) granting an increase of pension to Ann Milnes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3522) granting an increase of pension to Marion E. Laird (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3523) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Foss (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3524) granting a pension to Ellen M. Kilbourn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3525) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hitchcock (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY (by request):

A bill (S. 3526) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain Indian war veterans and widows, to certain Spanish war soldiers and their widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 3527) for the relief of Mary B. Jenks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 3528) granting an increase of pension to Christopher S. Alvord; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 3529) granting an increase of pension to Valentine Horst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) limiting grazing charges on forest reserves; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DIAL:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to repeal a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution in respect to child labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan cots, bedding, and camp equipment, not including tentage, for the use of the Modern Woodmen of America Foresters at their national quadrennial encampment to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., in June, 1925; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan cots, bedding, and camp equipment, not including tentage, for the use of the Modern Woodmen of America Foresters at their national quadrennial encampment to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., in June, 1925; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I introduce a bill in reference to the disposition of the Muscle Shoals property. I ask that the bill may be printed in the usual form, and also as a substitute for the pending Muscle Shoals bill, being House bill No. 518; in other words, I ask to have the bill printed in both forms.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3507) to provide for the national defense; for the production and manufacture of fixed nitrogen, commercial fertilizer, and other useful products, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, under the order of the Senate, to-morrow has been fixed for the consideration of House bill 518, relating to the disposition of the Muscle Shoals property. During the summer the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], who is the only chemist in the Senate, wrote two very interesting and learned articles in regard to this property. I ask unanimous consent that those articles may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in eight-point type, for the information of the Senate, so that they may be before the Senate when the matter comes up for consideration to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. Is the request to print in the RECORD the articles referred to by the Senator from Alabama in eight-point type?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. Is not that the usual course?

Mr. MOSES. That may not be done without changing the law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I mean to request that the articles be printed in the usual RECORD type, whatever that may be. I understand now it is six-point type.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of November 22, 1924]

WHY I AM FOR HENRY FORD'S OFFER FOR MUSCLE SHOALS

(By EDWIN F. LADD, United States Senator from North Dakota)

Only in the past 25 years have governments and scientists paid any real attention to the rapidly increasing dependence of the whole world upon the nitrogen of the air for the preservation and increase of soil fertility. It was in 1898 that Sir William Crookes, in his presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, called world-wide attention to this subject and predicted starvation for millions unless the nitrogen problem could be speedily solved, declaring that "all civilized nations stand in deadly peril of not having enough to eat." It is well known that without nitrogen we can not grow food crops or cotton for clothing, and without nitrogen no nation can carry on modern warfare.

But "there's a divinity that shapes our ends, roughhew them how we will," and it has been divinely arranged that the nitrogen in the air over every square mile of the earth's surface amounts to 20,000,000 tons; the gaseous nitrogen of the air, however, is extraordinarily inert and chemically rebellious.

The nitrogen problem is: How can this air nitrogen be economically converted into a solid or liquid product so that it can be used? This is a problem in industrial chemistry and national economics.

With respect to the purely legal questions arising in the solution of the Government's nitrogen problem, considered in connection with Henry Ford's offer for Muscle Shoals, I must be guided by the infallible authority of the lawyers of the Senate, reserving some layman views of my own as to the Federal water power act and its application to the proposal of Henry Ford.

As to the questions of chemistry involved in the solution of the Government's Muscle Shoals problem, however, I have some decided opinions of my own, based upon the history of air-nitrogen developments and upon my own study and experience as a chemist; and with this viewpoint I approach the Government's problems at Muscle Shoals and present my views to the readers of the Saturday Evening Post.

In a series of two articles the Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS, United States Senator from Nebraska and chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has presented to readers of the Saturday Evening Post his views as to why Henry Ford's offer for Muscle Shoals should not be accepted by the Senate. In general, Senator NORRIS and myself have been in accord on legislative matters. We have much in common. We are both identified with the progressive element in the Senate which is earnestly endeavoring to advance the interests of the people through constructive legislation in which party politics is made secondary to the general welfare. Both of us come from a region in which the fertilizer question, though of growing importance, is as yet one of the very least of the farmers' troubles. It can not fairly be said that either of us has adopted his views in order to secure a selfish benefit in his home State.

Though a progressive in Government policies, I am a conservative in commercial chemistry; and with respect to the Ford offer I have to say to that group of Senators with whom I am usually in accord what President Coolidge once said to the senators in the Massachusetts Legislature, "Be as radical as science and as reactionary as the multiplication table."

I regard the Government as exceptionally fortunate in having received an offer from Henry Ford when no one else would make a pro-

posal, and consider it very unfortunate that Chairman NORRIS has made unjust attacks on the Ford offer which have not been of a character calculated to lead to a calm, logical, and fair decision. The amount of useful power which Mr. Ford would get has been greatly exaggerated, while the power necessary for the manufacture of fertilizer under any fair interpretation of the terms of Mr. Ford's offer has been grossly underestimated. The extent of Mr. Ford's obligations, the amount of money which Mr. Ford or his company could make out of the transaction, the value of the property which Mr. Ford would receive, the title under which he would receive it, the significance of the lease period, the effect of the Federal water power act, the degree of public regulation of the business, the insurance of the dams against destruction—in all these and in many other particulars reckless statements of half truth or less than half truth have been made, grotesquely distorting the picture; misstatements which have been systematically broadcast throughout the country.

In view of these circumstances I am not surprised that Mr. Ford, after three years of unnecessary delay and unjust criticism, has seen fit to withdraw his offer. While I deeply regret that he has done so and gravely fear that the Government will never again secure an equal proposal, I am confident that the Senate will not overlook the fact that Mr. Ford has stated that he is still open to a counter proposition from the Government. There is a special significance in this statement, because when the Secretary of War sold the Gorgas steam-power plant which was a part of the property included in Mr. Ford's bid, he thereby made it impossible for Congress to accept the Ford proposal in accordance with its terms. Any legislation for its acceptance therefore necessarily must be in the nature of a counter proposal, and that is exactly what the McKenzie bill is—a counter proposition.

In spite of Mr. Ford's reported withdrawal I therefore cherish the hope that the benefits of the Ford offer at Muscle Shoals will not be lost.

For many years it has been proposed to improve the navigation of the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals in northwestern Alabama by means of two large navigation-power dams and one very small dam for navigation only. Of these, only one, the Wilson Dam, is being built.

ESSENTIAL FACTS

At Muscle Shoals the Government has built two nitrate plants. Nitrate plant No. 1, with a capacity of only 30 tons of nitrogen in the form of ammonia a day, was an unsuccessful experimental plant costing \$13,000,000. Nitrate plant No. 2, which cost \$67,000,000, is the largest nitrate plant in the world employing the cyanamide process. Its capacity is 40,000 tons of pure nitrogen a year. This is equivalent to about 250,000 tons of Chilean nitrate, or about 70 per cent of the entire amount imported from Chile annually for use by American agriculture. Unfortunately there is ample evidence that this plant will have to be radically changed to produce the improved concentrated fertilizers that are admittedly possible, while the cost of such changes and additions, from estimates given by the Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, will be at least \$25,000,000.

Senator NORRIS claims that these expenditures would cost Mr. Ford nothing, as he could repay himself by selling houses and lots to employees. Making the liberal estimate of \$2,000,000 as the value of the 571 houses—of which 263 are negro cabins with walls of tar paper—there would remain \$23,000,000 to be realized from the sale of lots. This is absurd for two reasons: First, the nitrate plant property can not be made to produce such a vast number of salable lots; and second, Mr. Ford is not going to Muscle Shoals to engage in the real-estate business.

The first question to be settled in disposing of this property is the policy to be pursued. The Government's investment at Muscle Shoals is the money of all the people. The project should be so disposed of as to bring the greatest good to the greatest number. In determining how to secure this result, there are two questions to be answered:

First, shall power production and distribution or fertilizer manufacture be paramount?

To decide upon a policy intelligently we must first have the facts, and when all debate and controversy have been swept aside there still remain four great outstanding facts that are generally admitted:

First, in spite of the fact that our domestic production of nitrogen in the form of by-product sulphate of ammonia has increased from 183,000 tons in 1914 to 591,000 tons in 1923, our dependence upon Chile for nitrate has increased from 564,000 tons in the fiscal year 1914 to nearly double that amount, or 962,000 tons, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924. Moreover, this increase in domestic production of by-product nitrogen, instead of being accompanied by a decrease in price, has resulted in an increase from \$2.69 a hundred pounds in 1914 to an average of \$3.14 a hundred pounds in 1923.

Second, Germany, prior to the war, was importing about 600,000 tons of Chilean nitrate annually, while to-day she is independent of Chile through the operation of her war-built air-nitrogen plants.

FERTILIZER COSTS

Third, authorities are agreed that combined nitrogen in the form of ammonia, which costs the farmer from 20 to 25 cents a pound when purchased in the form of mixed fertilizers, can be manufactured at Muscle Shoals for 5 to 6 cents a pound by several well-known processes.

Fourth, for eight years there has been an increasing volume of expert testimony to the effect that the nitrogen and phosphoric-acid industry properly established at Muscle Shoals can reduce the cost of fertilizers delivered to the farmers by one-half.

Nitrogen is an essential element in practically every kind of explosive, and in addition is the most expensive fertilizer ingredient that the farmer must buy. The Muscle Shoals development was made for the definite and clearly expressed purpose of procuring nitrogen for explosives in time of war and for fertilizers in time of peace, and the location was selected for two reasons: First, because it afforded the large amount of electrical power which now, as then, is an absolute necessity not only for the rather obsolete cyanamide process but for any known feasible process of producing a concentrated combination of nitrogen and phosphoric acid, the two chief fertilizer elements; second, because it is close to the great Tennessee phosphate fields and can be economically supplied with raw materials for fertilizer production.

It was made clear during the extended hearings before our committee that if we would divorce the nitrogen industry from reliance upon water power we immediately must turn to coal; but the country knows only too well how a coal strike can paralyze transportation and industry. Shall we deprive our future fertilizer industry of water power and make agriculture itself dependent upon the good grace and tolerance of the coal operators and their miners?

The domestic price of by-product nitrogen fertilizer is fixed by our domestic monopoly—mostly coal operators—in accordance with the price of Chilean nitrate, and the latter is fixed by a world-wide monopoly called the Chilean Nitrate Producers' Association. Our farmers fare no better at the hands of the by-product coke monopoly than they do at the hands of the Chilean nitrate monopoly. It seems to me that if we want to get cheaper fertilizer for American farmers we must find some other road than by permitting the fertilizer industry to be exploited by coal and coke operators, who have already declined to sell American farmers cheaper fertilizers, regardless of any technical advantage in doing so.

My position as to the use of the Muscle Shoals power in the manufacture of fertilizers squares exactly with that of Dr. E. H. Hooker, president of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association and of the Hooker Electrochemical Co., who is one of the leaders in the application of electric power to chemistry in the United States. Doctor Hooker told our committee that if the full opportunities for fertilizer manufacture are to be realized at Muscle Shoals, then the amount of power that would be necessary to meet the growing demand for fertilizer "will probably increase rather than decrease, although it will be less per unit."

This is exactly what is planned in the Ford offer, which is the only proposal in which there is no limit placed upon the amount of power to be used in fertilizer manufacture. It is confidently expected that the amount of power per ton of fertilizer will decrease, but that the total power to be used in fertilizer manufacture will constantly increase. From the very outset, however, Mr. Ford's minimum fertilizer obligations would require the entire supply of dependable Muscle Shoals power and would compel him to improve some of the secondary or irregular power to carry them out.

The proposal of Senator NORRIS that we divorce the power from the fertilizer and limit the amount of power to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer to not more than 25,000 horsepower of primary or dependable power and 75,000 horsepower of secondary or irregular power and engage in a cooperative business relation with the Alabama Power Co. and its associates in order to distribute the larger portion of the power, although a satisfactory arrangement to the associated power interests and to the fertilizer group will never have my support. Public utilities have had absolute domination of our water powers in this country for a generation, but never yet have they accomplished anything of importance to the farmer, although they themselves say in the report of the committee on public policy, National Electric Light Association, at their convention in June, 1922:

"No nation such as ours is stronger than its agriculture. * * * Any movement, therefore, to build up the city at the expense of the farming community is shortsighted."

OPPOSITION TO THE PLAN

Yet that association circulated pamphlets violently attacking the Ford plan as a means of reducing the farmer's expenses and increasing his crop yields and declaring that Dam No. 3, an important part of the project, should not be built at all.

When I review in the hearings the record of the power companies which were asked to bid on Muscle Shoals, I feel that the Government would get the worst of it in any business deal it might make with them. Mr. Duke, who controls the Southern Power Co., operating in North and South Carolina, and which company Mr. Yates testified would be a part of the superpower system—Mr. Duke, replying to the invitation sent to him by General Beach, condemned both the operation of the nitrate plant and the completion of the water power, and specifically pointed out to General Beach that the power could not go to the Carolinas.

Three of the associated power companies which made an offer for Muscle Shoals, following the publication of the Ford proposal, had already replied to General Beach's invitation in 1921, declaring that neither the Government nor private enterprise could afford to complete the water-power development at the Wilson Dam. Among the group of power companies which have opposed the farmers in their efforts to gain the acceptance of Mr. Ford's offer, the ringleader is the Alabama Power Co., a company whose contract with the Government was sharply criticized by the Attorney General, who stated:

"When its intricate provisions are closely scrutinized and their full significance realized, it becomes at once apparent that the company lost no opportunity of turning to its own advantage every possible change of circumstances."

These are the companies which proposed to use Muscle Shoals as a convenient auxiliary to their own private power development. I want no such partners or near-partners in any superpower policy at Muscle Shoals.

If the Ford offer is rejected, I am for Government operation; and if this policy is adopted, I am in favor of buying out the Alabama Power Co., just as the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission bought out the Ontario Power Co., the Toronto Power Co., and others, in its program of Government operation in Canada. I do not believe that our great Government should play second fiddle to any group of power companies in any plan of power distribution.

Senators may vote down the Ford offer, but when they do they should realize that the Ford proposal is the only one in which the responsibility of operating Nitrate Plant No. 2 to full capacity is guaranteed and the operation carried on at private and not at public expense. Mr. Ford's obligations are not limited to nitrogen alone, but include other commercial fertilizers, of which they are only two—phosphoric acid and potash. The capacity of Nitrate Plant No. 2 means sufficient nitrogen for 2,000,000 tons of 2-8-2 commercial fertilizer—worth about \$60,000,000—annually, while the total consumption of commercial fertilizers in the United States in 1921 was 5,183,523 tons; so it is very evident that the minimum fertilizer production proposed by Mr. Ford is by no means the insignificant portion of the total American consumption which the opposition would lead the country to believe.

The very fight which these interests are making to prevent the acceptance of the Ford offer belies their statement that the production would be so small as to have little or no effect on the price of fertilizers in general. Their able spokesman and bond expert, Francis E. Frothingham, of Coffin & Burr, Boston bond brokers, frankly acknowledges the corn when, not denying the possibilities for cheaper and better fertilizers at Muscle Shoals, he urges in the Boston Transcript that the power should be awarded to the Alabama Power Co., and complains that "As to the fertilizer end of this problem, it has been given an undue importance and has had a disturbing influence on the entire discussion." With the unanswerable facts in favor of the farmers at Muscle Shoals, and against the contentions of the power interests, it is no wonder that Mr. Frothingham feels pinched by the disturbing influence.

Since nitrogen and phosphoric acid constitute more than 75 per cent of the farmers' fertilizer purchases, it is to be expected that the large-scale production of these plant foods in this favorable location should have a radical effect upon the cost of fertilizers. When such a national leader in electrochemistry as Dr. E. H. Hooker, whose industries have recently contracted for \$15,000,000 worth of Niagara Falls electric power, declares that half-price fertilizer is feasible and that the operation of a single plant at Muscle Shoals will save the farmers \$30,000,000 a year in their fertilizer bill, then it behooves those who dispute it to come forward with their proof.

The repeated assurance of the feasibility of this important reduction in the cost of fertilizers, together with the well-known fact that German farmers are procuring their fertilizers at half price, has been a source of much dissatisfaction among American farmers, who are still dependent upon Chile and the by-product coke ovens for their nitrate fertilizer. Realizing its world-wide monopoly in nitrates, the Chilean Government for years has taken advantage of its monopoly through an export duty to meet a great part of the government's expense. An export tax of \$12.53 on every long ton of Chilean nitrate was levied in 1879, and since that time, whenever the farmer buys Chilean nitrate—which sells at our ports for about \$50 a ton—he pays a tax of about 20 per cent to support the Chilean Government. Since the beginning of importations this country's nitrate bill has reached approximately \$1,000,000,000 up to July 1, 1924, and American con-

sumers up to that date have paid Chile an export tax of more than \$212,000,000 for the mere privilege of buying nitrates from that country.

POSSIBLE SAVINGS

The comparative economic benefits of the Muscle Shoals power, when utilized in fertilizer manufacture as against public-utilities service through a superpower system, are evident when it is recognized that the farmers' expenditures for fertilizers in the 11 Southern States from Virginia to Arkansas, as shown in the following table and upon the map, were \$207,000,000 in 1920, while the expenditures for electric lighting and power purchased from all public utilities as recently as 1922 in the same States amounted to only \$109,000,000.

A saving of 50 per cent of the farmers' fertilizer bill in these 11 States would be a greater economic benefit to the people of that region than would result if every purchaser of public-utility light and power in those States were supplied at 10 cents on the dollar. Such a reduction would be absurd and manifestly impossible, while it is generally conceded that the cost of fertilizers can be reduced one-half at Muscle Shoals.

Annual expenditures for light and power furnished by public utilities compared with annual expenditures for fertilizers in the South-eastern States

(From reports of U. S. Census Bureau)

State	Expenditures for light and power purchased from all public utilities, 1922	Expenditures for fertilizer, 1920
Virginia	\$13,940,025	\$17,277,705
North Carolina	15,876,891	48,796,694
South Carolina	8,982,735	52,546,795
Georgia	14,674,362	46,196,434
Florida	7,143,546	10,316,929
Alabama	10,259,689	14,066,108
Tennessee	12,043,389	3,525,133
Kentucky	10,074,903	3,597,450
Mississippi	3,559,674	4,288,165
Louisiana	7,578,467	3,840,469
Arkansas	5,734,324	2,572,678
Total	109,868,005	207,024,560

It is also true that the farmers constitute by far the majority of the population in these States, for census returns show that more than 75 per cent of the population is classed as rural, so that the welfare of 17,000,000 out of a total of 22,000,000 of people depends directly, from year to year, upon their use of commercial fertilizers.

To say, as Senator Norris does, that we must have a public-utility development at Muscle Shoals and that "any other development, especially at public expense, is an injury and a fraud to the people of the country, and particularly to the people of the Southern States," was voted untrue by the southern Representatives in the House, who voted for the acceptance of the Ford proposal with but one dissenting vote.

There can be no question that in the Southeastern States a super-fertilizer policy rather than a superpower policy not only secures the greatest good but it secures that good directly for the greatest number, while indirectly there is not a State in the Union but will share in its economic benefits.

Those who are in favor of a superpower policy at Muscle Shoals and against a superfertilizer policy owe it to the farmers to show that their plan will do as much for the people by reducing the cost of power as the Ford plan will accomplish for the farmers by reducing the cost of fertilizer.

Let us have the giant power or superpower program by all means; it is a natural and inevitable improvement. Neither Mr. Ford nor any other reasonable man would refuse to interconnect the Muscle Shoals plants with a general system, since such interconnection would be of great and undoubted value to all concerned; but if we would serve our posterity wisely, we should assure ourselves that this water power, with its unique advantages in the production of fertilizer, shall be employed primarily for that purpose. This is the thought conveyed in the message of President Coolidge to Congress when he said, "The amount of money received for the property is not a primary or major consideration."

QUESTIONS OF POLICY

Such power distribution as can be accomplished without detriment to fertilizer production may confidently be expected under the Ford offer, and when Senator Norris makes the unqualified assertion that Nashville, Memphis, Knoxville, Chattanooga, Birmingham, and other southern cities will not get a kilowatt of Muscle Shoals power if the Ford offer is accepted he is making a statement which will not stand investigation. Mr. Ford expressly informed the public on October 11, 1923, that "if I get Muscle Shoals we shall run power lines 200 miles in every direction from Muscle Shoals."

It is true that power distribution is not a requirement of his offer, but this is in the interest of the greatest possible production of fertilizer. Neither Henry Ford nor anyone else can agree to manufacture nitrogen and other commercial fertilizers according to demand and at the same time agree to distribute his power supply to meet the public-utility demand in the Southeastern States.

Every bidder recognized this fact, and all except Henry Ford limited the power which they proposed to use in fertilizer production. This is one important reason why I am for the Ford offer.

The second question of policy is whether we shall have Government ownership and operation or private ownership and operation at Muscle Shoals.

There are many things which this powerful Government of ours can do more effectively than any private citizen or corporation. In the case of Muscle Shoals, however, as I view it, the policy of Government operation is in greatest danger from its own best friends. Neither a nation nor an individual can rush into commercial chemistry without risking heavy losses. In such a venture one of the very first questions which any private executive would ask is, What will it cost? Neither Senator NORRIS nor any other advocate of Government operation at Muscle Shoals has suggested an estimate of the investment that would be required, nor of what the returns would be if the Government undertakes this enterprise.

But these same people demand from Mr. Ford very specific guaranties, and because Mr. Ford did name definite terms, he, also, as a prudent business man, protected himself by limiting the payments during the preliminary period of six years at Dam No. 2 and three years at Dam No. 3, during which time he and his associates could not use any considerable amount of power. During this period they would be working out ways and means for utilizing this large amount of power primarily for cheaper fertilizers with useful by-products wherever possible. Nevertheless, Senator NORRIS and others denounce Mr. Ford's offer as not constituting a sufficient return to the Government, although Senator NORRIS in his bill is unwilling to hazard any estimate whatever of any future return. The important fact is that no other bidder has offered a return equal to Mr. Ford's, together with a definite obligation to manufacture fertilizer to the full capacity of nitrate plant No. 2 as a minimum, except at the expense of the Government.

At Muscle Shoals only 241,000 horsepower of a total of \$50,000 horsepower will be available continuously throughout the year, and when the remainder, or secondary power, is available at all it will be so unreliable and irregular that no reasonable man would build large industries dependent upon it for their operation.

COSTS UNDETERMINED

This large secondary power is a problem which, under the Norris plan, will lead the United States into large appropriations, either for the construction of great storage dams to stabilize the flow of the Tennessee River and hold back the flood waters so that they can be utilized during the low-water periods, or, as an alternative, for the construction of enormous steam-power plants, which would have to be operated for the greater part of the year. Probably both will be required. How much such a program would cost the United States the Chief of Engineers has declined to say.

"Just what will prove to be practicable no man at the present can state," said General Taylor to our committee; "nobody has got the data. We have more than anybody else and we don't know. Nobody does."

This statement of the Chief of Engineers confirms my opinion that the facts which we should have for a businesslike consideration of the Norris bill have never been determined.

On the other hand, the Ford offer eliminates all such uncertainties, for, following the preliminary construction period, the Government gets full 4 per cent on its entire investment to complete the Wilson Dam, fully equipped, and on the entire cost of building Dam No. 3, with complete equipment, no matter what these costs may be. As for the \$17,000,000 of war funds expended on the Wilson Dam before the Ford offer was made and on which no return is proposed, it fairly represents the unavoidable waste brought about by war and other unfavorable conditions; but this is included in the amount returned to the Government by the Ford sinking fund during the lease period, as has been shown by Secretary Weeks in his testimony before the Military Committee of the House.

GOVERNMENT OPERATION

I am for Government operation of our water powers, but I urge that we begin our policy under conditions that promise success—namely, at a large power site where most of the power is reliable and constant all the year round. One such favorable site is Priests Rapids on the great Columbia River in the State of Washington—a river which will richly repay a Government expenditure of \$500,000 or more for a complete survey of its navigation and power possibilities. A still better power site, perhaps, is at Croil Island, near the Long Sault Rapids in the St. Lawrence River, where the continuous power on the American and Canadian sides is nearly 1,000,000 horsepower.

That site is controlled by three powerful financial interests—the Du Ponts, the Aluminum Co. of America, and the General Electric Co.

In spite of the monopolistic character of these three great interests, I would be willing to grant them a 100-year lease to develop this 1,000,000 horsepower site on the St. Lawrence if they will include in their offer the fertilizer provisions of the Ford proposal. I do not believe, however, that these interests would make such an offer—they never have at Muscle Shoals. Meanwhile I suggest that our engineer representatives on the St. Lawrence Commission study the Government-operation plan of the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission with a view to recommending a similar plan for the Government operation of the great water-power site at the Long Sault on the St. Lawrence for the benefit of eastern farmers, and at Priests Rapids on the Columbia for the benefit of farmers of the West.

I may be pardoned a bit of a diversion perhaps in connection with the Columbia River. In my studies of the power possibilities of our streams I could find no data that appear at all conclusive as to the water power that can be developed on this mighty international stream. Few of our people realize that the Columbia drains an area twice as great as all the Middle Atlantic and New England States combined, and its tributaries extend through Washington and Idaho into Montana and Nevada.

On the other hand, I find that such an insignificant and unknown stream as the Catawba River in South Carolina has developments totaling nearly 500,000 horsepower, and an unknown tributary of the Coosa River, Ala., called the Tallapoosa River, has furnished sites for six large storage dams, where the engineers had reported but one.

The Columbia and its tributaries can develop more water power within our borders than the St. Lawrence; but the public does not appreciate the Columbia River, because its power possibilities have never been surveyed, and I repeat my statement that this Government can well afford to spend \$500,000 for such a survey.

Returning to Muscle Shoals, the difficulties which make it dangerous for Government operation are not merely the difficulties of power development. The air-nitrogen fertilizer industry exists in large commercial form only in Germany, while in the United States there is no such developed industry and there are no precedents to follow. One of the most competent electrochemical engineers in the United States well expressed the situation before our committee when he said, "This art is changing so fast that you can hardly follow it."

WHY INVITE FAILURE?

In this new industry any plant, however well designed, admittedly may become obsolete even before its construction is completed, as our large Muscle Shoals plant already has become. How, then, can any reasonable man insist upon taking the taxpayers' money by the scores of millions of dollars and sinking it in great fertilizer plants under such conditions when, with the Ford offer accepted, private capital agrees to research these improved processes, carry the research work through to a commercial scale, and to adopt such processes as prove their worth, insuring that the nitrate plant will be kept up to date for 100 years with no expense whatever to the Government?

I doubt if anyone can imagine that we would have had the present remarkable perfection of the modern automobile if the first horseless carriage had been turned over to the Department of Agriculture to develop; yet the problems of the automotive industry are simple indeed when compared with the problem of preparing and delivering to the farmer an adequate supply of plant foods at prices that will enable them to be applied profitably in sufficient quantity to our great field crops. To put such a problem of large-scale development and production into the hands of a Government bureau is, in my judgment, to invite a disastrous failure, which can and undoubtedly will be held up as a horrible example by those who oppose Government ownership and operation as a policy.

It is a most significant fact that many of the interests that opposed the operation of Muscle Shoals by the Government in 1920, and that have been fighting the Ford proposal, offer no objection to the Government operation bill of Senator NORRIS; but the amazing thing is that the Senator can not see that the power companies and their Wall Street allies who favor his bill and who have offered no proposal of their own in the Senate do so because the Senator's bill is a means of defeating the Ford proposal and provides a wide-open gateway to the power that these interests long have coveted, but which they could not get directly by offers of their own.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of November 29, 1924]

To secure the greatest good for the greatest number at Muscle Shoals we must certainly conclude in the light of the facts stated—first, that fertilizer production should be the chief objective and power distribution a secondary consideration; and, second, that the provisions of the Ford offer are much preferable to the risks of Government operation of such an undeveloped and hazardous enterprise.

Certain of the engineering societies have proposed that a fact finding commission of their members be created to assemble and submit to Congress the facts about Muscle Shoals; but at this stage of development of the art of air-nitrogen fixation no fact finding commission, whether of civil engineers, chemical engineers, or other scientific men

of any qualifications, could determine what the cost of fertilizer manufacture is to be at Muscle Shoals. A number of new processes, untried as yet on a commercial scale, await development, any one of which, placed in strong hands able to command the necessary technical talent and able to spend the necessary money, gives great promise of lower costs, with production of aluminum and its alloys, for example, as by-products. What we need is not an investigation by engineers but the test of these processes on a commercial scale.

THE FARMER'S FAITH

Senator NORRIS and those who agree with him say that the farmer has been deceived, and that his confidence in Henry Ford's ability to solve the fertilizer problem at Muscle Shoals is a mere blind faith, but I can not agree with them.

If anyone would know the reason for the farmer's faith in Mr. Ford, let him study the table herewith, which shows the price record of the Ford touring car and the average daily wages paid in the Ford factories for the past 16 years, from statistics furnished by the Ford Motor Co.

16-year record of the Ford Motor Co.—1908-1923

Year	Price of Model "T" touring car		Average daily wages paid	
	Amount	Per cent reduction from 1908	Amount	Per cent increase over 1908
1908	\$950		\$2.25	
1909	780	18	2.14	5
1910	690	27	2.40	7
1911	600	37	2.28	1
1912	550	42	2.25	0
1913	490	48	2.43	8
1914	440	54	4.41	96
1915	380	62	4.40	95
1916	360	62	4.41	96
1917	450	53	4.95	117
1918	525	45	5.31	136
1919	575	39	6.11	171
1920	440	54	6.72	198
1921	415	56	6.91	207
1922	348	63	6.65	195
1923	295	69	6.62	194

¹Decrease.

The farmer knows that this price reduction from \$950 in 1908 to \$295 in 1923 was not forced upon Mr. Ford by any of his competitors. He knows that the reductions have been made voluntarily, while at the same time Mr. Ford has been paying the highest wages paid anywhere in the automobile industry.

Any man who can master the science of mass production as Mr. Ford has mastered it, and reduce the price of his product 69 per cent while increasing the average daily wages of his men by 194 per cent, is serving the common people of this country as few men have served them. The people are not slow in recognizing such a friend, and the enthusiasm for Mr. Ford, instead of being based on blind faith, is a testimonial to his magnificent achievement. The man who says the farmers are fooled is fooled about the farmers. It is no more possible to legislate confidence in the power and fertilizer interests into the minds of American farmers than it is possible to legislate their confidence in Henry Ford and his company out of their minds.

The farmers will regard it as an insult to their intelligence to be told that they should have faith in the ability of the Department of Agriculture to reduce the price of fertilizer at Muscle Shoals as Henry Ford has reduced the price of his car. When will the Department of Agriculture have a selling organization equal to Mr. Ford's 10,000 successful agencies?

In view of the violent misrepresentations which have been broadcast over the country regarding Mr. Ford's offer, it is not surprising that he has seen fit to withdraw it, but whether he takes any further interest in the subject or not, it can not be denied that in bringing the true possibilities of Muscle Shoals to the attention of the country he has performed a public service for which due credit will be given him.

It has been declared that the acceptance of the Ford offer would be a raid on the Public Treasury, an attack on conservation, a subsidy of \$14,000,000,000, and an unregulated gift of \$50,000 horsepower. If all this were true, and if those who support the Ford offer were the simple-minded dupes or the vicious self-seeking politicians which they have been pictured, then this would be a serious indictment of the Members of the House of Representatives who passed the Ford offer without amendment by almost a 2-to-1 majority. Such absurd exaggerations hurt no one but those who use them. They will not stand because they are not based upon facts.

PUBLISHED FIGURES QUESTIONED

As an example of the lack of careful investigation on the part of Senator NORRIS in stating his facts, let us consider the following statement of his which has been widely published:

"There is personal property which under his [Ford's] bid would be conveyed to him, amounting in value, in round numbers, to \$2,000,000. Most of this personal property has a definite fixed market value. There are all kinds and quantities of building materials, all stored in sheds and kept in perfect condition. This building material was bought by the Government and stored on the property because it was thought at the time it might be necessary to use it in extending the towns owned and built by the Government, and in the construction of other shops and works. For instance, there is more than 6,000,000 feet of lumber, millions of common and fancy brick, immense quantities of slate shingles and hollow building tile. There are more than 10,000 wooden doors and 3,000 screen doors."

In order to determine the accuracy of this statement, I wrote to Gen. C. C. Williams, Chief of Ordnance, and received a reply stating that property valued at \$1,998,236.31, consisting principally of lumber, construction equipment, fittings, housing equipment, and the like, had been transferred to the Wilson Dam. Further inquiry develops the fact that it was used for temporary accommodations for the workmen, and for other temporary construction purposes. The office of the Chief of Ordnance also stated that "in addition to that transferred to the Wilson Dam, very appreciable quantities of certain materials have been used on plant maintenance during the last five years. A recent estimate, covering surplus property at plant No. 2, and including ammonium nitrate, construction equipment, railroad equipment, tools, electrical equipment, building material, and miscellaneous other equipment, but not including reserves which may be required for plant maintenance in the near future, has been prepared by the plant organization. The estimated sale value of this property is \$506,175.70. * * * In general the most valuable property has been used at the dam, leaving items of more uncertain value."

Instead of finding \$2,000,000 worth of building material which has been placed in sheds and well taken care of, and for which there is a ready market, as the Senator declares, Mr. Ford, on the acceptance of his offer, would find that the serviceable portion of this material has been used for temporary construction purposes at the Wilson Dam and that on completion of the job its value will be practically nil. Moreover, under his offer, it would become leased Government property not subject to sale.

This is a fair example of the lack of accuracy which appears throughout the reports of Senator NORRIS, which he has issued on behalf of a majority of our committee. Such inaccuracies do not inspire a great deal of confidence in the majority's report.

Many well-intended editorials inspired by these inaccuracies have denounced Mr. Ford's offer and have referred in glowing terms to the superiority of the offers of the power companies and others, but in spite of this widespread and expensive publicity, neither the House nor the Senate committees would report any of them. I have stated the reason. My space is limited, but I will state it again:

No other bidder combined a return equal to that of Mr. Ford's with a definite obligation to manufacture fertilizer to the full capacity of nitrate plant No. 2, except at the expense of the Government.

WAS JUDGE GARY ASLEEP?

There are, perhaps, half a dozen objections to the Ford offer which the opposing interests have heralded through the press from one end of the country to the other. First, there is the claim that Mr. Ford would receive "the greatest gift ever bestowed on mortal man since salvation was made free to the human race," as Senator NORRIS extravagantly puts it. The Senator has been supported in this view by similar statements of the fertilizer interests and the power interests, which have consistently opposed the development of Muscle Shoals from the very outset. The record of these interests does not support the statements made either by them or by the Senator from Nebraska.

VALUES OVERESTIMATED

If it were true that the Muscle Shoals properties possessed an earning power so great as to enable Mr. Ford or his estate under his offer to accumulate \$14,500,000,000 in 100 years by virtue of their possession, and enable his corporation to dominate all the business of the entire world, as Senator NORRIS declares, then any schoolboy would know that when the Federal Government decided to dispose of these properties there would have been a veritable stampede to secure such marvelous earning capacity. Who could imagine the United States Steel Corporation, for example, overlooking a chance to accumulate \$14,500,000,000? But did it undertake to secure this wonderful bonanza? It did not. When, in 1919, the Government, through its nitrogen director, Mr. A. G. Glasgow, attempted to secure

an offer for this property, his proposal was coldly received and the fertilizer and allied interests all declared that they were not interested.

The testimony shows that Mr. Glasgow went personally to the president of each of the large fertilizer companies and offered him the nitrate plants free of any rental whatever until they should earn 9 per cent on whatever investment was necessary for their operation, thereafter dividing profits evenly with the Government; but, with one accord these interests declined to make an offer, in spite of the fact that then, as to-day, the dam was under construction, with attractive prospects for water power for economical operation. An appeal was made also by the nitrogen director to the by-product coke operators—leading firms of which are controlled by the Mellon interests, which also control the Aluminum Co. of America—with the same result. The Muscle Shoals properties went begging and no one would have them. The situation was repeated in 1921, when General Beach asked the power companies for bids.

Falling to interest private capital, Mr. Glasgow proposed a Government corporation to be financed by the sale of surplus war materials, which should undertake the operation of this property. The Wadsworth-Kahn bill, which carried these provisions, was vigorously opposed in both the House and Senate by the same interests which had declined to bid; and though it passed the Senate, after having been destructively amended, the bill died in the House Committee on Military Affairs. It is these same interests which have been looking to the Senate to defeat the will of the people and reject the Ford proposal.

VALUES OVERESTIMATED

The truth of the whole matter is that these properties have no such value as Senator NORRIS suggests, but that their value would be utterly insignificant compared with the losses that would be incurred by anyone who undertook to operate nitrate plant No. 2 in the production of fertilizer as it now stands, and as it will continue to stand until scores of millions have been expended to establish the electrochemical fertilizer industry successfully at Muscle Shoals. Realizing this, the Union Carbide Co. and the Hooker-Atterbury-White people offered to operate the nitrate plant only on the condition that the Government paid all the expense. The Alabama Power Co. did not offer to operate the plant at all, but merely to keep it in idleness, while its offer to produce 50,000 tons of nitrogen for fertilizers annually was a conditional one. Its unconditional offer was limited to 5,000 tons annually.

The claim is not true that Mr. Ford receives a warranty deed in fee simple to this nitrate-plant property, however questionable its value, for the provisions of his offer must be written into his deeds and become covenants running with the land. The sale is conditional, and if Mr. Ford or his company at any time violates its provisions, the Government can cancel his deeds by court procedure and take its property back, and neither Mr. Ford nor his company can give a clear title to the property for 100 years.

As for the \$700,000 worth of platinum which Senator NORRIS suggests that Mr. Ford might sell, this platinum is made up into special catalysts that are an absolutely necessary part of the military equipment of nitrate plant No. 2, and Mr. Ford could not sell these catalysts without violating his agreement to maintain the nitrate plant ready for war service by the Government on five days' notice.

But, say the opposition, even if the nitrate plants are not so valuable, there is this great water power. Yes, I reply, but all the reliable power—all the 241,000 horsepower available all the year round with the help of the steam-power plants—must be used in order to carry out Mr. Ford's minimum fertilizer obligations, and in these operations his profit is limited to 8 per cent on the fair actual annual cost of production, with a board of farmers to tell him what is fair and to fix the price and control the distribution of his product. As for the irregular and unreliable power, sooner or later this largely will be needed for fertilizer manufacture to meet the demand. At present it has little or no value and will have none until millions are spent in making it dependable and valuable.

It should be remembered in discussing what Mr. Ford should or should not have offered, that he was asked merely to state what arrangements he would be willing to make to assure the Government a reasonable return on its investment if the United States should complete the unfinished dam and power plant. There was no suggestion that this nitrate enterprise, the peace-time purpose of which was the production of fertilizers and not the distribution of electrical power, should be required to come under the terms of the Federal water power act. The legality and enforceability of many of the provisions of that act were in dispute at that time, and still remain so, the States of New York and New Jersey having brought suit in the Supreme Court to test its validity and to defend their States' rights; and two national party platforms call for its amendment. It is a law designed to apply to projects in which water-power development and distribution are the purposes of the enterprise, and the act can hardly be affected whatever the outcome at Muscle Shoals.

There was no suggestion that offers to lease the dam must be limited in their lease period to 50 years. On the contrary, the only offer for Muscle Shoals which has ever been recommended to Congress by the United States engineers was made by the Alabama Power Co. in 1913 for a lease period of 100 years, and offered a return of only 3 per cent on the Government's investment. One way to defeat the Ford offer was to provide that Mr. Ford should come under the Federal water power act, and this was attempted in the House of Representatives; but a large majority, recognizing that the House had no authority to change Mr. Ford's offer without his consent, voted down the proposed amendments.

If the benefits of the regulation to be had under the water power act are really what is claimed for them, then they should be applied to all developments affecting the navigable capacity of our streams; such, for example, as that of the Aluminum Co. of America on the Little Tennessee River; but I have yet to find a single particular in which the public would be benefited by bringing the Aluminum Co. under the water power act, for the only difference in the situation would be that the annual operating expenses of the Aluminum Co. would be increased by 25 cents for each installed horsepower of its development. If there is no public benefit to be gained by bringing the Aluminum Co. of America under the water power act on the Little Tennessee River, then why should Henry Ford be required to come under the water power act in the production of fertilizers and aluminum at Muscle Shoals?

STATE CONTROL

As for the lease period, I agree with Secretary Weeks that this is not a vital question, for its length is absolutely immaterial if the interests of the public are protected. Neither Mr. Ford nor anyone else can distribute power to the public in any Southern State without his plant automatically becoming a public utility, subject to the rules and regulations of the State public-utility commission in the State in which he does business. If anyone has any doubt about this, or sees the need for further regulation, let him remember that aside from navigation the control of the use of the water of a navigable stream for beneficial purposes is not in the Federal Government but in the State; and if it should be found that any further regulation of Mr. Ford and his company becomes desirable, a simple remedy is immediately available, for the Governor of Alabama can call the legislature of the State together and pass whatever laws are necessary in the public interest.

The statement of Senator NORRIS that Mr. Ford's bid actually "provides that the Ford corporation shall have the electricity developed at Muscle Shoals without regulation by either Federal or State authority" is entirely incorrect and unjust to Mr. Ford. No such provision is made anywhere in the Ford offer, and if it were it would be entirely void and unenforceable. The powers of Congress and of the State legislatures and of the courts can not be set aside by contract. As to the legality of Mr. Ford's guaranties and pledges, this is a purely legal question in which I, like other laymen, must be guided by legal opinion; but I find nothing in the record to warrant the apprehension of our chairman; on the contrary, I find that the Judge Advocate General testified that these guaranties were satisfactory.

The Senator claims that Mr. Ford has asked the Government to insure him against the destruction of the dams; but the proposal says merely that (as in the case of all other navigation dams) the responsibility for maintenance expense is left to the Government, and it is a well-known principle of law that any contract becomes void by the destruction of its subject matter. As for the cost of this maintenance, Mr. Ford pays \$55,000 annually for this purpose and the Chief of Engineers has testified that this is sufficient. I am willing to trust the judgment of our Chief of Engineers.

Both nitrates and dyes are necessary for national defense; the same organic chemicals which become our dyes can be converted to poisonous gases for chemical warfare, or, when combined with nitrogen, become explosives. The crude materials for the dye industry are obtained from the by-products which are recovered in the manufacture of coke in by-product ovens.

When war was declared the American manufacturers, who as a whole were about 90 per cent dependent upon German synthetic colors, found that their supply was cut off in the face of an unprecedented demand for their own products in which the dyes were needed. As a result the price of dyes skyrocketed to a level as much as 2,100 per cent above normal. The demand far exceeded the supply, regardless of price, and it was under these conditions, with the opportunity for enormous profits, that the American dye plants were built.

THE DYE INTERESTS

In the Senate hearings on dyes in 1919 it was shown that the National Aniline & Chemical Co., owned by some of the largest interests which are fighting the Ford offer, was capitalized in 1917 with \$25,000,000 preferred and \$25,000,000 common stock and that 18 months later that company had been able to set aside for plant depreciation, obsolescence, Federal taxes, and so on, a sum equal to their entire common stock, or about \$25,000,000.

Having thus had an extraordinary opportunity to pay for their new plants out of war-time profits, the dye industry, led by the General Chemical Co. and the Du Ponts, came to Washington and declared that the high tariff of 30 per cent ad valorem plus 5 cents a pound which had been placed on foreign dyes by Congress in 1916 was not sufficient. In declaring to the Senate Committee on Finance what the dye industry wanted, Mr. Irénée Du Pont, president of E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., stated:

"What do we want? I say an embargo, with a permit to bring in these things we do not make for a 10-year period. I say we want, second, a tariff in addition to the embargo. The embargo may miscarry; put as high a duty as you can get behind the embargo wall. I want further, then, and at the risk of seeming to get a monopoly, to urge that you should provide that the Sherman law does not apply to the dye industry if it is thought necessary in the opinion of some Government official."

So the dye industry, whose unregulated profits had been absolutely protected by the President's war-time embargo on dyes of 1917, secured a continuation of the embargo in 1921 which continued until 1922, when the tariff was increased to 60 per cent ad valorem and 7 cents a pound; and to-day only a few specialty dyes are imported, while the average cost a pound of the dyes used in this country is about three times their pre-war cost.

On one hand we have this dye industry, owned by the powerful eastern financial interests, with its war-built plants long since paid for out of war-time profits, securing this remarkable aid at the expense of the American people in the name of national defense; on the other hand, we have the Ford offer to establish a nitrogen industry for the production of the nitrogen that is absolutely necessary for every pound of our military explosives, and of the greatest benefit to agriculture as well. One readily receives an absolute embargo against competition from abroad at the hands of Congress, free from any limitation whatever on its profits; the other, asking no tariff protection and with a voluntary limitation of profit to 8 per cent on the fair actual annual cost of production, and with a board of farmers to fix the price and to say what is fair, is denounced as a subsidy and denied a decision for more than three years.

Why the difference? It is this: In the case of the dye industry Congress has heard and promptly responded to the voice of big business, while in the case of the Ford offer Congress has failed to answer to the appeals of the farmers for a decision.

I have nothing whatever against the American dye industry—I recognize its great value as a military asset; but I protest against the discrimination which says that these favors to the dye industry are justifiable and the acceptance of Henry Ford's offer is unjustifiable.

Though the power and fertilizer interests which are fighting the Ford offer are willing to deal with Government bureaus or special officials, they have shown no inclination to deal directly with the representatives of the people in Congress or to deal with the consumers themselves. Consistent with this attitude, their spokesmen have recommended that all offers be rejected and the entire matter be referred to a commission as a means of defeating a vote on the Ford offer in Congress. In this connection they have pointed to the President's message in which he suggested a small joint committee of Congress to deal with the Muscle Shoals question. This is a very different proposal from the commission plan. It does not recommend that jurisdiction of the Muscle Shoals question shall be taken out of the hands of Congress. A commission with power to act would relieve Congress from its responsibility to the farmers, however, and if it chose to recommend the distribution of the power and to leave the farmers at the mercy of the Chilean Nitrate Producers' Association, the way would be open for it to do so.

Armies and not arbitration have settled the fate of nations for centuries, but civilization has come to realize that neither armies nor arbitration can assure national safety in these days of deadly scientific achievement.

A high naval authority recently said, "The poison-gas clause of the limitation of armament treaty is merely an internationally expressed hope that may be expected possibly to prolong the régime of peace."
* * * The discovery of a new gas may mean the routing of an army, the annihilation of a navy, or the loss of a war."

I am very much opposed to war, but I realize that under these conditions our country well may observe a day dedicated to the national defense. The voluntary mobilization of 17,000,000 men and women is inspiring and impressive, but it is a pitiable mockery of preparedness if our patriotism is not backed up by industries prepared to furnish the necessities of present-day warfare on short notice.

PEACE-TIME NECESSITIES

Men may be mobilized quickly, but no general order will produce great tonnages of nitrates for explosives nor of light metals and other materials for efficient aviation equipment nor of deadly toxic gases for chemical warfare, unless we have in this country large, well-established industries making peace-time products which can supply these war needs

when called upon—strong industries, able to carry on the intensive research which we must have if we are to continue in reasonable security.

We may agree to the limitation of armament, but we can not limit the production of peace-time necessities; and when these necessities can be turned quickly to present-day military purposes they become an unbridled menace in the hands of a foreign enemy. Nitrogen, for instance, has its peace-time use in fertilizers, chemicals, and refrigeration. Aluminum and other light metals are needed for motor cars, household utensils, commercial airplanes, welding, and electrical uses, while chemicals for war gases are used in dyes, textiles, paper, and a multitude of other manufactures. No limit can be placed upon the peace-time production of nitrogen, light metals, and gases, and no nation need feel secure which ignores or neglects them.

Applying this to Muscle Shoals, the possibilities of the future are nothing short of bewildering.

First, there is the opportunity to combine nitrogen fixation for fertilizer purposes with the production of light metals, such as aluminum, by a number of processes. For example, report No. 100 of the United States Fixed Nitrogen Research Laboratory describes a modification of the so-called aluminum-nitride process whereby an electric furnace product called ferro-aluminum is employed, and cites references showing that the production of ferro-aluminum is nothing new, for it has been known to electrometallurgists since 1885.

Estimates of the cost of production are given showing that with conditions to be had at Muscle Shoals the entire cost of nitrogen for fertilizer purposes can be charged against the aluminum, and even then the cost of the purified raw material from which aluminum is made can be reduced 40 per cent.

When our Government nitrogen laboratory, which since 1919 has made a specialty of the study of improved processes, admits that the raw materials for aluminum can be reduced 40 per cent in cost and at the same time the nitrogen, which is the most expensive element in commercial fertilizers, can be supplied free of charge for fertilizer manufacture, it must be admitted that the prospects for the production of fertilizers at Muscle Shoals and their sale to farmers at about half of the present prices is a reasonable expectation. Since the production of aluminum is an important factor in reducing the cost of fertilizers at Muscle Shoals, I would be disposed to give preference to any satisfactory offer which provides for its production in connection with fertilizer manufacture; not only at Muscle Shoals but at the magnificent power site at Croll Island in the St. Lawrence River and at Priest Rapids in the Columbia River, to which I referred in my previous article. Geologists are predicting the early exhaustion of the best of our copper deposits and the cheapening of aluminum well may become an important factor in maintaining the leading position of the United States among the industrial nations of the world.

CHEMICAL POSSIBILITIES

Nitrate plant No. 2 is the greatest calcium carbide plant in the world, and the products of calcium carbide alone rival those of coal tar in their possibilities of variety and usefulness. One great branch consists of the derivatives of carbide after it has been combined with nitrogen, forming the well-known fertilizer compound, calcium cyanamide. The United States Fixed Nitrogen Research Laboratory reports that it has studied a few of the many compounds which can be made from cyanamide, such as urea, the most concentrated form of exclusively nitrogen fertilizer known, dicyanodiamide, melamine, guanidine, guanidine, and urethane. Among others which have received less attention might be mentioned carbamic acid, amidodicyanic acid, carboxyguanidine, biguanide, ammeline, biuret, allophanic acid, cyanaminoformic acid, iminodicarboxylic acid, and others. As Dr. F. G. Cottrell, director of the Government's nitrogen laboratory, states in his annual report, "Some of the large number of cyanamide derivatives have already found distinct uses in the manufacture of military explosives, in medicine, and in the arts. This class of compounds forms the natural starting point for a whole new field in chemistry much as certain coal-tar compounds lay at the base of the present dyestuff industry."

Another series of products of calcium carbide are the derivatives of acetylene, the gas which is formed when calcium carbide is treated with water. Acetylene is most generally used for illumination, and in connection with oxygen produces in a special torch a very hot flame useful for cutting and welding steel and other metals. Combined with water, acetylene forms acetaldehyde, which, when oxidized, becomes acetic acid, which was used in a large way during the war for the preparation of materials for smokeless powder and dope for airplane wings. Acetic acid, however, when heated in the presence of a catalyst is converted to acetone, a valuable solvent especially useful in the making of smokeless powder, celluloid, chloroform, iodoform, sulphonal and many other organic compounds. Acetone is the base used to produce bromoacetone, which was used by the Germans as a tear gas. Its uses in organic synthesis defy enumeration. To mention one in-

interesting example, when acetone is reduced by nascent hydrogen generated by the action of an amalgam of sodium on water, a dihydroxyalcohol is formed, called pinacol.

This was made by the Germans in large quantities during the war and converted by heat and pressure into dimethylbutadiene, which, when merely stored in a sealed vessel, maintained at a temperature of about 60° centigrade for about two months, was converted by a process called polymerization into synthetic India rubber.

Cheap power and cheap salt at Muscle Shoals naturally lead to another varied field of valuable products. First, there is cheap metallic sodium by a number of available processes. The making of sodium has been suggested in recent scientific literature as a feasible means for the chemical storage of electrical power. Cheap metallic sodium opens the door to another series of electrochemical processes for producing combined nitrogen for fertilizers along with many useful by-products, particularly aluminum and magnesium. I would not venture an estimate of what it will cost to bring these new processes to successful production on a commercial scale, and no advocate of Government operation at Muscle Shoals has suggested any approximate estimate. The amount, however, certainly will be large, and under the Norris bill it will come out of the Federal Treasury. I much prefer to let Henry Ford undertake this job at his expense.

Other applications of salt, in connection with fertilizer production, yield chlorine, the well-known war gas; or, combined with sulphur, produce sulphur monochloride, useful in vulcanizing rubber, and which, when combined with ethylene, produces the mustard gas which nearly won the war for the Germans. Another combination of chlorine is chloride of lime, useful as a bleaching powder and disinfectant, from which are obtained chloroform and phosgene, another war gas with a peace-time usefulness in dye manufacture. Another branch of the electrochemical salt tree produces sodium cyanide, a useful disinfectant and of great value in extracting gold and silver from their ores, and in the manufacture of insecticides and fungicides for spraying fruit trees, and in the production of a deadly war gas called cyanogen chloride. Caustic soda is another product from which there are obtainable various soap compounds and drugs valuable in medicine, while as a by-product is produced the hydrogen gas that is essential in the manufacture of nitrogen fertilizers by several of the most modern processes.

RISKS AND HAZARDS

It has always been thought difficult to cause clay and salt to react upon each other directly at high temperatures because of the volatility of the salt. It now appears that this difficulty has been overcome, and patents have been issued for processes which indicate that this reaction promises to be made commercial. This may mean substantially cheaper metallic aluminum, for it indicates that the problem of large-scale production of anhydrous aluminum chloride at low cost may soon be solved. This is very significant aside from chemical warfare, for the Bureau of Mines reports that the use of 16 pounds of this chloride per barrel of oil increases the yield of gasoline from the present average conversion of 30 per cent of the crude oil to a conversion of 60 to 85 per cent, so that the production of gasoline from a given amount of crude oil can be more than doubled without material changes in the present refining plants. This chloride also has a multitude of other uses in the manufacture of many dyes, perfumes, drugs, and pharmaceuticals, and is employed on a large scale in carrying out the Friedel-Crafts organic reactions.

Has Henry Ford offered to double the production of gasoline from crude oil, or to carry out any other particular one of these interesting chemical possibilities at Muscle Shoals? No, of course not; but it is along just such a road of by-product production that success in the large-scale manufacture of cheaper and better fertilizers will be found, and his offer of commercial research will surely and inevitably lead him along just such roads as I have described, for Mr. Ford proposes:

"To determine by research whether by means of electric furnace methods and industrial chemistry there may be produced on a commercial scale fertilizer compounds of higher grade and at lower prices than farmers and other users of commercial fertilizers have in the past been able to obtain, and to determine whether in a broad way the application of electricity and industrial chemistry may accomplish for the agricultural industry of the country what they have economically accomplished for other industries; and if so found and determined, to reasonably employ such improved methods."

Those who desire to see the policy of Government ownership and operation succeed in this country will do well to let this complex and uncharted field of industrial chemistry, with its inevitable succession of mistakes, loss and great expense, severely alone. That is one of the compelling reasons why I am for the offer of Henry Ford.

As a chemist, I have every confidence that at Muscle Shoals processes can be made commercial for producing nitrogen for the preservation and increase of the fertility of our farm lands, with aluminum as a by-product to give us light metal alloys for aircraft. Thus we will free ourselves from our dependence upon a foreign country for nitrates.

Again I say, I am opposed to all wars; but I have just read a translation of an article lately published in Japan insisting that a Japanese-American war is unavoidable and the sooner it comes the better it will be for Japan, and stating that after America has developed its air forces, Japan, struggle as it may, can do nothing. I refuse to believe that we ever will have any war with Japan; yet I can understand what Mr. Ford meant in his recent public statement that Muscle Shoals might prevent war.

FOREIGN EYES ON CONGRESS

At 2 p. m. on December 3, 1924, the Norris and McKenzie bills come up for consideration in the United States Senate. If the Norris bill is passed, then it will probably fail in the House. If both bills are voted down, no legislation for disposing of Muscle Shoals can be expected at the short session. Without legislation, the 260,000 horsepower which will be ready for service at the Wilson Dam in June, 1925, will stand idle till Congress passes legislation for disposing of the Muscle Shoals power in 1926.

In conclusion no better confirmation of the position which I have taken regarding the Ford offer could be found than that contained in a recent dispatch from Santiago, Chile, published in the Wall Street Journal, as follows:

"Henry Ford's withdrawal of his offer to take over the Muscle Shoals project has resulted in a considerable boom in the Chilean nitrate industry," and a United Press dispatch goes on to say that "Chile has followed the whole Muscle Shoals controversy with the keenest interest and considered Ford the greatest menace to the future of the national nitrate industry. Withdrawal of his proposal was little short of a boon to this country. Nitrate shares in London—the principal market for Chilean nitrate stocks—rose from two to three points last week as soon as news of withdrawal of the Ford offer was received."

Other offers for Muscle Shoals were submitted to committees of Congress and Senator Norris has declared to the readers of the Saturday Evening Post that any and all of them were better than the proposal of Mr. Ford. The facts are, however, that neither the announcement of any of these offers nor their rejection by the committees produced the slightest flurry in the Chilean nitrate industry, either in London or Chile. The nitrate industry, however, quickly recognized that the Ford offer meant that something effective would be accomplished in freeing the farmers of this country from the domination of these monopolists, and their industry made no secret of its satisfaction and relief when the Ford proposal was withdrawn.

In view of these undeniable facts I can only express my regret and chagrin that the United States Congress, by delay and inaction, should have lost this great opportunity to secure a boon for American agriculture. It is my earnest hope that it will be possible to secure another proposal that will be the equal of the Ford offer, but I fear that the Government will never receive another like it.

The President claims that common sense is the country's greatest asset; if so it appears that the time has come for the President to join with Congress in applying some of this asset to the Muscle Shoals situation.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill making appropriations for the construction of certain public buildings. It is a very short bill and I ask that it may be printed in full in the RECORD of to-day's proceedings.

The bill (S. 3511) making appropriations for the construction of certain public buildings was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated for the objects hereinafter expressed, namely:

(a) For increase in the limit of cost of construction of those certain public buildings, heretofore authorized by Congress to be constructed and for which appropriations were made, referred to in Senate Document No. 28, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, \$15,130,780, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

(b) For the construction of public buildings on those certain sites, heretofore acquired, for the construction of which buildings no appropriations were made, referred to in Senate Document No. 28, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, \$23,557,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. FLETCHER. In connection with the bill just introduced by me I request to have incorporated in the RECORD excerpts from the annual reports of the Postmaster General for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1922, pages 2, 3, 4, and 5, June 30, 1923, page 19, and June 30, 1924, page 13 (as indicated), having particular reference to the desirability of Government ownership of post-office quarters; also Senate Document No. 28 of this Congress, together with a letter dated May 17, 1924, from the Secretary of the Treasury to the chairman of the

Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, referring to a similar bill introduced by me on March 20 last, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, all of which I send to the desk.

The document was, of course, printed for the information of Members of Congress and the public, but I understand that the demand for it is large and the supply exhausted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the request of the Senator from Florida will be agreed to.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Senate Document No. 28, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session]

ERECTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 94, information relative to sites acquired and appropriations necessary for the erection of certain public buildings

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 24, 1924.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In response to Senate Resolution 94, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish certain data in reference to public buildings, I have the honor to submit the following:

The information desired, together with certain additional data not specifically called for by the resolution, but without which the statement in regard to the status of authorized buildings and sites would not be complete, is set forth in Exhibit A, as follows:

(a) Name of each city or town (by States) where authorizations have been made for acquisition of a site, construction of a building on site already owned, or for site and building.

(b) Date site was acquired; or, if not acquired, its present status.

(c) Consideration paid for each site.

(d) Amount authorized for site, site and building, or for building only.

(e) Balance available for building.

(f) Estimated cost of building on site authorized.

(g) Amount of increase required where existing authorization is insufficient.

There is also submitted Exhibit B, which includes the names of certain projects, mentioned in Exhibit A, where drawings have been prepared, or are contemplated, for buildings of a very simple type that may possibly be provided within the existing limit of cost by the adoption of much cheaper methods of construction than has been the practice heretofore of this department; or by furnishing space to satisfy present needs only, without room for future expansion; or by not including accommodations for Government activities that may be located in the places named but where the legislation is for a post office only.

Respectfully,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

EXHIBIT A

Names of cities where sites only or sites and buildings have been authorized, limit of cost of each project, amount authorized in each case, cost of land where sites have been acquired, date of acquisition by Government, balance available, estimated cost of project, and increase in limit required

Place	Date site acquired	Cost of site	Amount authorized	Balance available	Estimated amount	Increase
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Alabama:						
Albertville	June 9, 1917	\$2,500	\$5,000		\$55,000	
Andalusia	Feb. 26, 1915	4,973	150,000	\$45,000	110,000	\$65,000
Attalla	Apr. 20, 1918	4,000	5,000		55,000	
Greenville	Jan. 23, 1917	5,000	5,000		95,000	
Sylacauga	Sept. 10, 1914	5,000	5,000		80,000	
Union Springs	Aug. 26, 1914	4,500	5,000		55,000	
Alaska:						
Fairbanks	Sept. 30, 1915	15,000	15,000		400,000	
Juneau	Sept. 2, 1911	22,500	200,000	177,500	477,500	300,000
Arizona:						
Globe	Nov. 14, 1911	15,000	15,000	100,000	225,000	125,000
Prescott	Apr. 13, 1915	7,500	7,500		250,000	
Tucson	Apr. 29, 1914	15,000	15,000		425,000	
Arkansas:						
Brinkley	Sept. 30, 1918	3,735	5,000		55,000	
Conway	June 16, 1915	2,000	5,000		100,000	
El Dorado	Mar. 2, 1922	5,000	5,000		175,000	
Forrest City	May 28, 1917	4,500	5,000		65,000	
Marianna	Feb. 7, 1917	2,750	150,000	47,250	92,250	45,000
North Little Rock (Ark.)	Dec. 14, 1920	9,500	10,000		100,000	
Prescott	Aug. 24, 1914	(4)	150,000	50,000	65,000	15,000
Russellville	Feb. 17, 1917	5,000	150,000	45,000	130,000	85,000
Stuttgart	Not purchased		5,000		90,000	

¹ Site and building.

² Site.

³ Building.

⁴ Donated.

Names of cities where sites only or sites and buildings have been authorized, limit of cost of each project, etc.—Continued

Place	Date site acquired	Cost of site	Amount authorized	Balance available	Estimated amount	Increase
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
California:						
Bakersfield	Aug. 23, 1911	\$17,500	\$20,000	\$135,000	\$250,000	\$115,000
Long Beach	Feb. 14, 1914	40,000	40,000		750,000	
Modesto	Dec. 28, 1916	17,000	20,000		175,000	
Red Bluff	Jan. 31, 1917	9,800	160,000	50,200	135,200	85,000
San Bernardino	June 17, 1913	16,500	20,000		200,000	
San Luis Obispo	Oct. 30, 1916	7,500	180,000	72,500	115,000	42,500
San Pedro	Site not selected.		160,000	60,000	500,000	440,000
Colorado:						
Canon City	May 8, 1915	11,000	15,000		140,000	
Durango	Jan. 24, 1912	10,000	10,000	100,000	250,000	180,000
Monte Vista	May 22, 1916	3,900	10,000		100,000	
Montrose	Mar. 31, 1916	15,000	15,000		400,000	
Sterling	July 31, 1917	15,000	15,000		125,000	
Connecticut:						
Branford	June 8, 1917	9,600	155,000	45,400	60,400	15,000
Manchester	Aug. 22, 1911	12,000	15,000		100,000	
Mystic	Mar. 22, 1917	4,000	155,000	51,000	76,000	25,000
Putnam	Sept. 16, 1911	8,500	165,000	56,500	106,500	50,000
Delaware:						
Newark	Dec. 18, 1914	4,000	5,000		60,000	
District of Columbia:						
State, etc., Department						
Florida:						
De Funiak Springs	Jan. 9, 1917	(4)	6,000		70,000	
Key West	Nov. 3, 1915	52,750	80,000		450,000	
Kissimmee	Oct. 9, 1914	5,000	6,000		70,000	
Lake City	Oct. 17, 1914	6,000	7,500		85,000	
Marianna	Nov. 16, 1916	4,000	170,000	66,000	151,000	85,000
Georgia:						
Canton	Aug. 29, 1916	5,000	5,000		50,000	
Douglas	Aug. 22, 1917	3,500	155,000	51,500	76,500	25,000
Eatonton	Apr. 10, 1917	3,000	5,000		55,000	
Madison	July 21, 1917	5,000	5,000		65,000	
Monroe	May 29, 1916	5,000	5,000		65,000	
Rossville	Apr. 3, 1915	5,000	5,000		70,000	
Sandersville	Aug. 12, 1915	5,000	5,000		65,000	
Thomson	Sept. 25, 1915	5,000	5,000		55,000	
Toccoa	Jan. 28, 1915	5,000	5,000		65,000	
Waynesboro	Apr. 13, 1915	4,093	5,000		70,000	
West Point	Apr. 28, 1916	6,000	150,000	44,000	60,000	25,000
Idaho:						
Caldwell	June 28, 1915	8,500	10,000		100,000	
Coeur d'Alene	May 3, 1912	13,200	100,000	86,800	251,800	165,000
Nampa	Jan. 15, 1917	6,200	10,000		125,000	
Sand Point	Aug. 6, 1916	(4)	170,000	70,000	115,000	45,000
Illinois:						
Batavia	Not selected.		195,000	95,000	95,000	None.
Carlinville	Mar. 10, 1917	8,000	10,000		95,000	
Carrollton	Sept. 14, 1918	7,000	7,000		100,000	
Chicago, West Side:						
Chicago, East Side			1,750,000			
Chicago, Sixty-third			50,000			
Cicero	June 19, 1915	6,000	7,000		100,000	
Geneseo	July 15, 1920	10,000	160,000	50,000	100,000	50,000
Havana	Nov. 14, 1916	9,000	10,000		110,000	
Highland	Sept. 30, 1914	4,000	7,000		80,000	
Jerseyville	Sept. 9, 1918	6,250	165,000	88,750	98,750	40,000
Mendota	Sept. 8, 1917	10,000	10,000		70,000	
Metropolis	Site not selected.		150,000	50,000	100,000	50,000
Mount Carmel	Sept. 23, 1914	20,000	175,000	55,000	115,000	60,000
Paxton	Site not selected.		160,000	60,000	100,000	40,000
Spring Valley	June 27, 1921	6,000	10,000		75,000	
Woodstock	Aug. 23, 1917	15,000	17,000		110,000	
Indiana:						
Bluffton	Oct. 9, 1918	11,500	170,000	58,500	98,500	40,000
Clinton	Jan. 4, 1917	6,800	160,000	53,200	73,200	20,000
Decatur	Sept. 20, 1919	9,000	10,000		125,000	
Greensburg	July 26, 1917	12,000	12,000		140,000	
Lebanon	Apr. 3, 1917	9,000	10,000		115,000	
Linton	Aug. 18, 1916	5,500	8,000		95,000	
Mount Vernon	Sept. 15, 1911	7,500	7,500		100,000	
Noblesville	Dec. 11, 1917	10,000	10,000		110,000	
North Vernon	May 16, 1918	10,000	160,000	50,000	85,000	35,000
Plymouth	Not purchased		10,000		80,000	
Rochester	do.		170,000	62,000	112,000	50,000
Salem	do.		5,000		60,000	
Warsaw	Oct. 27, 1921	10,000	10,000		100,000	
Iowa:						
Albia	June 19, 1917	5,000	5,000		100,000	
Cherokee	July 19, 1916	12,000	170,000	58,000	103,000	45,000
Des Moines	Aug. 15, 1919	65,000	100,000	250,000	600,000	350,000
Fairfield	Sept. 18, 1916	7,000	10,000		100,000	
Marengo	Dec. 29, 1915	3,500	5,000		75,000	

¹ Site and building.

² Site.

³ Building.

⁴ Donated.

⁵ Proposition taken up by Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in their report to the Senate.

⁶ These matters will require a survey of the entire Chicago situation.

Names of cities where sites only or sites and buildings have been authorized, limit of cost of each project, etc.—Continued

Place	Date site acquired	Cost of site	Amount authorized	Balance available	Estimated amount	Increase
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Iowa—Contd.						
Newton	July 13, 1917	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$125,000	
Gelwein	Aug. 23, 1915	8,000	8,000		85,000	
Kansas:						
Holton	Sept. 22, 1911	4,500	7,500		90,000	
Kentucky:						
Barbourville	Nov. 9, 1921	5,000	5,000		50,000	
Central City	June 17, 1915	7,500	7,500		60,000	
Elizabethtown	Dec. 23, 1916	4,000	7,500		75,000	
Eminence	Oct. 11, 1915	6,850	8,000		65,000	
Falmouth	Nov. 21, 1914	5,000	5,000		60,000	
Harrodsburg	Mar. 24, 1917	7,500	10,000		85,000	
Hodgenville	Aug. 28, 1917	2,500	5,000		55,000	
Madisonville	Dec. 29, 1916	5,000	10,000		90,000	
Murray	May 3, 1917	4,000	5,000		60,000	
Paintsville	Aug. 10, 1917	4,000	5,000		60,000	
Pikeville	Not purchased		7,500		75,000	
Prestonsburg	Mar. 12, 1918	3,000	5,000		60,000	
Shelbyville	June 10, 1911	10,000	¹ 10,000 ² 50,000	\$50,000	100,000	\$50,000
Louisiana:						
Morgan City	Dec. 7, 1921	6,000	6,000		60,000	
Thibodaux	Mar. 15, 1918	5,000	¹ 50,000	45,000	60,000	15,000
Maine:						
Caribou	Sept. 20, 1911	10,000	¹ 10,000 ² 50,000	50,000	80,000	30,000
Fort Fairfield	Feb. 8, 1915	18,000	18,000	62,000	77,000	15,000
Hallowell	Mar. 13, 1912	6,500	20,000		70,000	
Maryland:						
Salisbury	Apr. 21, 1917	10,500	¹ 90,000	79,500	104,500	25,000
Massachusetts:						
Athol	June 5, 1923	10,500	¹ 80,000	69,500	99,500	30,000
Leominster	July 2, 1917	20,000	¹ 90,000	70,000	135,000	65,000
Malden	Site to be donated.		150,000	150,000	250,000	100,000
Newburyport	May 3, 1912	25,000	¹ 25,000 ² 70,000	70,000	140,000	70,000
Provincetown	Dec. 10, 1917	7,500	8,000		90,000	
Southbridge	Nov. 11, 1915	18,000	¹ 80,000	62,000	122,000	60,000
South Framingham	Dec. 19, 1916	18,000	25,000		145,000	
Waltham	Oct. 17, 1911	46,051	¹ 115,000	68,949	178,900	110,000
Winchester	Mar. 31, 1916	19,500	¹ 75,000	55,500	120,500	65,000
Michigan:						
Benton Harbor	June 2, 1917	25,000	25,000		160,000	
Bozette City	Aug. 14, 1911	8,000	10,000		70,000	
Calumet	Not purchased		20,000		120,000	
Cheboygan	Oct. 2, 1906	7,900	¹ 70,000	62,100	87,100	25,000
Hastings	Dec. 30, 1918	6,300	¹ 81,000	74,700	124,700	50,000
Midland	Nov. 8, 1916	6,000	¹ 60,000	54,000	96,000	45,000
Wyandotte	Site not purchased.		¹ 75,000	75,000	150,000	75,000
Minnesota:						
Duluth	Apr. 15, 1911	86,700	95,000		650,000	
Fairmount	Site not purchased.		65,000	60,000	115,000	55,000
Montevideo	Aug. 23, 1911	5,000	¹ 5,000 ² 50,000	50,000	110,000	60,000
Mississippi:						
Holly Springs	Feb. 2, 1914	6,500	¹ 5,000 ² 45,000	43,500	73,500	30,000
Water Valley	Apr. 29, 1916	5,000	¹ 50,000	45,000	75,000	30,000
Missouri:						
Aurora	Apr. 19, 1909	6,975	10,000		90,000	
Caruthersville	July 18, 1918	4,000	5,000		75,000	
Centralla	Sept. 11, 1914	6,000	7,500		100,000	
Farmington	Jan. 30, 1918	5,000	5,000		80,000	
Fayette	Mar. 28, 1917	4,000	¹ 55,000	51,000	91,000	40,000
Harrisonville	Oct. 27, 1916	5,000	¹ 52,500	47,500	67,500	20,000
Lamar	Aug. 22, 1914	7,000	10,000		65,000	
Lebanon	Dec. 16, 1914	6,800	7,500		75,000	
Liberty	Sept. 28, 1917	6,000	¹ 60,000	54,000	69,000	15,000
Mountain Grove	Oct. 12, 1916	6,000	7,500		80,000	
Sikeston	June 16, 1917	7,500	7,500		75,000	
Trenton	Jan. 25, 1910	3,000	10,000		90,000	
Unionville	Feb. 26, 1917	7,500	7,500		55,000	
West Plains	Aug. 29, 1914	5,000	7,500		75,000	
Nebraska:						
Central City	July 17, 1917	(¹)	¹ 55,000	55,000	75,000	20,000
Nevada:						
Fallon	June 11, 1917	1,500	¹ 55,000	53,500	65,500	12,000
Goldfield	Not acquired		¹ 75,000	75,000	75,000	None.
New Hampshire:						
Somersworth	Dec. 23, 1920	7,500	7,500		60,000	
New Jersey:						
Bayonne	Nov. 19, 1913	25,000	¹ 25,000 ² 100,000	100,000	250,000	150,000
East Orange	Oct. 9, 1911	48,606	¹ 125,000	125,000	390,000	265,000
Millville	Nov. 26, 1912	14,700	¹ 55,000	40,300	115,300	75,000
Montclair	Nov. 11, 1914	30,000	¹ 130,000	100,000	230,000	150,000
Passaic	Apr. 7, 1913	25,000	25,000		¹ 50,000 ² 425,000	
Red Bank	June 3, 1914	25,000	25,000		125,000	
Salem	Mar. 2, 1917	10,000	10,000		100,000	
Vineland	Nov. 8, 1915	10,000	¹ 70,000	60,000	120,000	60,000
Woodbury	Nov. 12, 1912	15,000	¹ 70,000	55,000	80,000	25,000

¹ Site and building.

² Site.

³ Building.

⁴ Donated.

⁵ New site or additional land.

Names of cities where sites only or sites and buildings have been authorized, limit of cost of each project, etc.—Continued

Place	Date site acquired	Cost of site	Amount authorized	Balance available	Estimated amount	Increase
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
New Mexico:						
East Las Vegas	Dec. 27, 1917	\$9,000	¹ \$125,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	None.
New York:						
Bath	Dec. 9, 1914	13,000	15,000		90,000	
Binghamton	Mar. 22, 1916	100,000	100,000		¹ 25,000 ² 475,000	
Bronx	July 17, 1914	275,900	³ 285,000		800,000	
Cohoes	Feb. 1, 1916	58,500	¹ 140,000	81,500	116,500	\$35,000
Dunkirk	Mar. 21, 1914	20,000	20,000		170,000	
Fort Plain	Site not purchased.		¹ 65,000	65,000	95,000	30,000
Long Island City	Apr. 13, 1915	40,000	¹ 200,000	160,000	310,000	150,000
Lyons	Dec. 18, 1917	15,000	15,000		90,000	
Nyack	Aug. 10, 1911	15,500	15,500		100,000	
Oneida	Mar. 29, 1917	14,350	20,000		110,000	
Saranac Lake	Jan. 12, 1917	18,500	¹ 90,000	71,500	111,500	40,000
Syracuse	Oct. 6, 1911	324,999	¹ 325,000 ² 550,000	550,000	1,600,000	1,050,000
Utica	Sept. 20, 1911	99,500	100,000		800,000	
Yonkers	June 22, 1917	338,000	¹ 500,000	160,300	550,000	390,000
Walden	Nov. 19, 1914	7,500	¹ 65,000	57,500	87,500	30,000
Waterloo	June 2, 1911	19,000	¹ 30,000 ² 55,000	55,000	90,000	35,000
North Carolina:						
Edenton	Aug. 2, 1916	4,000	7,500		85,000	
Lenoir	Aug. 24, 1915	4,500	8,000		90,000	
Lumberton	Sept. 16, 1914	10,000	10,000		115,000	
Mount Olive	Aug. 25, 1920	2,000	5,000		75,000	
Mount Airy	Site not purchased.		5,000		100,000	
Rockingham	No appropriation.		5,000		75,000	
Rutherfordton	July 21, 1917	4,000	5,000		65,000	
Thomasville	Sept. 13, 1917	8,000	¹ 55,000	47,000	82,000	35,000
Wadesboro	No appropriation.		5,000		70,000	
Wilson	May 28, 1909	10,000	¹ 60,000	50,000	250,000	200,000
North Dakota:						
Fargo	Apr. 9, 1915	23,500	25,000		600,000	
Jamestown	Dec. 23, 1911	7,500	¹ 20,000 ² 75,000	75,000	260,000	185,000
Ohio:						
Akron	Aug. 28, 1914	86,280	¹ 400,000	313,720	1,000,000	686,280
Conneaut	Nov. 3, 1911	15,000	15,000		115,000	
Delphos	Not purchased.		7,000		¹ 10,000 ² 90,000	
Freemont	Apr. 2, 1912	12,000	¹ 15,000 ² 100,000	100,000	145,000	45,000
Jackson	July 31, 1911	10,000	10,000		85,000	
Kenton	Nov. 2, 1916	14,000	¹ 80,000	66,000	131,000	65,000
Millersburg	Feb. 26, 1918	7,500	7,500		70,000	
Napoleon	Sept. 15, 1915	7,500	7,500		115,000	
New Philadelphia	July 20, 1915	12,400	12,500		120,000	
Niles	May 27, 1911	15,000	15,000		110,000	
Sandusky	Mar. 30, 1917	55,000	¹ 215,000	160,000	280,000	120,000
St. Marys	Sept. 25, 1917	6,500	7,500		75,000	
Steubenville	Sept. 23, 1912	35,000	270,000	235,000	235,000	None.
Urbana	June 3, 1911	13,000	15,000		115,000	
Washington	Feb. 6, 1915	15,000	¹ 80,000	65,000	115,000	50,000
Wilmington	Not purchased.		¹ 75,000	75,000	130,000	55,000
Oklahoma:						
Frederick	Mar. 8, 1917	6,800	10,000		90,000	
Hobart	May 28, 1915	10,000	10,000		110,000	
Oregon:						
St. Johns	Not purchased.		5,000		55,000	
Pennsylvania:						
Donora	Not selected.		¹ 75,000	75,000	100,000	25,000
Dubois	Oct. 5, 1912	25,000	¹ 25,000 ² 85,000	85,000	135,000	50,000
Franklin	Feb. 1, 1915	19,000	¹ 100,000	81,000	161,000	80,000
Kittanning	Sept. 30, 1909	15,000	15,000		125,000	
Lancaster	Oct. 1, 1917	127,833	138,278		500,000	
Lewistown	May 15, 1917	10,500	¹ 75,000	58,500	103,500	45,000
McKees Rocks	Sept. 7, 1916	14,500	¹ 80,000	65,000	100,000	85,000
Olyphant	Not selected.		65,000	65,000	85,000	20,000
Pittsburgh	Pending.	950,000	950,000		2,250,000	
Pittston	Mar. 25, 1919	20,000	¹ 100,000	80,000	230,000	150,000
Rochester	Aug. 4, 1911	26,000	30,000		65,000	
Sayre	Not selected.		¹ 80,000	80,000	130,000	50,000
State College	Feb. 9, 1916	14,400	¹ 75,000	60,600	120,600	60,000
Tamaqua	Not purchased.		¹ 75,000	48,000	123,000	75,000
Tarentum	July 28, 1911	20,000	¹ 20,000 ² 60,000	60,000	125,000	65,000
Tyrone	Aug. 2, 1918	25,000	25,000		150,000	
Waynesburg	Not selected.		¹ 75,000	75,000	140,000	65,000
Rhode Island:						
Warren	June 8, 1916	10,000	10,000		75,000	
South Carolina:						
Dillon	Oct. 9, 1914	7,500	7,500		75,000	
Lancaster	Mar. 30, 1915	8,000	¹ 50,000	42,000	82,000	40,000
South Dakota:						
Chamberlain	Not selected.		¹ 60,000	60,000	75,000	15,000
Milbank	July 7, 1917	4,000	7,500		65,000	

Names of cities where sites only or sites and buildings have been authorized, limit of cost of each project, etc.—Continued

Place	Date site acquired	Cost of site	Amount authorized	Balance available	Estimated amount	Increase
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
South Dakota—Continued.						
Vermilion	Jan. 4, 1917	\$2,500	\$7,500		\$85,000	
Tennessee:						
Athens	Dec. 24, 1914	5,000	150,000	\$45,000	115,000	\$70,000
Elizabethton	Not purchased		2,500		2,500	
Franklin	Jan. 17, 1917	6,200	155,000	48,800	128,800	80,000
Huntingdon	Aug. 13, 1915	2,500	2,500		75,000	
Memphis sub-postoffice	Mar. 14, 1918	90,000	1210,000	120,000	750,000	630,000
Rogersville	Dec. 30, 1916	2,250	3,000		65,000	
Tulahoma	June 28, 1919	6,000	150,000	44,000	74,000	30,000
Texas:						
Atlanta	Sept. 19, 1912	4,000	5,000		65,000	
Coleman	Oct. 12, 1915	1	5,000		70,000	
Comanche	Aug. 13, 1918	3,000	150,000	47,000	87,000	40,000
Crockett	Sept. 23, 1915	6,000	6,000		85,000	
Dallas	Apr. 18, 1914	250,000	300,000		2,000,000	
Georgetown	Oct. 5, 1914	5,000	5,000		85,000	
Gilmer	Jan. 23, 1917	5,000	155,000	50,000	70,000	20,000
Huntsville	Jan. 25, 1912	5,000	5,000		85,000	
Memphis	Mar. 16, 1916	3,000	7,500		75,000	
Mount Pleasant	Dec. 29, 1916	5,000	155,000	50,000	80,000	30,000
Orange	Apr. 10, 1915	5,000	160,000	55,000	110,000	55,000
Pittsburg	Feb. 21, 1917	5,000	155,000	50,000	65,000	15,000
Seguin	May 19, 1914	(4)	7,500		80,000	
Sweetwater	Nov. 19, 1914	6,500	7,500		90,000	
Taylor	Mar. 31, 1915	5,000	5,000		115,000	
Utah:						
Nephi	May 17, 1918	5,000	5,000		65,000	
Vernal	Mar. 15, 1918	4,750	150,000	45,250	130,250	85,000
Vermont:						
St. Johnsbury	June 26, 1917	8,500	1100,000	91,500	146,500	55,000
Virginia:						
Buena Vista	Apr. 4, 1919	4,000	5,000		75,000	
Cape Charles	Not purchased		7,500		75,000	
Manassas	Dec. 19, 1919	3,750	5,000		65,000	
West Point	Sept. 23, 1915	5,000	5,000		55,000	
Woodstock	July 23, 1917	4,000	5,000		65,000	
Washington:						
Coffey	Oct. 25, 1917	5,500	7,000		75,000	
Pasco	July 12, 1916	10,000	10,000		75,000	
Seattle	Jan. 11, 1912	169,500	200,000	300,000	124,800,000	4,500,000
West Virginia:						
Hinton	Mar. 14, 1913	5,027	10,000	50,000	85,000	35,000
New Martinsville	June 20, 1916	12,250	12,500		85,000	
Philippi	Apr. 13, 1914	8,000	8,000		60,000	
Williamson	Oct. 28, 1911	6,500	7,500	50,000	250,000	200,000
Wisconsin:						
Madison	Nov. 19, 1923	336,448	1550,000	213,552	853,552	640,000
Milwaukee, west side	No appropriation		100,000		350,000	
Mineral Point	Dec. 9, 1921	4,468	160,000	55,500	70,500	15,000
Monroe	Aug. 1, 1911	7,500	7,500		110,000	
Tomah	July 18, 1917	8,000	155,000	47,000	72,000	25,000
Waupun	Sept. 3, 1913	3,400	5,000		80,000	
Wyoming:						
Buffalo	Sept. 14, 1911	7,000	7,000	62,500	97,500	35,000
Cody	Apr. 20, 1912	4,500	5,000	50,000	125,000	75,000
Green River	Oct. 6, 1911	6,000	6,000		70,000	
Newcastle	Dec. 22, 1916	4,400	5,000		75,000	

¹ Site and building.

² Site.

³ Building.

⁴ Donated.

⁵ Additional for site.

⁶ Present site not suitable; changes in legislation contemplated.

⁷ New site and building.

EXHIBIT B

LIST OF BUILDINGS INCLUDED IN EXHIBIT A WHERE DRAWINGS HAVE BEEN PREPARED OR ARE CONTEMPLATED

California: Bakersfield, Red Bluff, and San Luis Obispo.
 Georgia: Douglas and West Point.
 Idaho: Sandpoint.
 Illinois: Geneseo, Jerseyville, and Mount Carmel.
 Indiana: Bluffton, Clinton, and North Vernon.
 Kentucky: Shelbyville.
 Louisiana: Thibodaux.
 Maryland: Salisbury.
 Massachusetts: Leominster.
 Michigan: Cheboygan and Midland.
 Mississippi: Water Valley.
 Missouri: Fayette and Liberty.
 Nevada: Fallon.
 New Jersey: Vineland.
 New Mexico: East Las Vegas.
 New York: Cohoes, Saranac Lake, Walden, and Waterloo.

Ohio: Kenton, Steubenville, and Washington Court House.
 Pennsylvania: Dubois, Franklin, Lewistown, Pittston, and State College.
 Tennessee: Franklin.
 Texas: Gilmer, Mount Pleasant, and Pittsburg.
 Vermont: St. Johnsbury.
 Wisconsin: Mineral Point.
 Wyoming: Buffalo and Cody.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
 Washington, May 17, 1924.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
 United States Senate.

SIR: Reference is made to your recent request for a report on Senate bill 2882, for increase in the limit of cost of certain public buildings heretofore authorized and for which appropriations were made, referred to in Senate Document No. 28, in total amount \$15,130,780; and for construction of public buildings, on sites heretofore acquired, for which buildings no appropriations were made, referred to in said document, in amount \$23,557,500.

Detailed information in regard to the projects in the two sections of the bill was transmitted to Congress in letter of January 24, 1924 (printed as Senate Document No. 28), a copy of which is attached to this report and made a part thereof.

It has been found possible to award contracts for buildings at certain of the places of the type and construction described in the last paragraph of the said letter and furnishing the minimum accommodations possible under the legislation. This reduces the total amount required under section (a) of the bill to \$14,860,780.

The passage of this bill would permit the construction of those buildings authorized and limits of cost fixed under act of March 4, 1913, which, on account of the increased cost of labor and materials, can not now be erected within such limits. The completion of these projects and the erection of Federal buildings in many places where sites only have been authorized would be a substantial help in relieving the congestion in the Postal Service.

In connection with the foregoing you are advised that the department is informed that the appropriations contemplated by this bill are in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Respectfully,

A. W. MELLON,
 Secretary of the Treasury.

[From Annual Report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924]

The Postal Service is growing steadily and its requirements are difficult to meet without constant recourse to enlarged quarters, which are secured on a rental basis at an expense much greater than that which would result from Government construction and ownership. A vast sum is paid annually for these rentals. The reasons in favor of some plan of Government ownership of post-office buildings for postal use where an economy would be realized is set forth in detail in my letter to the Joint Commission on Postal Service, which reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
 Washington, D. C., August 21, 1923.

JOINT COMMISSION ON POSTAL SERVICE,
 Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: There are at present 5,846 post offices in leased quarters and 1,119 post offices in buildings owned by the Government. The aggregate annual rental paid for the occupancy of these 5,846 leased quarters is \$9,262,515.47, but this aggregate does not include the amount paid for quarters not under lease, which when added to \$9,262,515.47 makes a present total annual rental bill of \$11,060,056, not including garages, to be paid by the Government from appropriation made to the Post Office Department. There are at present 5 Government-owned buildings actually under construction and 11 under contract for construction in which post offices will find quarters.

The earnings of the Post Office Department have doubled in the last 10 years. This ever-increasing postal business demands and must have space in which it may be efficiently and economically carried on. During the last holiday season several cities handled heavy parcel-post business on the sidewalks under protection of guards but without protection against the weather. This increased volume of postal business has forced the use of basements and subbasements and has brought about a congestion in workrooms in some of our larger cities. This condition, caused by inadequate and unsuited quarters, is detrimental to the comfort and physical well-being of many postal workers, is subversive to efficiency of service, and from any viewpoint is wholly undesirable. Renewal leases entered into from March 4, 1921, to August 5, 1922, show an increase in space of 71 per cent over the space in the expired leases, but in this calculation the space of additional post offices established at various places since the expiration of the aforesaid leases because of the necessities of the service is not included. If this new and additional space be included, then there is an in-

crease of 153 per cent over the expired leases. The per cent of increase in the rental of these renewed leases over the expired leases is 147, but this does not include the rental for the new and additional post offices, which when added make an increase of 342 per cent over the rental of these expired leases.

In addition to the amount of \$11,660,056 annually paid for the rental of post-office quarters there are 76 garages throughout the country under lease, for which the amount of \$588,921 is annually paid for rental. This sum of \$588,921 when added to \$11,660,056 brings the total amount of rental paid by the Government for buildings leased for postal uses up to \$12,248,977. Confronted with this annual expenditure of \$12,248,977 for rental of real estate for postal uses, which will annually steadily increase, two questions at once arise for answer with reference to first-class post offices, the larger second-class post offices, and the larger classified stations and their branches. First, viewed solely from the financial side, is the present plan of leasing in keeping with the best business methods and practices? Second, aside from the financial point of view, is the present plan giving the best postal service results?

My answer to the first question is in the negative. I am decidedly of the opinion, and I believe that your business experience and observation will support my view, that annually a great saving in money will result if a policy of Government ownership were adopted. I do not advocate Government ownership of all offices, stations, and garages, for manifestly at times and on occasions it is better business to lease than own. But I do advocate and urge Government ownership in those cases where an economy would be realized and where good business judgment demands ownership rather than tenancy. Of course, at times efficiency of service will suggest leasing rather than ownership even when a considerable money saving could be effected by ownership, but these cases are exceptional, and good judgment can always be depended upon to leave such cases to the leasing plan.

Many reasons can be given in support of the Government ownership plan, among which are the following:

1. The Government can borrow money on practically a 4 per cent basis to build post offices, whereas when it leases it pays a rental sufficient to permit the lessor to borrow money at 7 per cent, and in some cases as much as 10 per cent. In other words, by this lease policy the Government is indirectly paying 7 per cent and 10 per cent interest on money when it is able to borrow at 4 per cent.

2. When the Government owns a post-office building it is free from taxation, whereas when it leases an office it is indirectly paying taxes at the rate of about 2 per cent on the investment and many times at a very much higher rate. When a building required for postal uses represents an investment of a large amount of money it is readily seen that the taxes alone which the Government must pay to the lessor in the form of rent is a very considerable sum.

3. Another way of stating in a combined form the two preceding propositions is that the ordinary lessor usually obtains about 10 per cent gross on his investment, whereas if the Government owned the property, building it with 4 per cent money, it would be costing the Government about one-half as much as it is obliged to pay in the form of a lease for the use of a building.

4. If the Government adopted the policy of owning its post-office buildings, it would be in a position to take property by right of eminent domain, whereas it can not take a leasehold interest by such right.

5. In our negotiations for leases with prospective lessors we are confronted with the fact that we can not build, and therefore we must pay what they ask. If we could say to bidders, "Unless you bring your rental down to a certain reasonable figure the Government will put up a building of its own," we would then have a powerful weapon of negotiation where we now have none. But that is only possible when the Government has adopted a policy of ownership and provided funds to carry out such a policy.

6. Leased buildings are constantly being outgrown, confronting the department with the necessity of either adding additional space or seeking an entirely new location. With a lease policy and without the right of condemnation the additional adjacent space is often held at unconscionable figures, and we are often compelled to pay far more than we know to be reasonable on account of the situation.

7. When a Government post office or postal building is erected by a lessor, in a very large percentage of cases it enhances the value of all property in the vicinity, so that it becomes necessary to renew such lease at much higher figures, whereas if the Government owned the building it would receive the benefit of the enhancement of values which it has created.

8. The lessor who builds a post office or postal station for the Government on a contract for lease for 10 or 20 years is obliged to figure on absorbing either the whole or a large percentage of the original cost of the building, and this he does. He is obliged to do this because he knows he may be compelled at the end of the lease to reconvert it into other uses. The result of such a lease policy is that the Government not only pays about 10 per cent on the original investment but it pays in addition thereto a certain per cent of all the

original investment distributed over a term of years, so that at the end of the lease the Government has nothing, but is obliged to start over again, still at the mercy of lessors, with no efficient weapon to compel fair prices.

My answer to the second of the above questions is also in the negative. It frequently is impossible to lease buildings having satisfactory working conditions, such as natural light and ventilation. In erecting Government-owned buildings ideal working conditions would be provided, thereby insuring the health and comfort of employees, which should always be given first consideration. Then, too, such buildings would be erected in accordance with plans and specifications either made or approved by the Post Office Department based upon its experience with a view to efficiency of service as well as to cost of service.

The Joint Commission on Postal Service expressed the opinion in its report to the Senate and House of Representatives that the site immediately west of the present general post-office building at New York City, commonly called the Pennsylvania Railroad site, was a desirable site for a building to relieve the present congested condition of the general post office at New York City. The department began negotiations to lease for a period of 20 years a building to be erected on this site, but no agreement has been made. Of the offers submitted to the department the aggregate rental for 20 years ranged from \$19,245,695 to \$24,900,000. If the Government would purchase this site and erect the building and become the owner instead of lessee, at the end of 20 years the aggregate expenditure would be considerably less than the lowest offer, and in addition the Government would own the property. What is said of the advantage of ownership as against tenancy of this New York City site can with equal force be said of other sites. Where the business and circumstances justify Government ownership it seems unbusinesslike for the Government to deny to itself and forego all the advantages, financial and otherwise, of ownership and become lessee with a money loss and with all the other many attendant disadvantages of tenancy.

It is not my present purpose to suggest or advocate any particular way for the execution of this general plan of Government ownership of buildings for postal use. My present purpose is to call attention to the necessity for the adoption of this general plan of Government ownership of buildings within the limitation of good business judgment, as hereinabove pointed out, as against the leasing system. I regard the present plan of leasing as unbusinesslike, and in view of this present practice I hope the Congress may enact the necessary legislation to effect the change herein suggested and advocated.

I earnestly solicit your support and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT WORK,
Postmaster General.

[From Annual Report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922]

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

Attention again is invited to the unbusinesslike method of securing quarters for post offices and postal stations under the leasing system. In many cases the Government is paying in annual rent from 10 to 17 per cent of the value of the premises occupied. On August 21, 1922, a letter was addressed by the then Postmaster General to the Joint Commission on Postal Service setting forth very fully the department's views with reference to Government ownership of post-office buildings. This letter was published in full in the last annual report, and the conclusions contained therein have been considered by me and receive my full approval.

[From Annual Report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924]

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

I desire again to invite attention to the unbusinesslike method of securing quarters for post offices and postal stations under the leasing system. In many cases the Government is paying in annual rent a large per cent of the value of the premises occupied. In 1922 the then Postmaster General addressed a letter to the Joint Commission on Postal Service setting forth fully the department's views with reference to Government ownership of post-office buildings. In the last report mention was made of my full approval of those recommendations.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR COLT

Mr. GERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 265), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Presi-

dent pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the Hon. LEBARON B. COLT, late a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

LEILA A. GRIFFIN

Mr. SMITH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 266), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Leila A. Griffin, daughter of Richard S. Anderson, late a messenger of the Senate, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BRANDEGEE

Mr. McLEAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 267), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the Hon. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR LODGE

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 268), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, late a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

HANDLING OF MAIL MATTER

Mr. STERLING submitted a resolution (S. Res. 269), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas there was included in the appropriation bill for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, an item of \$500,000 for the purpose of completing the work of determining the cost to the department of handling the various classes of mail matter; and

Whereas it is understood that said report has been completed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be respectfully requested to submit said report to the Senate of the United States.

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. LADD submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to direct the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, the Federal Reserve Board, and all other agencies of the Government which are or may be concerned thereunder, to refrain henceforth, without specific prior authorization of the Congress, from—

(1) Directly or indirectly engaging the responsibility of the Government of the United States, or otherwise on its behalf, to supervise the fulfillment of financial arrangements between citizens of the United States and sovereign foreign Governments or political subdivisions thereof, whether or not recognized de jure or de facto by the United States Government; or

(2) In any manner whatsoever giving official recognition to any arrangement which may commit the Government of the United States to any form of military intervention in order to compel the observance of alleged obligations of sovereign or subordinate authority, or of any corporations or individuals, or to deal with any such arrangement except to secure the settlement of claims of the United States or of United States citizens through the ordinary channels of law provided therefor in the respective foreign jurisdictions, or through duly authorized and accepted arbitration agencies.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9138) to authorize the discontinuance of the seven-year regauge of distilled spirits in bonded warehouses, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 2265. An act to provide for a rearrangement of the public-alley facilities in square 616 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 3397. An act to remit the duty on a carillon of bells to be imported for the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary, Providence, R. I.;

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

H. R. 9561. An act making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, to enable the heads of the several departments and independent establishments to adjust the rates of compensation of civilian employees in certain of the field services; and

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birth-day of George Washington.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, we have just received a message from the House of Representatives having to do with the completion of some of the unfinished business of the last session. There is another matter of importance which did not reach the stage which was reached by the bills which have just been sent to the desk from the House of Representatives and which merely lack the signatures of the two Presiding Officers. I refer to a bill that was in conference at the last session and lacked the finishing touches of consideration. It is very important that that bill should be acted upon at the earliest moment. It is the second deficiency appropriation bill and proposes to appropriate about \$175,000,000 or \$180,000,000. It affects every department of the Government and almost every known interest of the Government, because it is a clean-up for the year of amounts necessary to close accounts, to pay employees, and to settle other pending obligations. It is important because many of the beneficiaries are suffering for the want of the money which the bill proposes to provide. It is important because the Budget Bureau should know what has been provided for these expenses of the last year, so that they may arrange the budget for the next year accordingly. The departments should know what disposition is to be made of the measure.

Therefore I propose to call up the conference report at this time. All that will be required will be, first, a motion to reconsider; second, a motion to adopt the report of the conferees; and third, a recession on the part of the Senate from the only two remaining items that were in disagreement. So I now ask unanimous consent to reconsider the action by which the conference report on the second deficiency appropriation bill was recommitted to the committee of conference.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join in the request of the Senator from Wyoming. During the last session an order was made under a unanimous-consent request submitted by me at that time. I wish to say that there has been an entirely satisfactory adjustment, so far as I am personally concerned, with regard to the matters that caused my protest. I regretted very much at that time to make the protest. I agree with the Senator from Wyoming that it is very important to consider this matter immediately.

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

Mr. WARREN. Now I move the adoption of the conference report on House bill 9559.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, 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 32, 35, and 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the sums herein appropriated shall be used for the commencement of construction work on any reclamation project which has not been recommended by the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior and approved by the President as to its agricultural and engineering feasibility and the reasonableness of its estimated construction cost"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$315,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 29, 34, 58, and 59.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
W. L. JONES,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this juncture?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Allow the Chair to state his understanding of the present parliamentary situation. The Chair understands that the conference report is now before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. WARREN. It is, and I therefore move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion, and I hope it may prevail. Those who deigned to pay any attention to what I said just before the session of Congress closed on June 7 last will remember that I suffered a grievous disappointment because two certain amendments adopted by the Senate on June 5 were eliminated by the conferees. I believe the Senate conferees used every effort at their command to hold these amendments. In the heat and sensation of the hour of adjournment I may not have done the conferees the full justice to which they were entitled; but I am profoundly convinced that they used every honorable effort to hold these two Senate amendments.

I have faith in the justice of the United States Senate. I believe that at the eligible and appropriate time the Senate will readopt and insist upon the two amendments that were thrown out of the bill by the conferees. I refer to the one presented by my colleague and to the other presented by myself. Believing in the justice of the Senate, and relying upon the inherent strength of these amendments, I vote for this conference report, and ask unanimous consent that a comparatively few paragraphs from the report of the committee of special advisers on reclamation, namely, the fact finding commission, urging these amendments be included in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA-YUMA PROJECT

Notwithstanding it has been held under existing law that all moneys received and to be received under a certain contract, dated October 23,

1918, between the United States and the Imperial irrigation district should be paid into the reclamation fund, we recommend appropriate legislation directing that such moneys be credited to the Arizona-California-Yuma project, including the Mesa division, upon an equitable basis.

We understand the term "equitable basis" to mean taking into consideration the differences in soil, topography, and location of each farm unit on a project, with a special reference to the influence of these and all other essential factors upon the ability of each such unit to produce crops of value as compared with other farm units upon the same project.

This committee finds that this project was authorized to provide water for the irrigation of certain lands on both sides of the Colorado River in the vicinity of the town of Yuma, Ariz.

CONTRACT LANDS

The land in California is in an Indian reservation. The lands in Arizona were destined to be irrigated partly by gravity and partly by a pumping plant. The lands now included under water-right contracts embrace the following:

	Acres
Indian reservation lands in California disposed of to white settlers	6,100
Reservation lands in California remaining with the Indians	8,100
Valley lands in Arizona	48,800
Mesa lands in Arizona	6,000

(There are mesa lands having a total area of about 34,000 acres susceptible of irrigation by works yet to be completed.)

COST OF WATER RIGHTS

The project cost of water rights in California has been fixed by notice at \$55 to \$66 per acre. The project cost of water rights in Arizona, in the Yuma Valley, has been fixed by public notice at \$75 per acre. The project cost of water rights on mesa lands in Arizona is estimated at \$200 an acre.

EXPENDITURES NOT INCLUDED IN THE FIXING OF PROJECT COSTS AND WHICH ARE NOT NOW REPRESENTED BY ANY ASSETS WHICH CAN BE CHARGED TO SETTLERS

The original plans for this project provided for a main canal starting from the Laguna Dam to divert water from the Colorado River, which was to extend down to the Yuma area on the east side of the river, crossing in its course the Gila River. After \$580,936 had been spent it was found that this route was not feasible, and it was abandoned. There are no assets to balance this expenditure, and it has not been included in fixing the cost of water rights.

In order to protect the farms on both sides of the river from flooding and erosion, it became necessary to build a levee and in some places to riprap the banks. The building of this flood-protection system had developed until the costs stand at present as follows:

Indian reservation levee	\$867,287.12
Yuma Valley levee	1,374,122.93
Gila Valley levee	405,363.97
Yuma city levee	112,666.20
Imperial Valley irrigation district	156,512.29
Total	2,715,952.51

The cost of this levee system has not been included in the estimates on which the different project costs of water were fixed. It is an expenditure which settlers could not afford to pay and which has not been charged against them. It needs to be disposed of definitely, and the committee makes a recommendation with regard to it.

In fixing the project costs that settlers were required to pay, the entire expenditure on the Laguna Dam was included (about \$2,225,000). Subsequently a right to use this dam has been sold to the Imperial irrigation district in California for \$1,600,000. The question has arisen as to whether this sum when paid shall be placed in the general reclamation fund or credited on water-right contracts of settlers under the Arizona-California-Yuma project.

With regard to these different matters the committee recommends:

(1) That the \$580,936 expended on the Arizona main canal, which was subsequently abandoned, be deducted from the general reclamation fund as money lost beyond recovery.

(2) That the levee system be regarded as a public work of the United States, similar in character to other protection works built under the rivers and harbors act along navigable streams, because the United States holds that the Colorado River is a navigable stream, and in pursuance of that holding the Government has built protection works at Yuma and a levee on the California side of the stream in Mexico, known as the Oockerson Levee, at an expenditure of \$1,000,000. These have been treated as improvements under the rivers and harbors act, no charge for repayment having been made against anyone.

The committee recommends, therefore, that legislation be secured under which the expenditure for the construction, operation, and maintenance of these levees by the reclamation fund shall be treated as an expenditure of the General Government, similar to expenditures

¹ Reimbursed.

under the rivers and harbors act, and that the reclamation fund be reimbursed by an appropriation equal to the amount of this expenditure.

The committee recommends that expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of the levee system to be provided for under some cooperative agreement between the States of California and Arizona and the War Department similar to other cooperative agreements for the maintenance of levees on the Mississippi and other rivers, and that no part of this cost be included in the operation and maintenance expenses of this project.

We further recommend:

1. All excess holdings of lands in farm units should be disposed of to bona fide settlers.
2. Disposition of all unpaid charges in accordance with Resolution No. 24.
3. Adoption of the new plan of repayment in accordance with Resolution No. 23.

YUMA AUXILIARY PROJECT (MESA DIVISION OF THE YUMA PROJECT)

This division was constructed under the provisions of an act of Congress approved January 25, 1917, known as "An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in conjunction with the Yuma project in Arizona (39 Stat. 868)." The drastic provisions of this act are impossible of fulfillment, and only a few of the settlers have been able to meet their contracts. They, too, will soon fail, as the charge for water will bankrupt them.

The committee recommends:

That an early study be made by the Bureau of Reclamation of this division with a view of making recommendations to Congress for financial relief, or the disposal of the division, if adequate relief is not feasible.

Mr. ASHURST. The fact finding commission was appointed by Secretary Work. All the members thereof, including the chairman, were and are well known throughout the country as experts upon irrigation matters, and this commission unanimously concurred in the justice and necessity of the two amendments to which I have referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in the report as first made, there were five items in disagreement. Three of them were agreed to on the floor of the House after the last report was made, so that there are but two items in disagreement now, amendments numbered 29 and 34. One of those items refers to an appropriation for Spanish Springs, Nev.; the other to the position and salary of the Director of Reclamation. So, Mr. President, to cover those two items, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 29 and 34.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, one of these items is the one that caused discussion at the last session. I am entirely satisfied now that every member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate recognizes the justice of that item. The Department of the Interior has again recommended the item; the Budget has again provided for it; and I feel every assurance that it will be a part of the forthcoming Interior Department appropriation bill, which will be here in a few days, as I understand. Therefore I again gladly join with the chairman of the committee in supporting his motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming moves that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 29 and 34 to House bill 9559.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that carries the bill to passage. I ask that the enrollment may immediately follow and that the enrollment committee may hasten the presentation of the bill to the Presiding Officers of both Houses, so that it may reach the President at an early date.

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

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE WOODROW WILSON

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution which passed the House of Representatives yesterday relating to memorial services for the late former President Wilson is on the President's table. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 30, which the Secretary will read.

The reading clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Monday, the 15th day of December, 1924, be set aside as the day upon which there shall be held a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Woodrow Wilson, former President of the United States.

That a joint committee, to consist of five Senators and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be named, with full power to make all arrangements and publish a suitable program for the joint session of Congress herein authorized, and to issue the invitations hereinafter mentioned.

That invitations shall be extended to the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and such other invitations shall be issued as to the said committee shall seem best.

That all expenses incurred by the committee in the execution of the provisions of this resolution shall be paid, one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is upon agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was unanimously agreed to.

THE BUDGET

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the Budget message of the President of the United States, which will be read.

The reading clerk read the message, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. The receipts and expenditures shown in detail in the Budget are summarized in the following statement:

Summary

	Estimated, 1926	Estimated, 1925	Actual, 1924
Total receipts.....	\$3,641,295,092	\$3,601,968,297	\$4,102,044,701.65
Total expenditures (including reduction of the public debt required by law to be made from ordinary receipts).....	3,267,551,378	3,534,083,808	3,506,677,715.31
Excess of receipts.....	373,743,714	67,884,489	595,366,986.31

In transmitting to Congress December 3, 1923, the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, I recommended that taxes be reduced. This recommendation was warranted by the statement of our finances as presented to Congress in that Budget. It was there estimated that under the tax laws then in force the surplus of receipts over expenditures would be \$329,639,624 for the fiscal year 1924 and \$395,681,634 for the fiscal year 1925. Taxes have been reduced. The benefits to the people of this reduction went back to the commencement of the calendar year January 1, 1923. The confidence of the Chief Executive and of the Congress that our revenues could be safely reduced has been fully justified. The fiscal year which ended June 30, 1924, was closed with a surplus of receipts over expenditures of \$505,366,000. This was \$175,727,000 in excess of the estimate made on December 3, 1923. Increase of \$117,367,000 in receipts and decrease of \$58,360,000 in expenditures produced this unexpected additional surplus of \$175,727,000.

We have now completed five months of the current fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1925. This affords an index of the probable reduction in our revenues under the current tax law. It also affords an index of the limits within which our expenditures can be kept under the continuing policy of economy. A revision of the estimate of receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, indicates to-day that the receipts will be \$3,601,968,297 and the expenditures \$3,534,083,808. This forecasts a surplus of receipts over expenditures for the current fiscal year of \$67,884,489. This estimate is most significant. On the one hand, we anticipate receiving this year \$400,000,000 less revenue than we had last year, due principally to the reduction in taxes. On the other hand, we must provide \$114,000,000 for the extraordinary increase in expenditures made necessary by the World War adjusted compensation act. Yet we are confident that the year will be closed with a surplus of more than \$67,000,000. Our aim should be not only to conserve this prospective surplus but to add to it.

For the fiscal year 1926 it is estimated that the ordinary receipts will be \$3,641,295,092 and the expenditures \$3,267,551,378. This indicates a surplus of \$373,743,714. In addition to these receipts and expenditures it is estimated that the postal receipts will be \$647,410,000 and the expenditures chargeable

thereto \$637,376,005. This forecasts a surplus in postal revenue of \$10,033,995, which amount is included in the estimated general surplus of \$373,743,714.

We come now to the estimates of appropriations contained in this Budget. The Chief Executive is pledged to economy in the requests he makes upon Congress for funds for the executive branch of the Government. This pledge is kept in these estimates of appropriations. They call for a total of \$3,092,143,841.48, exclusive of the Postal Service. A fair comparison of the estimates of appropriations for 1926 with the appropria-

tions actually made for 1925 should include the supplemental estimates for 1925 which were presented to Congress for consideration in the second deficiency bill, fiscal year 1924, and the bill to adjust compensation of employees in certain of the field services. These two bills failed of enactment before the adjournment of Congress June 7, 1924. In the following table a comparison is made of the estimates of appropriations for 1926 with the appropriations actually made for 1925 and the supplemental estimates submitted for that year which are awaiting final legislative consideration:

Estimates of appropriations for 1926 compared with appropriations for 1925, plus supplemental estimates for 1925 which are awaiting final legislative consideration

	Estimates of appropriations, 1926	Appropriations, 1925	Supplemental estimates submitted for 1925	Total for 1925
Legislative establishment.....	\$15,094,545.80	\$14,229,816.00	\$50,000.00	\$14,279,816.00
Executive Office.....	439,960.00	397,847.50	43,520.00	441,367.50
Independent offices:				
Civil Service Commission.....	997,375.00	947,115.00	64,920.00	1,012,035.00
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	2,301,500.00	2,650,600.00	—	2,650,600.00
Federal Board for Vocational Education.....	8,222,270.00	6,380,000.00	944,000.00	7,324,000.00
Federal Trade Commission.....	950,000.00	1,010,000.00	—	1,010,000.00
General Accounting Office.....	3,701,960.00	3,724,612.00	75,240.00	3,799,852.00
Housing Corporation.....	743,915.00	808,100.00	74,315.00	882,415.00
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	4,913,500.00	4,272,284.00	369,580.00	4,641,864.00
Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation.....	24,330,000.00	30,344,000.00	—	30,344,000.00
State, War, and Navy Department Buildings.....	2,342,880.00	2,433,115.00	—	2,433,115.00
Tariff Commission.....	721,500.00	681,980.00	1,260.00	683,240.00
Smithsonian Institution and National Museum.....	817,890.00	869,101.66	—	869,101.66
United States Veterans' Bureau.....	405,700,000.00	349,065,000.00	135,892,898.00	484,957,898.00
Other independent offices.....	1,578,045.00	1,777,186.79	30,000.00	1,807,186.79
Department of Agriculture.....	140,092,750.00	70,956,024.00	7,091,162.00	78,047,186.00
Department of Commerce.....	22,741,514.00	23,942,905.00	1,904,650.00	25,847,555.00
Department of the Interior.....	267,785,596.17	290,473,724.06	3,845,439.80	294,319,163.86
Department of Justice.....	24,917,822.00	21,371,430.00	1,258,186.50	22,629,616.50
Department of Labor.....	8,335,260.00	7,981,516.51	694,829.96	8,676,346.47
Navy Department.....	289,783,978.00	277,208,327.00	498,930.00	277,707,257.00
State Department.....	16,130,652.51	15,027,646.29	737,110.00	15,764,756.29
Treasury Department.....	163,847,741.00	147,414,605.00	33,243,495.00	180,658,100.00
War Department, including Panama Canal.....	338,551,230.00	334,553,786.13	12,599,808.54	347,153,594.67
District of Columbia.....	32,335,827.00	27,682,067.00	2,672,048.21	30,354,115.21
Ordinary.....	1,777,377,711.48	1,636,202,788.94	202,091,393.01	1,838,294,181.95
Reduction in principal of the public debt:				
Sinking fund.....	323,175,000.00	310,000,000.00	—	310,000,000.00
Purchase of Liberty bonds from foreign repayments.....	—	208,600.00	—	208,600.00
Redemption of bonds and notes from estate taxes.....	—	100,000.00	—	100,000.00
Redemption of securities from Federal reserve bank and Federal intermediate credit bank franchise tax receipts.....	950,000.00	1,152,200.00	—	1,152,200.00
Redemption of bonds, etc., received as repayments of principal and as interest payments on obligations of foreign governments.....	160,641,130.00	160,345,601.00	—	160,345,601.00
Principal of the public debt.....	484,766,130.00	471,806,401.00	—	471,806,401.00
Interest on the public debt.....	830,000,000.00	865,000,000.00	—	865,000,000.00
Total payable from the Treasury.....	3,092,143,841.48	2,973,009,189.94	202,091,393.01	3,175,100,582.95
Post Office Department and Postal Service, payable from postal revenues.....	637,376,005.00	613,645,195.25	—	613,645,195.25
Total including Post Office Department and Postal Service.....	3,729,519,846.48	3,586,654,385.19	202,091,393.01	3,788,745,778.20

For the national defense the estimates amount to \$549,000,000, which is \$29,000,000 less than the amount available this current fiscal year. These figures do not include non-military items of the War and Navy Departments. This reduction is made in accordance with my belief that we can have adequate national defense with a more modest outlay of the taxpayers' money. Further study may point the way to additional reduction without weakening our national defense, but rather perfecting it. This Nation is at peace with the world. We no longer have international competition in naval construction of major units. We are concerned primarily with maintaining adequate preparedness. We should have adequate preparedness in 1926 within the limits of the amount recommended.

Aside from the important factor of training personnel, our national defense is largely an industrial problem. To-day the outstanding weakness in the industrial situation, as it affects national defense, is the inadequacy of facilities to supply air-service needs. The airplane industry in this country at the present time is dependent almost entirely upon Government business. To strengthen this industry is to strengthen our national defense. For the Air Service of the Army and Navy, and the Air Mail Service, the estimates, including contract authorizations, amount to \$38,945,000. This contemplates an expenditure with the industries of \$18,287,000 for the procurement of airplanes, engines, and accessories. The remaining \$20,658,000 is for maintenance, operation, experimentation, and research. The amount of \$38,945,000, however, does not include all that will be available for this service in 1926. Amounts contributing to the Air Service carried in other estimates, and usable war supplies, will make a total availability conservatively estimated at \$65,000,000.

The amount requested for national defense includes \$50,118,000 for the Army and Navy Reserves, National Guard,

citizen's military training camps, and other civilian training activities.

There is also included in the national-defense estimates \$7,444,000 for increase of the Navy. This will provide for continuing work on the fleet submarines under construction and for beginning work on two of the four remaining fleet submarines authorized in the 1916 program. With regard to the Navy estimates, legislation is now pending which provides for additional vessels, including gunboats for use on the Yangtze River. Further estimates for increase in the Navy are dependent upon the enactment of this legislation. It will also be necessary to request of Congress legislation increasing the authorized cost of the two airplane carriers now under construction. If this be granted, it will require funds for the next fiscal year not provided in the estimates contained in this Budget.

For rivers and harbors \$56,237,000 is recommended. In this is included \$40,000,000 for maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works, \$10,500,000 for flood control on the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers, and \$5,437,000 for the operation and maintenance of canals and the removal of wrecks and other obstructions. Of the \$40,000,000 for maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors, \$21,973,915 is for new work and \$17,241,575 is for maintenance. This will make possible material progress on the most important projects approved by Congress.

It is estimated that \$6,541,590 will be needed to complete Dam No. 2 at Muscle Shoals. Of this amount \$3,501,200 will be required this year. This will be covered by a supplemental estimate for 1925. The balance, \$3,040,390, is provided for in these estimates.

There is included in these estimates \$50,000,000 to be set aside in the adjusted service certificate fund established under the World War adjusted compensation act of May 19, 1924,

This is for the second payment to the fund to be made January 1, 1926. For the first payment, due January 1, 1925, \$100,000,000 is included in the deficiency bill now under consideration by Congress. The applications from veterans so far have been below the estimated number which the records indicate as entitled to the benefits of the act. If the two appropriations recommended be made, it is estimated there will be a sufficient amount in the fund on January 1, 1926, to meet the demands of the act. Should the number of applications increase beyond what present experience indicates as probable, there will be ample time to submit a supplemental estimate for the additional amount necessary before that date.

The estimates for salaries of civilian employees in the District of Columbia are in accordance with the provisions of the classification act approved March 4, 1923. For the field services the estimates for salaries are based on rates comparable with those for departmental employees in the District of Columbia.

For Federal aid to States the estimates provide in excess of \$109,000,000. These subsidies are prescribed by law. I am convinced that the broadening of this field of activity is detrimental both to Federal and State Governments. Efficiency of Federal operations is impaired as their scope is unduly enlarged. Efficiency of State governments is impaired as they relinquish and turn over to the Federal Government responsibilities which are rightfully theirs. I am opposed to any expansion of these subsidies. My conviction is they can be curtailed with benefit to both the Federal and State Governments.

For reclamation purposes I am recommending \$9,777,257 for 1926. It is highly desirable that the Congress, as a basis for this and other future reclamation expenditures, enact the legislation embodying new reclamation policies proposed in H. R. 9611, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

The gross public debt was reduced \$1,098,894,375 during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, and stood at \$21,250,812,989 on the latter date. This reduction was accomplished through (1) the application of the sinking fund and other public debt retirements required to be made from ordinary receipts, aggregating \$457,999,750; (2) a reduction in the general fund balance of \$135,527,639; and (3) the use of the entire surplus of \$505,366,986. The annual interest charges on the debt represented by this reduction are equivalent to over \$45,000,000.

The total reduction in the debt since the high point of \$26,594,000,000 on August 31, 1919, amounted to \$5,343,000,000 at the close of the last fiscal year. This total reduction has effected a saving in interest amounting to approximately \$25,000,000 annually, a saving which equals nearly one-third of the total annual pre-war expenditures of the Government.

The fixed-debt charges are included in the regular Budget of the Government under a definite plan worked out soon after the close of the war for the gradual retirement of the public debt and must be met before the Budget can balance. The most important of these fixed-debt charges is the cumulative sinking fund provided in the Victory Liberty loan act. Retirements through this fund during the past fiscal year were about \$296,000,000. The next items in size among the fixed-debt charges are the retirements of securities received from foreign governments under debt settlements and the purchases and retirements of securities from foreign repayments. These continuing reductions of the public debt have a very material effect in maintaining high prices for Liberty bonds. They permit the issuance of new Government securities for temporary and for refunding purposes at low interest rates, with consequent further economy in Government expenditures. Interest paid in the fiscal year 1924 amounted to \$940,000,000. It is estimated that this item will be \$865,000,000 in 1925 and \$830,000,000 in 1926. This saving of \$110,000,000 in two years is the result of the reduction in the amount of the debt and decrease in the average rate of interest paid. The sinking fund is a part of the contract between the United States and the holder of the United States obligation, and therefore can not in good faith be changed. The continual steady effect of these debt-reducing factors is to cut down the largest single item of Government expenditure and permit further reductions in the burden of taxation.

In my message transmitting the Budget for the fiscal year 1925 I recommended the enactment of legislation which would authorize a reasonable progressive building program to meet the needs of the executive departments and establishments of the Government in the District of Columbia. The situation is yearly becoming more acute even with full utilization of all Government-owned buildings, including the temporary buildings erected during the period of the late emergency. We are now spending something more than \$670,000 per year for rental of buildings or parts of buildings in the District of Columbia.

The present crowded condition is detrimental to efficiency. The fire hazard in the temporary buildings is great. An expenditure of \$5,000,000 annually for a period of years would enable the present situation to be gradually relieved. A larger yearly expenditure would shorten the period during which full relief could be attained. During the last session of Congress a bill was introduced authorizing a yearly appropriation of not exceeding \$10,000,000 for a progressive building program in the District of Columbia. This bill has my indorsement. I earnestly recommend its enactment by Congress.

I have recently appointed a commission to investigate agricultural conditions. The purpose of this was to determine what action, through legislation or otherwise, should be taken to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries. The findings and recommendations of the commission are for the use of the Congress. I mention this commission here for the reason that I will shortly submit to the Congress an estimate of appropriation to meet the expenses of the commission.

We are now in the fourth year of our campaign for reduction in the cost of government. Our aim is to reduce the burden of taxes. In this we have been successful. For those things which we are now required to do we are fast reducing our expenditures to a minimum consistent with efficient service. We have before us an estimated surplus of \$67,000,000 for the current fiscal year and \$373,000,000 for the next fiscal year. Shall we embark upon new projects involving expenditures which will prevent the accumulation of these expected surpluses, or shall we continue the campaign for economy? I am for economy. If we continue the campaign for economy, we will pave the way for further reduction in taxes. This reduction can not be effected immediately. Before it is undertaken we should know more definitely by actual operation what our revenues will be under our present tax law. But the knowledge of our revenue under the existing law will avail us nothing if we embark upon any new large expenditure program.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

December 1, 1924.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of a motion, the Chair will refer the message and accompanying papers to the Committee on Appropriations.

OREGON-CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress I introduced the bill (S. 2751) to authorize the addition to national forests of lands revested in United States by the act of June 9, 1916, or reconveyed to the United States under act of February 26, 1919, and the bill (S. 2752), of similar title, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. I ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of those bills.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator what the bills involve?

Mr. McNARY. They are bills involving the expansion of the national forests to include what are known as the Oregon-California railroad grant lands in the State of Oregon.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the Senator's request?

Mr. McNARY. That the committee be discharged from the further consideration of these two bills.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator mean to ask to have some other action taken respecting the bills?

Mr. McNARY. After further consideration, I entertain some doubt of the propriety of the bills in their present form, and I merely desire to have the committee discharged from the further consideration of the bills. If that request is granted, I shall move that they be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys be discharged from the further consideration of the bills to which he has referred. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McNARY. I now move that the bills be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 3, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 2, 1924

[Appointments during the last recess of the Senate]

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Howard M. Gore, of West Virginia, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

Wilbur John Carr, of New York.

John Van A. MacMurray, of New Jersey.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

William J. Donovan, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Earl J. Davis, resigned.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

James Rockwell Sheffield, of New York, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

Edgar A. Bancroft, of Illinois, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

CLASS I

Maxwell Blake, of Missouri.
 Jefferson Caffery, of Louisiana.
 Sheldon L. Crosby, of New York.
 Charles C. Eberhardt, of Kansas.
 John G. Foster, of Vermont.
 Alphonse Gaullin, of Rhode Island.
 Franklin Mott Gunther, of Virginia.
 Albert Halstead, of the District of Columbia.
 Carlton Bailey Hurst, of the District of Columbia.
 Julius G. Lay, of the District of Columbia.
 Henry H. Morgan, of Louisiana.
 Gabriel Bie Ravndal, of South Dakota.
 Warren D. Robbins, of New York.
 William H. Robertson, of Virginia.
 Thomas Sammons, of Washington.
 H. F. Arthur Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia.
 Robert P. Skinner, of Ohio.
 Frederick A. Sterling, of Texas.
 Nathaniel B. Stewart, of Georgia.
 George T. Summerlin, of Louisiana.
 Horace Lee Washington, of the District of Columbia.
 Post Wheeler, of Washington.
 Sheldon Whitehouse, of New York.
 Hugh R. Wilson, of Illinois.
 Evan E. Young, of South Dakota.

CLASS II

Homer M. Byington, of Connecticut.
 William Coffin, of Kentucky.
 Edwin S. Cunningham, of Tennessee.
 Charles B. Curtis, of New York.
 Claude I. Dawson, of South Carolina.
 William Dawson, of Minnesota.
 William H. Gale, of Virginia.
 Clarence E. Gauss, of Connecticut.
 Edwin N. Gunsaulus, of Ohio.
 Nelson T. Johnson, of Oklahoma.
 Leo J. Keena, of Michigan.
 Tracy Lay, of Alabama.
 Marion Letcher, of Georgia.
 Alexander R. Magruder, of Maryland.
 De Witt C. Poole, of Illinois.
 Ralph J. Totten, of Tennessee.
 Roger Culver Tredwell, of Indiana.
 Craig W. Wadsworth, of New York.
 Alexander W. Weddell, of Virginia.

CLASS III

Norman Armour, of New Jersey.
 Ray Atherton, of Illinois.
 James G. Bailey, of Kentucky.
 Thomas D. Bowman, of Missouri.
 John K. Caldwell, of Kentucky.
 Clarence Carrigan, of California.
 George E. Chamberlin, of New York.
 Carl F. Deichman, of Missouri.
 Frederic R. Dolbeare, of New York.
 Louis G. Dreyfus, jr., of California.
 Allen W. Dulles, of New York.
 Frederick T. F. Dumont, of Pennsylvania.
 Robert Frazer, jr., of Pennsylvania.
 Arthur C. Frost, of Massachusetts.

Wesley Frost, of Kentucky.
 John A. Gamon, of Illinois.
 Arthur Garrels, of Missouri.
 Arminius T. Haeberle, of Missouri.
 Matthew E. Hanna, of Connecticut.
 Ernest L. Harris, of Illinois.
 Lewis W. Haskell, of South Carolina.
 Charles M. Hathaway, jr., of Pennsylvania.
 P. Stewart Heintzleman, of Pennsylvania.
 Philip Holland, of Tennessee.
 W. Stanley Hollis, of Massachusetts.
 Augustus E. Ingram, of California.
 Theodore Jaekel, of New York.
 Douglas Jenkins, of South Carolina.
 Hallett Johnson, of New Jersey.
 John E. Kehl, of Ohio.
 Alexander C. Kirk, of Illinois.
 Ezra M. Lawton, of Ohio.
 Sampel T. Lee, of Michigan.
 Will L. Lowrie, of Illinois.
 Ferdinand L. Mayer, of Indiana.
 George S. Messersmith, of Delaware.
 Raneford S. Miller, of New York.
 Stokeley W. Morgan, of Arkansas.
 Edwin L. Neville, of Ohio.
 Edward J. Norton, of Tennessee.
 John Ball Osborne, of Pennsylvania.
 Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island.
 Willys R. Peck, of California.
 Mahlon Fay Perkins, of California.
 G. Howland Shaw, of Massachusetts.
 Alban G. Snyder, of West Virginia.
 Addison E. Southard, of Kentucky.
 Henry P. Starrett, of Florida.
 Louis A. Sussorff, jr., of New York.
 Francis White, of Maryland.
 John Campbell White, of Maryland.
 Charles S. Winans, of Michigan.

CLASS IV

William W. Andrews, of Ohio.
 F. Lamont Belin, of Pennsylvania.
 Philander L. Cable, of Illinois.
 Hamilton C. Claiborne, of Virginia.
 Felix Cole, of the District of Columbia.
 E. Haldeman Dennison, of Ohio.
 Hernando De Soto, of California.
 Leon Dominian, of New York.
 George K. Donald, of Alabama.
 James Clement Dunn, of New York.
 Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California.
 Cornelius Ferris, of Colorado.
 Fred D. Fisher, of Oregon.
 Otis A. Glazebrook, of New Jersey.
 Herbert S. Gould, of California.
 George A. Gordon, of New York.
 Elbridge Gerry Greene, of Massachusetts.
 Oliver B. Harriman, of West Virginia.
 Clarence B. Hewes, of Louisiana.
 Calvin M. Hitch, of Georgia.
 Myron A. Hofer, of Ohio.
 Ross E. Holaday, of Ohio.
 Samuel W. Honaker, of Texas.
 Williamson S. Howell, jr., of Texas.
 J. Klahr Huddle, of Ohio.
 John F. Jewell, of Illinois.
 Stewart Johnson, of Illinois.
 Paul Knabenshue, of Ohio.
 Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York.
 Irving N. Linnell, of Massachusetts.
 J. Theodore Marriner, of Maine.
 John F. Martin, of Florida.
 Lester Maynard, of California.
 Jay Pierrepont Moffat, of New York.
 Maxwell K. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania.
 Dana G. Munro, of New Jersey.
 R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio.
 Gordon Paddock, of New York.
 Robert M. Scotten, of Michigan.
 Richard B. Southgate, of Massachusetts.
 Benjamin Thaw, jr., of Pennsylvania.
 Walter C. Thurston, of Arizona.
 John C. Wiley, of Indiana.
 North Winship, of Georgia.
 L. Lanier Winslow, of New York.
 John Q. Wood, of Hawaii.

CLASS V

Copley Amory, jr., of New Hampshire.
 Frank D. Arnold, of Pennsylvania.
 Henry H. Balch, of Alabama.
 Joseph W. Ballantine, of Massachusetts.
 Thomas H. Bevan, of Maryland.
 Pierre de L. Boal, of Pennsylvania.
 George A. Bucklin, of Oklahoma.
 Ralph C. Busser, of Pennsylvania.
 Charles H. Cameron, of New York.
 Harry Campbell, of Kansas.
 Frederick C. Chabot, of Texas.
 Harold D. Clum, of New York.
 John K. Davis, of Ohio.
 Leslie A. Davis, of New York.
 Hasell H. Dick, of South Carolina.
 Alfred W. Donegan, of Alabama.
 Eugene H. Dooman, of New York.
 W. Roderick Dorsey, of Maryland.
 Edward A. Dow, of Nebraska.
 Coert Du Bois, of California.
 John W. Dye, of Minnesota.
 Carol H. Foster, of Maryland.
 Claude E. Guyant, of Illinois.
 George C. Hanson, of Connecticut.
 Joseph E. Haven, of Illinois.
 Oscar S. Heizer, of Iowa.
 Frank Anderson Henry, of Delaware.
 Charles L. Hoover, of Missouri.
 George N. Ifft, of Idaho.
 Ernest L. Ives, of Virginia.
 Jesse B. Jackson, of Ohio.
 William L. Jenkins, of Pennsylvania.
 Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina.
 Paul R. Josselyn, of Iowa.
 Wilbur Keblinger, of Virginia.
 Graham H. Kemper, of Kentucky.
 Frank C. Lee, of Colorado.
 Walter A. Leonard, of Illinois.
 Stuart K. Lupton, of Tennessee.
 David B. Macgowan, of Tennessee.
 O. Gaylord Marsh, of Washington.
 Keith Merrill, of Minnesota.
 Leland B. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
 Wallace S. Murray, of Ohio.
 David J. D. Myers, of Georgia.
 Myrl S. Myers, of Pennsylvania.
 José de Olivares, of Missouri.
 Kenneth S. Patton, of Virginia.
 Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri.
 John R. Putnam, of Oregon.
 Edward L. Reed, of Pennsylvania.
 Leslie E. Reed, of Minnesota.
 Elliott Verne Richardson, of New York.
 Emil Sauer, of Texas.
 James B. Stewart, of New Mexico.
 Alfred R. Thomson, of Maryland.
 S. Pinkney Tuck, of New York.
 Avra M. Warren, of Maryland.
 Hugh H. Watson, of Vermont.
 Charles D. Westcott, of Pennsylvania.
 Edwin C. Wilson, of Florida.
 Thomas M. Wilson, of Tennessee.
 Alan F. Winslow, of Illinois.
 James B. Young, of Pennsylvania.

CLASS VI

Wainwright Abbott, of Pennsylvania.
 Walter A. Adams, of South Carolina.
 Charles H. Albrecht, of Pennsylvania.
 J. Webb Benton, of Pennsylvania.
 Percy A. Blair, of the District of Columbia.
 William P. Blocker, of Texas.
 Walter F. Boyle, of Georgia.
 Homer Brett, of Mississippi.
 Charles C. Broy, of Virginia.
 Parker W. Buhrman, of Virginia.
 William C. Burdett, of Tennessee.
 Algar E. Carleton, of Vermont.
 Joseph W. Carroll, of New York.
 Benjamin F. Chase, of Pennsylvania.
 H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona.
 Harris N. Cookingham, of New York.
 Raymond E. Cox, of New York.
 Henry C. A. Damm, of Tennessee.

Thomas L. Daniels, of Minnesota.
 Chester W. Davis, of New York.
 James P. Davis, of Georgia.
 Monnett B. Davis, of Colorado.
 Lawrence Dennis, of Massachusetts.
 Erle R. Dickover, of California.
 Henry I. Dockweller, of California.
 Clement S. Edwards, of Minnesota.
 Joseph Flack, of Pennsylvania.
 Barton Hall, of Missouri.
 George M. Hanson, of Utah.
 Robert Harnden, of California.
 Thornwell Haynes, of Alabama.
 Frederick P. Hibbard, of Texas.
 Henry B. Hitchcock, of New York.
 John P. Hurley, of New York.
 Jay C. Huston, of California.
 Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina.
 John D. Johnson, of Vermont.
 Curtis C. Jordon, of California.
 Edwin Carl Kemp, of Florida.
 Alfred W. Kliefoth, of Pennsylvania.
 Harry M. Lakin, of Pennsylvania.
 William R. Langdon, of Massachusetts.
 Frederic D. K. Le Clercq, of South Carolina.
 Dayle C. McDonough, of Missouri.
 Joseph F. McGurk, of New Jersey.
 George A. Makinson, of California.
 Lucien Memminger, of South Carolina.
 Cord Meyer, of New York.
 G. Harlan Miller, of Pennsylvania.
 James P. Moffitt, of New York.
 Benjamin Muse, of Virginia.
 Charles Roy Nasmith, of New York.
 Edward I. Nathan, of Pennsylvania.
 H. Dorsey Newson, of New York.
 George Orr, of New Jersey.
 Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio.
 Frederick F. A. Pearson, of Rhode Island.
 Charles J. Pisar, of Wisconsin.
 Harold B. Quarton, of Iowa.
 Elbridge D. Rand, of California.
 John Randolph, of New York.
 Bertil M. Rasmussen, of Iowa.
 Benjamin Reath Riggs, of Pennsylvania.
 John M. Savage, of New Jersey.
 Walter H. Schoellkopf, of New York.
 Walter H. Sholes, of Oklahoma.
 Samuel Sokobin, of New Jersey.
 William B. Southworth, of Pennsylvania.
 Francis R. Stewart, of New York.
 Lucien N. Sullivan, of Pennsylvania.
 Merritt Swift, of the District of Columbia.
 Harold H. Tittmann, jr., of Missouri.
 Thomas W. Voetter, of New Mexico.
 John J. C. Watson, of Kentucky.
 Orme Wilson, jr., of New York.
 Warden McK. Wilson, of Indiana.
 Henry M. Wolcott, of New York.

CLASS VII

Philip Adams, of Massachusetts.
 Charles E. Allen, of Kentucky.
 Norman L. Anderson, of Wisconsin.
 W. Roswell Barker, of Minnesota.
 Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa.
 Frank Bohr, of Kansas.
 Wilbert L. Bonney, of Illinois.
 John L. Bouchal, of Nebraska.
 Richard F. Boyce, of Michigan.
 Robert R. Bradford, of Nebraska.
 Austin C. Brady, of New Mexico.
 George L. Brandt, of the District of Columbia.
 Lawrence P. Briggs, of Michigan.
 Alfred T. Burri, of New York.
 Harry E. Carlson, of Illinois.
 James C. Carter, of Georgia.
 William E. Chapman, of Oklahoma.
 Reed Paige Clark, of New Hampshire.
 Arthur B. Cooke, of South Carolina.
 John Corrigan, jr., of Georgia.
 Elliot B. Coulter, of Illinois.
 Paul H. Cram, of Maine.
 Cecil M. P. Cross, of Rhode Island.
 Raymond Davis, of Maine.
 Thomas D. Davis, of Oklahoma.

Leonard G. Dawson, of Virginia.
 Harold M. Deane, of Connecticut.
 James Orr Denby, of Indiana.
 Samuel S. Dickson, of New Mexico.
 Hooker A. Doolittle, of New York.
 William F. Doty, of New Jersey.
 J. Preston Doughten, of Delaware.
 Maurice P. Dunlap, of Minnesota.
 Dudley G. Dwyre, of Colorado.
 Francis J. Dyer, of California.
 John G. Erhardt, of New York.
 Hugh S. Fullerton, of Ohio.
 Ilo C. Funk, of Colorado.
 Gerhard Gade, of Illinois.
 William P. George, of Alabama.
 Raleigh A. Gibson, of Illinois.
 John Sterett Gittings, jr., of Maryland.
 Bernard Gottlieb, of New York.
 Louis H. Gourley, of Illinois.
 William J. Grace, of New York.
 Edward M. Groth, of Georgia.
 Don S. Haven, of Pennsylvania.
 Harry F. Hawley, of New York.
 Robert W. Heingartner, of Ohio.
 Robertson Honey, of New York.
 George D. Hopper, of Kentucky.
 Charles Bridgham Hosmer, of Maine.
 William H. Hunt, of New York.
 Robert L. Keiser, of Indiana.
 Clinton E. MacEachran, of Massachusetts.
 John H. MacVeagh, of New York.
 Karl de G. MacVitty, of Illinois.
 William J. McCafferty, of California.
 Andrew J. McConico, of Mississippi.
 Stewart E. McMillin, of Kansas.
 Renwick S. McNiece, of Utah.
 Robert B. Macatee, of Virginia.
 George R. Merrell, jr., of Missouri.
 Hugh Millard, of Nebraska.
 John R. Minter, of South Carolina.
 W. M. Parker Mitchell, of Virginia.
 Edmund B. Montgomery, of Illinois.
 Orsen N. Nielsen, of Wisconsin.
 Thomas R. Owens, of Alabama.
 Maurice C. Pierce, of Wisconsin.
 Harold Playter, of California.
 Walter T. Prendergast, of Ohio.
 Ernest B. Price, of New York.
 Samuel C. Reat, of Illinois.
 Horace Remillard, of Massachusetts.
 Winthrop R. Scott, of Ohio.
 John F. Simons, of New York.
 Gaston Smith, of Louisiana.
 Carl O. Spamer, of Maryland.
 Clarence J. Spiker, of the District of Columbia.
 Richard L. Sprague, of Massachusetts.
 Paul C. Squire, of Massachusetts.
 Maurice L. Stafford, of California.
 Dana C. Sycks, of Ohio.
 G. Russell Taggart, of New Jersey.
 William H. Taylor, of Pennsylvania.
 Raymond P. Tenney, of Massachusetts.
 Samuel R. Thompson, of California.
 R. A. Wallace Treat, of Ohio.
 Marshall M. Vance, of Ohio.
 Henry C. von Struve, of Texas.
 Egmont C. von Tresckow, of South Carolina.
 George Wadsworth, of New York.
 Harry L. Walsh, of Maryland.
 Henry S. Waterman, of Washington.
 Henry T. Wilcox, of New Jersey.
 Herbert O. Williams, of California.
 Harold L. Williamson, of Illinois.
 Digby A. Willson, of New York.
 Gilbert R. Willson, of Texas.
 Damon C. Woods, of Texas.
 Romeyn Wormuth, of New York.
 William J. Yerby, of Tennessee.
 Bartley F. Yost, of Kansas.

CLASS VIII

Harry J. Anslinger, of Pennsylvania.
 Miss Lucile Atcherson, of Ohio.
 Henry D. Baker, of Illinois.
 Rees H. Barkalow, of New Jersey.

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island.
 Donald F. Bigelow, of Minnesota.
 Lee R. Blohm, of Arizona.
 Hiram A. Boucher, of Minnesota.
 Lewis V. Boyle, of California.
 William W. Brunswick, of Kansas.
 Howard Bucknell, jr., of Georgia.
 Robert S. Burgher, of Texas.
 Herbert S. Bursley, of the District of Columbia.
 Edward Caffery, of Louisiana.
 John S. Calvert, of North Carolina.
 Reginald S. Castleman, of California.
 J. Rives Childs, of Virginia.
 Thomas W. Chilton, of New York.
 George T. Colman, of New York.
 Edward S. Crocker, 2d, of Massachusetts.
 Nathaniel P. Davis, of New Jersey.
 Richard M. de Lambert, of New Mexico.
 Howard Donovan, of Illinois.
 William W. Early, of North Carolina.
 Stillman W. Eells, of New York.
 Leon H. Ellis, of Washington.
 Robert F. Fernald, of Maine.
 Augustine W. Ferrin, of New York.
 Harold D. Finley, of New York.
 Carl A. Fisher, of Utah.
 Samuel J. Fletcher, of Maine.
 Walter A. Foote, of Pennsylvania.
 Paul H. Foster, of Texas.
 Ray Fox, of California.
 Lynn W. Franklin, of Maryland.
 Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York.
 William P. Garrety, of New York.
 Albert H. Gerberich, of Pennsylvania.
 Herndon W. Goforth, of North Carolina.
 Harvey T. Goodier, of New York.
 Charles I. Graham, of Illinois.
 John Harrison Gray, of New York.
 Julian C. Greenup, of California.
 Christian Gross, of Illinois.
 Stuart E. Grummon, of New Jersey.
 Maxwell M. Hamilton, of Iowa.
 Stanley Hawks, of New York.
 William W. Heard, of Maryland.
 Donald R. Heath, of Kansas.
 Charles H. Heisler, of Delaware.
 Jack Dewey Hickerson, of Texas.
 Leighton Hope, of Mississippi.
 William I. Jackson, of Illinois.
 S. Bertrand Jacobson, of New York.
 Robert Y. Jarvis, of California.
 Felix S. S. Johnson, of New Jersey.
 Robert F. Kelley, of Massachusetts.
 Trojan Koddig, of Pennsylvania.
 Gerhard H. Krogh, of North Dakota.
 Clark P. Kuykendall, of Pennsylvania.
 Drew Linard, of Alabama.
 Robert D. Longyear, of Massachusetts.
 Thomas McEnelly, of New York.
 Walter H. McKinney, of Michigan.
 H. Freeman Matthews, of Maryland.
 John J. Meily, of Pennsylvania.
 H. Tobey Mooers, of Maine.
 J. Lee Murphy, of New York.
 James J. Murphy, jr., of Pennsylvania.
 Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin.
 Gustave Pabst, jr., of Wisconsin.
 Robert R. Patterson, of Michigan.
 Robert L. Rankin, of New Jersey.
 Walter S. Reineck, of Ohio.
 H. Earle Russell, of Michigan.
 Lester L. Schnare, of Georgia.
 Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia.
 Harold Shantz, of New York.
 George P. Shaw, of California.
 Fred C. Slater, of Kansas.
 Alexander K. Sloan, of Pennsylvania.
 E. Talbot Smith, of Connecticut.
 Leland L. Smith, of Oregon.
 John Stambaugh, 2d, of Ohio.
 Christian T. Steger, of Virginia.
 George K. Stiles, of Maryland.
 Francis H. Styles, of Virginia.
 Harold S. Tewell, of North Dakota.
 Edward B. Thomas, of Illinois.

Frederick L. Thomas, of New York.
Howard K. Travers, of New York.
Ernest A. Wakefield, of Maine.
George P. Waller, of Alabama.
Fletcher Warren, of Texas.
LeRoy Webber, of New York.
James V. Whitfield, of North Carolina.
Samuel H. Wiley, of North Carolina.
James R. Wilkinson, of Wisconsin.
Howard F. Withey, of Michigan.
G. Carlton Woodward, of Pennsylvania.

CLASS IX

Richard P. Butrick, of New York.
Charles L. De Vault, of Indiana.
Raymond H. Geist, of Ohio.
Bernard F. Hale, of Vermont.
Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa.
Shelby F. Strother, of Kentucky.
Howard P. Van Sant, of New Jersey.

UNCLASSIFIED

Knox Alexander, of Missouri.
Paul H. Alling, of Pennsylvania.
Maurice W. Altaffer, of Ohio.
Charles A. Amsden, of New Mexico.
George Alexander Armstrong, of New York.
Lawrence S. Armstrong, of New York.
George Atcheson, jr., of California.
Frederick W. Baldwin, of New York.
Charles A. Bay, of Minnesota.
William H. Beach, of Virginia.
David C. Berger, of Virginia.
Herbert C. Biar, of Indiana.
William A. Bickers, of Virginia.
Gilson G. Blake, jr., of Maryland.
Ralph A. Boernstein, of the District of Columbia.
Ellis A. Bonnet, of Texas.
Paul Bowerman, of Michigan.
Howard A. Bowman, of New York.
Norton F. Brand, of North Dakota.
Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
Henry R. Brown, of Minnesota.
John H. Bruins, of New York.
Joseph F. Burt, of Illinois.
Leo J. Callanan, of Massachusetts.
Alfred D. Cameron, of Washington.
Randolph F. Carroll, of Virginia.
Arthur H. Cawston, of Illinois.
Culver B. Chamberlain, of Missouri.
Flavius J. Chapman, 3d, of Virginia.
J. Holbrook Chapman, of the District of Columbia.
Prescott Childs, of Massachusetts.
Haskell E. Coates, of Wisconsin.
Harold M. Collins, of Virginia.
William W. Corcoran, of Massachusetts.
Alexander P. Cruger, of New York.
William E. De Courcy, of Texas.
Charles H. Derry, of Georgia.
Horace J. Dickinson, of Arkansas.
Julian C. Dorr, of New York.
Albert M. Doyle, of Michigan.
Fred C. Eastin, jr., of Missouri.
Samuel G. Ebling, of Ohio.
Ernest E. Evans, of New York.
Curtis T. Everett, of Tennessee.
E. Kitchel Farrand, of Illinois.
James G. Finley, of the District of Columbia.
C. Paul Fletcher, of Tennessee.
Peter H. A. Flood, of New Hampshire.
Richard Ford, of Oklahoma.
Charles Forman, of Louisiana.
George Gregg Fuller, of New York.
Joseph T. Gilman, of Massachusetts.
Arthur B. Giroux, of New York.
Frank P. S. Glassey, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur J. Gravelle, of Iowa.
Leonard N. Green, of Minnesota.
Samuel E. Green, 3d, of Maryland.
Winthrop S. Greene, of Massachusetts.
Joseph G. Groeninger, of Maryland.
George J. Haering, of New York.
John N. Hamlin, of Oregon.
Richard B. Haven, of Illinois.
Harry C. Hawkins, of Michigan.

J. Cameron Hawkins, of New York.
Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado.
Robert O'D. Hinckley, of the District of Columbia.
Frederick W. Hinke, of New York.
Anderson Dana Hodgdon, of Maryland.
John E. Holler, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas S. Horn, of Missouri.
R. Flournoy Howard, of Georgia.
John F. Huddleston, of Ohio.
Joel C. Hudson, of Missouri.
George R. Hukill, of Delaware.
Benjamin M. Hulley, of Florida.
Alan T. Hurd, of California.
Carlton Hurst, of the District of Columbia.
John R. Ives, of Michigan.
William Oscar Jones, of Pennsylvania.
James Hugh Keeley, jr., of the District of Columbia.
Rufus H. Lane, jr., of Virginia.
Richard S. Leach, of Connecticut.
Scott S. Levisse, of Virginia.
Charles W. Lewis, jr., of Michigan.
Edward P. Lowry, of Illinois.
John McArdle, of Pennsylvania.
Clarence E. Macy, of Colorado.
Erik W. Magnuson, of Illinois.
Marcel E. Malige, of Idaho.
Raphael A. Manning, of Massachusetts.
Joseph A. Marquis, of Maine.
Paul Mayo, of Colorado.
Carl D. Meinhardt, of New York.
Paul W. Meyer, of Colorado.
Harvey Lee Milbourne, of West Virginia.
Hugh S. Miller, of Illinois.
John E. Moran, of Illinois.
Robert L. Mosier, of Indiana.
John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island.
William F. Nason, of Massachusetts.
Alfred T. Nester, of New York.
Sidney E. O'Donoghue, of New Jersey.
Earl L. Packer, of Utah.
Nelson R. Park, of Colorado.
James E. Parks, of North Carolina.
George R. Paschal, jr., of Florida.
William L. Peck, of Connecticut.
C. Warwick Perkins, jr., of Maryland.
Julian L. Pinkerton, of Kentucky.
Edwin A. Plitt, of Maryland.
Austin R. Preston, jr., of New York.
Joseph P. Ragland, of the District of Columbia.
Egbert B. Rand, of Louisiana.
Sydney B. Redecker, of New York.
Conger Reynolds, of Iowa.
John S. Richardson, jr., of Massachusetts.
Quincy F. Roberts, of Texas.
Thomas H. Robinson, of New Jersey.
Laurence E. Salisbury, of Illinois.
Edwin Schoenrich, of Maryland.
William W. Schott, of Kansas.
Winfield H. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
George E. Seltzer, of New York.
Edward E. Silvers, of New Jersey.
William A. Smale, of California.
Robert Lacy Smyth, of California.
F. Leroy Spangler, of Kansas.
Edwin F. Stanton, of California.
W. Maynard Stapleton, of Pennsylvania.
Harry E. Stevens, of California.
Ronald D. Stevenson, of Pennsylvania.
Robert B. Streepier, of Ohio.
Leo D. Sturgeon, of Illinois.
George Tait, of Virginia.
Sheridan Talbott, of Kentucky.
Howard C. Taylor, of South Dakota.
Cyril L. F. Thiel, of Illinois.
Joseph I. Touchette, of Massachusetts.
Arthur F. Tower, of New York.
Harry L. Troutman, of Georgia.
Mason Turner, of Connecticut.
William T. Turner, of Georgia.
Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.
Maurice Walk, of Illinois.
Richard R. Willey, of New York.
Rollin R. Winslow, of Michigan.
Granville O. Woodard, of California.

Leslie E. Woods, of Massachusetts.
Whitney Young, of New York.

CONSULAR OFFICERS

To be consuls

Harry J. Anslinger, of Pennsylvania.
Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island.
Herbert S. Bursley, of the District of Columbia.
Richard P. Butrick, of New York.
Edward Caffery, of Louisiana.
Charles L. De Vault, of Indiana.
Howard Donovan, of Illinois.
Samuel J. Fletcher, of Maine.
Raymond H. Geist, of Ohio.
Charles I. Graham, of Illinois.
Bernard F. Hale, of Vermont.
Charles H. Heisler, of Delaware.
Leo J. Keena, of Michigan.
H. Tobey Mooers, of Maine.
Christian M. Rayndal, of Iowa.
Francis H. Styles, of Virginia.
Fletcher Warren, of Texas.

To be vice consuls of career

Paul H. Alling, of Pennsylvania.
George Alexander Armstrong, of New York.
William H. Beach, of Virginia.
Ellis A. Bonnet, of Texas.
Prescott Childs, of Massachusetts.
Joseph T. Gilman, of Massachusetts.
Arthur J. Gravelle, of Iowa.
Winthrop S. Greene, of Massachusetts.
George J. Haering, of New York.
Harry C. Hawkins, of Michigan.
Benjamin M. Hulley, of Florida.
John R. Ives, of Michigan.
C. Warwick Perkins, jr., of Maryland.
Joseph P. Ragland, of the District of Columbia.
Edwin Schoenrich, of Maryland.
W. Maynard Stapleton, of Pennsylvania.
Harry E. Stevens, of California.
Howard C. Taylor, of South Dakota.
Cyril L. F. Thiel, of Illinois.

FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS

[NOTE.—The following named foreign-service officers have retired in accordance with the provisions of the "Act for the reorganization and improvement of the foreign service of the United States, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1924.]

CLASS I

Alexander M. Thackara, of Pennsylvania.

CLASS III

Joseph I. Brittain, of Ohio.
Frederic Ogden de Billier, of the District of Columbia.
Frederic W. Goding, of Illinois.
George Horton, of Illinois.
Francis B. Keene, of Wisconsin.
Dominic I. Murphy, of the District of Columbia.
Frederick M. Ryder, of Connecticut.
Alfred A. Winslow, of Indiana.

CLASS IV

Henry S. Culver, of Ohio.
William P. Kent, of Virginia.
Frank W. Mabin, of Iowa.
Chester W. Martin, of Michigan.
George H. Pickerell, of Ohio.

CLASS V

Charles M. Freeman, of New Hampshire.
John N. McCunn, of Wisconsin.
Robert Brent Mosher, of the District of Columbia.
Gebhard Willrich, of Wisconsin.

CLASS VI

Edward L. Adams, of New York.
Julius D. Dreher, of South Carolina.
John H. Grout, of Massachusetts.
Mason Mitchell, of New York.

CLASS VII

Percival Gassett, of the District of Columbia.
Lorin A. Lathrop, of California.

CLASS VIII

Eugene L. Bellisle, of Massachusetts.
James S. Benedict, of New York.

Henry W. Diederich, of the District of Columbia.
Henry Abert Johnson, of the District of Columbia.
James B. Milner, of Indiana.
Bradstreet S. Rairden, of Maine.

CLASS IX

Frank C. Denison, of Vermont.
Alonzo B. Garrett, of West Virginia.
Thomas R. Wallace, of Iowa.

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

J. Holbrook Chapman, of the District of Columbia.
John N. Hamlin, of Oregon.
Robert O'D. Hinckley, of the District of Columbia.
Paul Mayo, of Colorado.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

(Terms expiring June 1, 1926)

Adolphus E. Graupner, of California.
Charles D. Hamel, of North Dakota.
J. S. Y. Ivins, of New York.
A. E. James, of New Jersey.
Jules Gilmer Korner, jr., of North Carolina.
W. C. Lansdon, of Kansas.
Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee.
John J. Marquette, of Montana.
Charles P. Smith, of Massachusetts.
John M. Sternhagen, of Illinois.
Charles M. Trammell, of Florida.
Sumner L. Trussell, of Minnesota.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF CHARITIES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Terms of three years, from July 1, 1924)

John Joy Edson, of the District of Columbia. (Reappointment.)
George M. Kober, of the District of Columbia. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Learned Hand, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Julius M. Mayer, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Guy H. Martin, of Idaho, to be United States district judge for the Canal Zone, vice John D. Wallingford, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Julien A. Hurley, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, fourth division, district of Alaska, vice Guy B. Erwin, removed.

Grady Reynolds, of Alabama, to be United States attorney, middle district of Alabama, vice Thomas D. Samford, term expired.

David J. Reinhardt, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware, vice James H. Hughes, jr., term expired.

George Stephan, of Colorado, to be United States attorney, district of Colorado, vice Granby Hillyer, resigned.

John Buckley, of Connecticut, to be United States attorney, district of Connecticut, vice Allan K. Smith, appointed by court.

Joseph C. Shaffer, of Virginia, to be United States attorney, western district of Virginia, vice Lewis P. Summers, resigned.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Carl H. Hilton to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

Norman M. Nelson to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 19, 1924.

William W. Chism to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 14, 1924.

William H. Jacobson to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 18, 1924.

Arthur J. Craig to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

Victor E. Schminke to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

William Bowman to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

Joseph S. Rosenthal to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 18, 1924.

Robert E. Hunter to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Carl E. Guisness to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

William L. Foley to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 14, 1924.

Sydney A. Harvey to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

Frederick L. Thompson to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 23, 1924.

Frank D. Higbee to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 25, 1924.

Harold C. Palmer to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

Chester McP. Anderson to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 22, 1924.

Nathan Levy to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Wellington S. Morse to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 21, 1924.

William H. Newman to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 14, 1924.

Edward R. Glosten to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 14, 1924.

Clifford D. Feak to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Ray W. Dierlam to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 18, 1924.

James H. Earle to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 31, 1924.

Chester B. Kirkpatrick to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Clarence C. Paden to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 14, 1924.

Nathaniel S. Fulford, jr. to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

Kenneth S. Davis to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

Alexander A. Tanos to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from date of oath.

Leroy M. McCluskey to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 18, 1924.

William H. Austermann to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

Niles E. Lanphere to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 18, 1924.

Niels S. Haugen to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 23, 1924.

Jerome J. Buskin to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Robert H. Furey to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 18, 1924.

John P. Crowley to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 18, 1924.

Bion B. Libby to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

Lester B. Poole to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Harold B. Adams to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Harry C. Howe to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

Philip A. Short to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

Kenneth L. Young to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 19, 1924.

Horace D. Glover to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 13, 1924.

Chester C. Childs to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 21, 1924.

Ernest B. Johnson to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 19, 1924.

Frank E. B. Stuart to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 19, 1924.

Ralph R. Hayes to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

Paul B. Cronk to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

Donald F. deOtte to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Frank E. Pollio to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Robert deB. Vale to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Henry T. Jewell to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from August 18, 1924.

John W. Kelliher to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

Emette B. Smith to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

Ben C. Wilcox to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from August 20, 1924.

Ernest T. Peterson to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from August 27, 1924.

Edward S. Moale to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Elias M. Deer, jr., to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from August 21, 1924.

Jarvis B. Wellman to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from August 15, 1924.

Eugene S. Endom to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from August 16, 1924.

James F. Brady to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 5, 1924.

John H. Burke to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 6, 1924.

Vincent J. Charte to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 5, 1924.

Harold L. Connor to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 5, 1924.

Arthur W. Davis to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 4, 1924.

Charles Etzweiler to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 4, 1924.

Roy F. Gilley to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 6, 1924.

Angus S. MacIntyre to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 6, 1924.

Julius F. Jacot to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 5, 1924.

Arthur G. Morrill to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 6, 1924.

Paul O. Ritter to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 6, 1924.

William W. Storey to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 6, 1924.

Glenn E. Trester to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from October 2, 1924.

Donald G. Jacobs to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 15, 1924.

John F. Kinnaly to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 9, 1924.

John McCann to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 8, 1924.

Stewart P. Mehlman to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 9, 1924.

Joseph T. Ogden to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 8, 1924.

Ozro H. Hunt to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from September 8, 1924.

Cadet Engineer Thomas Y. Awalt to be ensign (engineering), to rank as such from September 10, 1924.

Frank H. Nelson to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 19, 1924.

Emmanuel Desses to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from October 5, 1924.

Lloyd O. Hammarstrom to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 27, 1924.

Mudge A. Ransom to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from October 5, 1924.

Frank M. Meals to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from September 16, 1924.

John H. Martin to be temporarily an ensign (engineering), to rank as such from October 23, 1924.

Lorenz A. Lonsdale to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from October 6, 1924.

August Anderson to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from October 3, 1924.

Christian Jansen to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from September 29, 1924.

John B. Jones to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from September 29, 1924.

Sigvard B. Johnson to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from October 3, 1924.

Nelson F. King to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from September 29, 1924.

Oscar Vinje to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from September 29, 1924.

Albert Hays to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from September 30, 1924.

Thomas A. Ross to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from October 22, 1924.

Charles Lucas to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from October 2, 1924.

Olaf Egeland to be temporarily a chief boatswain, to rank as such from October 1, 1924.

Horace B. Deets to be temporarily a chief machinist, to rank as such from September 29, 1924.

Barnett Rashin to be temporarily a chief machinist, to rank as such from October 1, 1924.

Torleif Hansen to be temporarily a chief machinist, to rank as such from October 3, 1924.

Edward G. Davis to be temporarily a chief machinist, to rank as such from November 7, 1924.

David M. Moore to be temporarily a chief machinist, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

James M. Cahill to be temporarily a chief machinist, to rank as such from October 4, 1924.

Knute P. Floe to be temporarily a chief machinist, to rank as such from October 3, 1924.

Charles Thrun to be temporarily a chief gunner, to rank as such from September 29, 1924.

John DeCosta to be temporarily a chief gunner, to rank as such from October 2, 1924.

Howard D. Brownley to be temporarily a chief pay clerk, to rank with but after ensign, to rank as such from September 29, 1924.

Robert Grassow to be temporarily a chief warrant carpenter, to rank with but after ensign, to rank as such from October 4, 1924.

Herbert F. Rowland to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from October 25, 1924.

Irving E. Baker to be temporarily an ensign, to rank as such from October 25, 1924.

Cadet Alfred C. Richmond to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 1, 1924.

Cadet Walter R. Richards to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 1, 1924.

Cadet Roy L. Raney to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet George B. Gelly to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet Russell E. Wood to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet Clarence H. Peterson to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet James A. Hirschfield to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet Joseph D. Conway to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet Charles W. Lawson to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet Frank T. Kenner to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet George C. Carlstedt to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet John Rountree to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet William W. Kenner to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet Stephen P. Swicegood, jr., to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 17, 1924.

Cadet Henry C. Perkins to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 24, 1924.

Cadet Paul W. Collins to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 24, 1924.

Cadet Harold S. Berdine to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 24, 1924.

Cadet Charles W. Thomas to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 24, 1924.

Cadet Frank A. Leamy to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 24, 1924.

Cadet John H. Byrd to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 24, 1924.

Cadet Beckwith Jordan to be an ensign, to rank as such from October 24, 1924.

Boatswain (life saving) Oswald A. Littlefield to be a district superintendent with the rank of ensign, to rank as such from October 24, 1924.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Surg. Taliaferro Clark to be senior surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from December 25, 1924, in place of Senior Surg. G. B. Young, to be placed on "waiting orders," effective December 24, 1924. Surgeon Clark has passed the necessary examination required by law.

Dr. Adolph S. Rumreich to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 2, 1924.

Dr. Ernest E. Huber to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 2, 1924.

Passed Asst. Surg. Clifford R. Eskey to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 8, 1924.

Passed Asst. Surg. Walter T. Harrison to be surgeon, to rank as such from October 26, 1924.

Passed Asst. Surg. Rolla E. Dyer to be surgeon, to rank as such from October 31, 1924.

Passed Asst. Surg. Charles Armstrong to be surgeon, to rank as such from October 27, 1924.

Passed Asst. Surg. Justin K. Fuller to be surgeon, to rank as such from October 27, 1924.

Passed Asst. Surg. Vance B. Murray to be surgeon, to rank as such from July 26, 1924.

Asst. Surg. Lester C. Scully to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 4, 1924.

Asst. Surg. Floyd C. Turner to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 30, 1924.

Asst. Surg. Marion R. King to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 4, 1924.

Dr. Edwin H. Carnes to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from November 3, 1924.

Dr. Lucius F. Badger to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from date of oath.

These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

William H. H. Heckman, of California, to be register of the land office at Eureka, Calif., in accordance with the provisions of the Interior Department appropriation act approved June 5, 1924.

James J. Donegan, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Burns, Oreg., in accordance with the provisions of the Interior Department appropriation act approved June 5, 1924.

Charles E. Player, of California, register of the land office at Independence, Calif., vice Oliver C. Harper, term expired.

William H. Dickinson, of Wyoming, register of the land office at Lander, Wyo., vice Irving W. Wright, resigned.

John H. Peare, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at La Grande, Oreg., effective upon completion of consolidation in accordance with provisions of Interior Department appropriation act approved June 5, 1924.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONELS

Lieut. Col. Leon LaGrange Roach, Infantry, from June 19, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Horace Potts Hobbs, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Louis Joseph Van Schaick, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Edgar Albert Myer, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Arthur Morson Shipp, Infantry, from July 19, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Joseph William Beacham, jr., Infantry, from July 21, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Guy Stevens Norvell, Cavalry, from July 23, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Robert Hayes Wescott, Infantry, from July 24, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Allen Parker, Infantry, from August 1, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Allen Smith, jr., Infantry, from August 22, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Frank Burson Hawkins, Infantry, from September 20, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Paul Trapier Hayne, Adjutant General's Department, from September 25, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Fred Erskine Buchan, Cavalry, from September 27, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Edward Albert Sturges, Finance Department, from October 23, 1924.

Lieut. Col. William Luke Luhn, Cavalry, from November 2, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Hu Blakemore Myers, Cavalry, from November 3, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Henry Russell Richmond, Cavalry, from November 10, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Charles Evans Kilbourne, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 16, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Osmun Latrobe, Cavalry, from November 20, 1924.

Lieut. Col. Orval Pool Townshend, Infantry, from November 26, 1924.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Maj. Richard Irving McKenney, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 19, 1924.

Maj. Charles Albert Clark, Quartermaster Corps, from July 1, 1924.
 Maj. Robert Louis Moseley, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.
 Maj. Aristides Moreno, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.
 Maj. William Lay Patterson, Infantry, from July 19, 1924.
 Maj. Charles Edward Wheatley, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 21, 1924.
 Maj. Earl Biscoe, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 23, 1924.
 Maj. William Scott Wood, Field Artillery, from July 24, 1924.
 Maj. James Howard Stansfield, Judge Advocate General's Department, from August 1, 1924.
 Maj. Francis Bradford Wheaton, Quartermaster Corps, from August 22, 1924.
 Maj. James Merrill Hutchinson, Quartermaster Corps, from September 20, 1924.
 Maj. George Morgan Newell, Finance Department, from September 25, 1924.
 Maj. Sidney Smith Underwood, Ordnance Department, from September 27, 1924.
 Maj. Thomas Egbert Jansen, Finance Department, from October 5, 1924.
 Maj. Felix Edward Blackburn, Judge Advocate General's Department, from October 23, 1924.
 Maj. Charles Almon Hunt, Infantry, from November 2, 1924.
 Maj. Warren Thomas Hannum, Corps of Engineers, from November 3, 1924.
 Maj. Robert Ross Ralston, Corps of Engineers, from November 10, 1924.
 Maj. Mark Brooke, Corps of Engineers, from November 16, 1924.
 Maj. Laurence Verner Frazier, Corps of Engineers, from November 20, 1924.
 Maj. James Franklin Bell, Corps of Engineers, from November 23, 1924.
 Maj. Gilbert Henry Stewart, Ordnance Department, from November 26, 1924.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. Joseph Taggart McNarney, Air Service, from June 16, 1924.
 Capt. Pearson Menoher, Cavalry, from June 19, 1924.
 Capt. Albert Henry Warren, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 22, 1924.
 Capt. Omar Nelson Bradley, Infantry, from June 25, 1924.
 Capt. Paul John Mueller, Infantry, from June 26, 1924.
 Capt. Leland Stanford Hobbs, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.
 Capt. John Frederick Kahle, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1924.
 Capt. Edwin Bowman Lyon, Air Service, from July 1, 1924.
 Capt. Reinold Melberg, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1924.
 Capt. Clarence Brewster Lindner, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 3, 1924.
 Capt. John Henry Cochran, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 19, 1924.
 Capt. Carl Conrad Bank, Field Artillery, from July 21, 1924.
 Capt. Charles Calvert Benedict, Air Service, from July 23, 1924.
 Capt. Vernon Evans, Infantry, from July 24, 1924.
 Capt. Roscoe Barnett Woodruff, Infantry, from August 1, 1924.
 Capt. Joseph Jesse Teter, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 10, 1924.
 Capt. Lewis Clarke Davidson, Infantry, from August 22, 1924.
 Capt. Dwight David Eisenhower, Infantry, from August 26, 1924.
 Capt. Harold William James, Infantry, from August 26, 1924.
 Capt. George Hume Peabody, Air Service, from September 18, 1924.
 Capt. Martin John O'Brien, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 20, 1924.
 Capt. Joseph Cumming Haw, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 20, 1924.
 Capt. James Basevi Ord, Infantry, from September 20, 1924.
 Capt. Earl Larue Naiden, Air Service, from September 25, 1924.
 Capt. Henry McElderry Pendleton, Cavalry, from September 27, 1924.
 Capt. Iverson Brooks Summers, jr., Adjutant General's Department, from October 1, 1924.
 Capt. Edmund de Treville Ellis, Quartermaster Corps, from October 5, 1924.
 Capt. Robert William Strong, Cavalry, from October 23, 1924.

Capt. Clifford Randall Jones, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 26, 1924.
 Capt. John Beugnot Wogan, Field Artillery, from November 2, 1924.
 Capt. Clesen Henry Tenney, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 3, 1924.
 Capt. Clifford Barrington King, Field Artillery, from November 4, 1924.
 Capt. Frank Edwin Emery, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from November 5, 1924.
 Capt. Edward Caswell Wallington, Chemical Warfare Service, from November 10, 1924.
 Capt. Carl Ernest Hocker, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 16, 1924.
 Capt. John William Leonard, Infantry, from November 20, 1924.
 Capt. Richmond Trumbull Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 23, 1924.
 Capt. Edward Campbell McGuire, Cavalry, from November 26, 1924.

TO BE CAPTAINS

First Lieut. Wilbur Joseph Fox, Infantry, from June 11, 1924.
 First Lieut. Frank Eckel Taylor, Judge Advocate General's Department, from June 16, 1924.
 First Lieut. Charles Palmer Clark, Air Service, from June 17, 1924.
 First Lieut. William Vincent Witcher, jr., Infantry, from June 17, 1924.
 First Lieut. Leo Leftwich Partlow, Field Artillery, from June 18, 1924.
 First Lieut. Joseph Francis Stiley, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 19, 1924.
 First Lieut. Edward Henry Dignowity, Corps of Engineers, from June 22, 1924.
 First Lieut. John William Elkins, jr., Infantry, from June 22, 1924.
 First Lieut. Philip Doddridge, Infantry, from June 24, 1924.
 First Lieut. Chilion Farrar Wheeler, Air Service, from June 25, 1924.
 First Lieut. Henry Thomas Kent, Infantry, from June 26, 1924.
 First Lieut. James Arthur Boyers, Infantry, from June 27, 1924.
 First Lieut. Evan Kirkpatrick Meredith, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.
 First Lieut. Howard John Liston, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.
 First Lieut. Charles Marion Thirkeld, Field Artillery, from July 1, 1924.
 First Lieut. William Robert Carlson, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1924.
 First Lieut. Ernest Thomas Jones, Infantry, from July 2, 1924.
 First Lieut. Harry Womersley Ostrander, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 3, 1924.
 First Lieut. Melville Stratton Creusere, Field Artillery, from July 3, 1924.
 First Lieut. Clarence Flagg Murray, Field Artillery, from July 6, 1924.
 First Lieut. Perry Cole Ragan, Infantry, from July 8, 1924.
 First Lieut. James Cave Crockett, Infantry, from July 19, 1924.
 First Lieut. Philip Dunbar Terry, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 19, 1924.
 First Lieut. Charles Carroll Knight, jr., Field Artillery, from July 21, 1924.
 First Lieut. Joseph Vincent Thebaud, Infantry, from July 23, 1924.
 First Lieut. George Willis Norris, Signal Corps, from July 24, 1924.
 First Lieut. Ira Augustus Hunt, Infantry, from July 29, 1924.
 First Lieut. Paul Parker Logan, Infantry, from August 1, 1924.
 First Lieut. Jesse James France, Field Artillery, from August 10, 1924.
 First Lieut. Armand Sherman Miller, Field Artillery, from August 21, 1924.
 First Lieut. Thomas Henry, Infantry, from August 22, 1924.
 First Lieut. Earl Hamlin DeFord, Air Service, from August 26, 1924.
 First Lieut. Peter Powell Rodes, Field Artillery, from August 26, 1924.

First Lieut. Frank Martin Smith, Infantry, from September 3, 1924.

First Lieut. John Carl Cook, Field Artillery, from September 3, 1924.

First Lieut. Herbert William Garrison, Infantry, from September 3, 1924.

First Lieut. Burdette Shields Wright, Air Service, from September 18, 1924.

First Lieut. Arthur Kay Chambers, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 19, 1924.

First Lieut. Paul Thomas Hogge, Infantry, from September 20, 1924.

First Lieut. Dale Clarence Hall, Ordnance Department, from September 20, 1924.

First Lieut. Charles Summers Miller, Cavalry, from September 20, 1924.

First Lieut. Eugene Edwin Hagan, Quartermaster Corps, from September 25, 1924.

First Lieut. Joseph Edward Schillo, Quartermaster Corps, from September 27, 1924.

First Lieut. John Moody Tuther, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1924.

First Lieut. Joseph Henry Burgheim, Infantry, from October 5, 1924.

First Lieut. John Palmer Harris, Ordnance Department, from October 5, 1924.

First Lieut. Fred Thomson Bass, Corps of Engineers, from October 7, 1924.

First Lieut. Andrew Jackson Patterson, Infantry, from October 18, 1924.

First Lieut. Rufus Alexander Byers, Infantry, from October 23, 1924.

First Lieut. George Edwin Adamson, Quartermaster Corps, from October 26, 1924.

First Lieut. Charles A. Morrow, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1924.

First Lieut. Edward Oscar Schairer, Quartermaster Corps, from November 2, 1924.

First Lieut. Charles Muller, Infantry, from November 3, 1924.

First Lieut. Alfred Henry Thiessen, Signal Corps, from November 4, 1924.

First Lieut. Claude Evan Gray, Finance Department, from November 4, 1924.

First Lieut. Horace Nevil Heisen, Air Service, from November 5, 1924.

First Lieut. Aubrey Irl Eagle, Air Service, from November 7, 1924.

First Lieut. Jacob J. Van Putten, jr., Finance Department, from November 10, 1924.

First Lieut. Harvey Weir Cook, Air Service, from November 11, 1924.

First Lieut. Charles Summer Reed, Ordnance Department, from November 14, 1924.

First Lieut. Raymond Clair Hildreth, Signal Corps, from November 16, 1924.

First Lieut. David Emery Washburn, Signal Corps, from November 20, 1924.

First Lieut. Bernard Edward McKeever, Quartermaster Corps, from November 21, 1924.

First Lieut. Michael James Byrne, Infantry, from November 23, 1924.

First Lieut. William George Muller, Infantry, from November 26, 1924.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Second Lieut. Harold Robert Emery, Infantry, from June 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. David Sanderson McLean, Infantry, from June 11, 1924.

Second Lieut. William Joseph Meroney, Infantry, from June 14, 1924.

Second Lieut. Russell Lowell Williamson, Air Service, from June 16, 1924.

Second Lieut. Howard Dohla Johnston, Infantry, from June 16, 1924.

Second Lieut. Franklin Leroy Rash, Infantry, from June 17, 1924.

Second Lieut. Edgar Harvey Snodgrass, Infantry, from June 17, 1924.

Second Lieut. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, Infantry, from June 18, 1924.

Second Lieut. Adna Chaffee Hamilton, Infantry, from June 19, 1924.

Second Lieut. Harold Stuart Ruth, Infantry, from June 22, 1924.

Second Lieut. Sterling Eugene Whitesides, jr., Infantry, from June 22, 1924.

Second Lieut. Lewis Stone Sorley, jr., Infantry, from June 24, 1924.

Second Lieut. Albert Coady Wedemeyer, Infantry, from June 24, 1924.

Second Lieut. David Best Latimer, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1924.

Second Lieut. Roswell Boyle Hart, Infantry, from June 25, 1924.

Second Lieut. Halvor Hegland Myrah, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 26, 1924.

Second Lieut. Herbert Joseph Riess, Infantry, from June 27, 1924.

Second Lieut. Henry Ignatius Szymanski, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.

Second Lieut. Frederick Brenton Porter, Field Artillery, from July 1, 1924.

Second Lieut. Bryan Sewall Halter, Infantry, from July 1, 1924.

Second Lieut. Charles Raymond Gross, Infantry, from July 2, 1924.

Second Lieut. Charles Hardy Hart, jr., Infantry, from July 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. Adolphus Rankin McConnell, Air Service, from July 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. George DeVere Barnes, Quartermaster Corps, from July 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. Paul Robert Menzies Miller, Field Artillery, from July 6, 1924.

Second Lieut. Albert Smith Rice, Infantry, from July 8, 1924.

Second Lieut. Charles Linton Williams, Air Service, from July 19, 1924.

Second Lieut. Charles Ream Jackson, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 19, 1924.

Second Lieut. Charles Leslie Keerans, jr., Infantry, from July 21, 1924.

Second Lieut. Fred Cleveland Fishback, Air Service, from July 23, 1924.

Second Lieut. George Oliver Roberson, Air Service, from July 23, 1924.

Second Lieut. Kenneth Newton Walker, Air Service, from July 24, 1924.

Second Lieut. John Lawrence Hanley, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 29, 1924.

Second Lieut. Stanley Hunsicker Hunsicker, Quartermaster Corps, from August 1, 1924.

Second Lieut. Neal Henry McKay, Quartermaster Corps, from August 10, 1924.

Second Lieut. Stanleigh Megargee, Quartermaster Corps, from August 14, 1924.

Second Lieut. Oscar Leslie Rogers, Air Service, from August 21, 1924.

Second Lieut. Roger Frederic O'Leary, Quartermaster Corps, from August 21, 1924.

Second Lieut. Samuel Perham Mills, Air Service, from August 24, 1924.

Second Lieut. Edgar Theodore Selzer, Air Service, from August 26, 1924.

Second Lieut. Albert Joseph Lubbe, Signal Corps, from August 26, 1924.

Second Lieut. George Raymond Ensminger, Ordnance Department, from August 26, 1924.

Second Lieut. John Bicknell Luscombe, Quartermaster Corps, from August 30, 1924.

Second Lieut. Charles Harold Howard, Air Service, from August 30, 1924.

Second Lieut. Edward Alton Hillery, Air Service, from September 1, 1924.

Second Lieut. Hugh Sydney Harpole, Quartermaster Corps, from September 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. Homer William Jones, Quartermaster Corps, from September 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. Everett Sanford Davis, Air Service, from September 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. Frank Egerton Powell, Quartermaster Corps, from September 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. Bradford Nelson Headley, Quartermaster Corps, from September 4, 1924.

Second Lieut. Frederick Irving Patrick, Air Service, from September 6, 1924.

Second Lieut. Donald Reuben Goodrich, Air Service, from September 17, 1924.

Second Lieut. Carl Henry Barrett, Air Service, from September 18, 1924.

Second Lieut. Francis Hill Kuhn, Quartermaster Corps, from September 18, 1924.

Second Lieut. John Daniel O'Connell, Quartermaster Corps, from September 19, 1924.

Second Lieut. Harold Brand, Air Service, from September 20, 1924.

Second Lieut. Edward Watson Kelley, Infantry, from September 20, 1924.

Second Lieut. Claud Thomas Gunn, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 20, 1924.

Second Lieut. Herbert Benjamin Wilcox, Infantry, from September 27, 1924.

Second Lieut. Robert Milton Eichelsdoerfer, Cavalry, from October 1, 1924.

Second Lieut. Otto Max Jank, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. Paul Evert, Air Service, from October 5, 1924.

Second Lieut. Paul Americus Harris, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 5, 1924.

Second Lieut. Jefferson Cleveland Campbell, Field Artillery, from October 7, 1924.

Second Lieut. Hugh Franklin Conrey, Field Artillery, from October 8, 1924.

Second Lieut. Edwin Clark Maling, Infantry, from October 9, 1924.

Second Lieut. Richard Head Trippe, Infantry, from October 11, 1924.

Second Lieut. O. D. Wells, Infantry, from October 18, 1924.

Second Lieut. Frank Celestine Meads, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 19, 1924.

Second Lieut. Paul Wallace Cole, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 23, 1924.

Second Lieut. Everett Samuel Prouty, Infantry, from October 26, 1924.

Second Lieut. Charles Speir Lawrence, Infantry, from October 26, 1924.

Second Lieut. John Corwin Shaw, Infantry, from October 26, 1924.

Second Lieut. William Cadwalader Price, jr., Field Artillery, from October 29, 1924.

Second Lieut. Clarence Matthew Tomlinson, Infantry, from November 2, 1924.

Second Lieut. Eugene Reedy Guild, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 3, 1924.

Second Lieut. Julian Buckner Haddon, Air Service, from November 4, 1924.

Second Lieut. Claude Delorum Collins, Infantry, from November 4, 1924.

Second Lieut. William Hugh Burns, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 5, 1924.

Second Lieut. William Eldridge Moore, Quartermaster Corps, from November 7, 1924.

Second Lieut. Clem Oliver Gunn, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 10, 1924.

Second Lieut. Wilber Russell Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 11, 1924.

Second Lieut. Donald Weldon Brann, Infantry, from November 14, 1924.

Second Lieut. George Bernhard Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 16, 1924.

Second Lieut. Walter John Wolfe, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 19, 1924.

Second Lieut. Roswell Emory Round, Infantry, from November 20, 1924.

Second Lieut. Clyde Harrison Lamb, Infantry, from November 21, 1924.

Second Lieut. Fred Ross Cowan, Quartermaster Corps, from November 21, 1924.

Second Lieut. Lester Frank Watson, Quartermaster Corps, from November 23, 1924.

Second Lieut. William Edwin Vecqueray, Quartermaster Corps, from November 26, 1924.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, December 2, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Heavenly Father, grant us this day strength of mind and heart that we may have fidelity and courage to overcome difficulties and bear valiantly our responsibilities. Help us to catch the strain of the Man of Galilee in disinterested and

self-denying service. Teach us, O Lord, that he has not learned the vital lesson of life who fails to conquer fear. In our labors, in our devotion to duty, in our broad outlook upon the needs of our country, may we find the title to our place and honor. Amen.

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

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a privileged report (H. Rept. 581) from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The report was filed previously through inadvertence through the basket, and in order to retain the privilege to which the bill is entitled it is necessary to report it from the floor.

The SPEAKER. Is it a bill authorizing projects?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York submits a privileged report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEMPSEY, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, reports the following bill: "A bill (H. R. 8914) authorizing construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary, but as a matter of course I reserve all points of order on the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9561. An act making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, to enable the heads of the several departments and independent establishments to adjust the rates of compensation of civilian employees in certain of the field services;

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

S. 2265. An act to provide for a rearrangement of the public alley facilities in square 616 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 3397. An act to remit the duty on a carillon of bells to be imported for the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary, Providence, R. I.; and

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birthday of George Washington.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday, to-morrow, be dispensed with. I will give my reasons for making the request if I may have the attention of the minority leader. I am informed that the Committee on Naval Affairs, which has the call to-morrow, is not quite ready with its bill, which is a very important one. That is true also of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, which has the next call. If unanimous consent should be given to do away with the day, I am also informed that the Appropriations Committee will be ready to begin consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill on Wednesday, and I think it is in the interest of the dispatch of the business of the House if we can dispense with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday on to-morrow be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no disposition at all to object to that arrangement, but I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio about the program for the remainder of the week. As I understand, the President's message will be read to-morrow, and the Appropriations Committee will have the remainder of the day. Will there be anything during the remainder of the week aside from the consideration of the appropriation bill?

Mr. LONGWORTH. So far as I know, there is nothing except the appropriation bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That will be the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give the House some idea as to when the McFadden bill will be considered?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that personally I would be very glad to have that bill taken up and disposed of before the holidays if possible, but we desire to get through with the appropriation bills as quickly as possible as they come up. I understand there are at least two bills ready.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman thinks at least there is no possibility of the bill being considered before the holidays?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can not answer the gentleman definitely, because I do not know whether there is any substantial opposition to the McFadden bill or not. I have been told that there was some at the last session that has been removed by amendments now in the bill.

Mr. WINGO. I noticed that in the New York newspapers, but otherwise I was not advised.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In that case, I shall be glad to help dispose of that bill as soon as possible.

Mr. WINGO. I shall ask for consideration. Although I shall not vote for the bill, I have promised to expedite it. We are concerned with the consideration of the bill, and we are being blamed for the delay. I wanted the Record to show that we are ready to take it up to-day, or to-morrow, or on any day that the majority cares to take it up.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that personally I am in favor of having that bill considered as soon as possible.

Mr. WINGO. I am in favor personally of its expedition.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do I understand that the Interior Department appropriation bill has not yet been reported?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It will be reported, as I understand, immediately after the reading of the Budget report to-day.

Mr. BLANTON. Will there be a disposition to give the Members, during the consideration of this Interior Department bill, an opportunity to debate certain items to which there might be objection? In other words, it has not been reported yet. We have no time to consider it. There might be items in it subject to points of order. We would like to have opportunity to look into that bill somewhat before it is pushed through hurriedly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have no idea that there is any disposition on the part of the Committee on Appropriations or the gentlemen in charge of that bill to hasten its consideration unduly.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it proposed to-morrow to dispense with business in order on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes. I have made that request, but it has not yet been granted.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman renew his request to-day?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have already made the request. It is now pending before the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, submitted, for printing under the rule, a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6941) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it the gentleman's purpose to call up that conference report to-morrow?

Mr. FULLER. No. It has to be agreed to in the Senate first. It is hanging over from the last session. It has not yet been agreed to in the Senate.

RATIFICATION OF A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Arkansas, which the Clerk will read.

[For communication, see proceedings of Senate, page 16.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

[For message, see proceedings of Senate, page 34.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CRAMTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill H. R. 10020, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was read a first and second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CARTER reserved all points of order.

CORRECTIONS

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, roll call No. 207, on the conference report on the bill S. 1898, the postal salary bill, given in the Record of June 6, 1924, shows me not voting. I wish to state that I was present and voted "yea" on the roll call.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, on the same roll call on the same date, I was likewise reported as not voting, when, as a matter of fact, I was present and voted "yea."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the corrections will be made.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 3, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

597. A letter from president Board of Managers, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

598. A letter from the chairman of United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the Eighth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission (H. Doc. No. 466); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

599. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report of the finances of the Post Office Department for the preceding year, showing the amount of balances due the department at the beginning of the year, the amount of postage which accrued within the year, the amount of engagements and liabilities, and the amount actually paid during the year for carrying mail, showing how much of the amount was for carrying the mail in preceding years, and a report of the amount expended in the department for the preceding year, including detailed statements of expenditures made from the contingent fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

600. A letter from the Director of United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting a report of the administration of the adjusted compensation act by the United States Veterans' Bureau to date; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

601. A letter from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a report showing in detail all travel from Washington performed by officers and employees of the Tariff Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

602. A letter from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a report showing the exchange of typewriters and adding machines by the Tariff Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

603. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

604. A letter from the Director of United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting statement showing by location, salary range, and bureau designation employees receiving an aggregate annual salary of \$2,000 and over, as of November 1, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

605. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement showing which officers or employees of the Post Office Department (other than special agents, inspectors, or employees who, in the discharge of their regular duties, are required to travel) traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia from

July 1, 1923, to June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

606. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report of the public property in the Post Office Department on December 1, 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

607. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report giving the aggregate number of the various publications issued by the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1924, giving same in detail, the cost of the paper used for such publications, cost of printing, and the cost of preparation of each publication, and the number of each which have been distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

608. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement required by section 5 of the act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915, etc., showing data relative to typewriters exchanged by the Post Office Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

609. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabular statement showing in detail the claims of postmasters for reimbursement for loss of postal, money order, and other funds and stamps resulting from burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty, which have been acted upon by the Postmaster General during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, the amounts claimed, amounts allowed, disallowances, and cause of loss; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CRAMTON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10020. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1033). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5022) granting a pension to John E. T. Ward; and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid 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. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 10020) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10021) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Yorktown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 10022) to provide for the establishment of a dairying and livestock experiment station at Paragould, Ark.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 10023) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics of tobacco," approved April 30, 1912; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 10024) to repeal the excise tax on auto trucks and wagons, automobiles and motor cycles, tires, inner tubes, parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 10025) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain described lands in the State of Nevada for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Walker River Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 10026) to amend the act to adjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, approved June 10, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINDRED: A bill (H. R. 10027) to regulate the operation of motor-propelled vehicles in the District of Columbia, and to provide penalties for its violation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 10028) to regulate motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 10029) to increase the morale of the naval service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SITES: A bill (H. R. 10030) granting the consent of Congress to the Harrisburg Bridge Co. and its successors to reconstruct its bridge across the Susquehanna River at a point opposite Market Street, Harrisburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 299) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Yorktown, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIXLER: A bill (H. R. 10031) granting a pension to Amanda Koons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10032) granting an increase of pension to Martha Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10033) granting a pension to Frederick L. Eagle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 10034) granting a pension to Georgia A. Godwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10035) granting a pension to Kelley Roberson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10036) granting a pension to Leonard Godwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10037) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Chick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 10038) for the relief of William J. Nagel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10039) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Stork; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 10040) granting a pension to Jessie Emma Diggery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 10041) for the relief of the San Francisco, Napa & Calistoga Railway; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10042) granting a pension to William B. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10043) granting a pension to Guy Warwick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10044) granting a pension to Sarah E. Keefer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10045) granting a pension to Alphald E. Park; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 10046) granting an increase of pension to Cora Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 10047) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Croshier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10048) for the relief of Joseph McCloy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10049) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Jesser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLEETWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10050) granting a pension to Augusta Mattemore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10051) granting a pension to Martha J. Lawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10052) granting a pension to Nancy E. Quillen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10053) granting a pension to Jennie City; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10054) granting a pension to Dora Tomey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10055) granting a pension to Willie Ray Paris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 10056) granting a pension to Anna J. Manuel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10057) granting a pension to Harriet D. Waterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10058) granting an increase of pension to John G. Schempp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 10059) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 10060) granting a pension to Louise Holden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10061) granting a pension to Emma C. Alton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 10062) granting a pension to Charles W. Hanson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 10063) granting an increase of pension to Julia Embich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10064) to renew and extend certain letters patent to George J. Pilger; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 10065) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 10066) granting a pension to Salome M. Wertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10067) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10068) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Piper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10069) granting an increase of pension to Harriet M. Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10070) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Crum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10071) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Fluck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 10072) granting a pension to Anna Guthery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 10073) granting a pension to Carrie H. Moffatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10074) to provide for the retirement of Clarence W. Sessions, judge of the District Court for the Western District of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 10075) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10076) granting a pension to Mary Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10077) granting an increase of pension to Parmelia Swan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10078) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10079) granting an increase of pension to Rachel L. Herbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10080) granting a pension to William G. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10081) granting an increase of pension to Martha Burdett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10082) granting a pension to Martha Hutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10083) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Badger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10084) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Coss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10085) granting an increase of pension to Cassie A. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10086) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Fetterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10087) granting a pension to Mary D. Wirebaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10088) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10089) granting an increase of pension to Flora A. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10090) granting an increase of pension to Julia R. Burris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10091) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Deselms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10092) granting a pension to Elizabeth Olmstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10093) granting a pension to Elizabeth Vanfosson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10094) granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Ault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10095) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10096) granting a pension to Ada M. Buffington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: A bill (H. R. 10097) granting a pension to Minnie Klingel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 10098) granting a pension to Victor Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10099) granting a pension to Kate Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 10100) granting a pension to Sarah A. Lansing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10101) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10102) to correct the military record of Joseph A. Stevenson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 10103) granting a pension to Louise C. Kimberly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 10104) granting an increase of pension to Adaline Minsing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10105) granting a pension to Mary Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10106) granting a pension to Mary M. Town; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 10107) granting a pension to Zora Haggerty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10108) granting a pension to Martha Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10109) granting a pension to Elizabeth W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10110) for the relief of Neal W. Allen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10111) for the relief of Lawrence J. Kessinger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10112) granting a pension to Don C. Hadcock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 10113) for the relief of the Burt Wool & Leather Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 10114) granting an increase of pension to Arthur L. Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10115) granting an increase of pension to Edith C. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10116) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Marble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10117) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Hankins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10118) granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Wile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 10119) granting a pension to Elizabeth Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10120) granting a pension to Tina C. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10121) granting a pension to David B. Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 10122) granting an increase of pension to Charles Andross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10123) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 10124) granting a pension to Rachiel E. Mishler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10125) granting an increase of pension to Emma Meckel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10126) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Fahr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10127) granting an increase of pension to Emily E. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10128) granting an increase of pension to Martha P. Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10129) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa Jameson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10130) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Ulen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10131) granting a pension to Martha Jane Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10132) granting a pension to Anna B. Armistead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10133) granting a pension to Sophie Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10134) granting a pension to Albert Braun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10135) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Maria McGill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10136) granting an increase of pension to Mary Abbie Meats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10137) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Bredekamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10138) granting an increase of pension to Amanda R. Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIXLER: Resolution (H. Res. 369) to pay salary and funeral expenses of Henry R. Thorpe, late an employee in the Doorkeeper's department of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

3051. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Jason Waterman Warren, president of J. W. Warren Co., Cleveland, Ohio, favoring certain amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3052. Also (by request), petition of First Baptist Church of Paterson, N. J., approving the purpose of Senate bill 1898; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3053. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of State commission of prisons, recommending to the Federal Government the erection in New York State of an institution with facilities for the detention of Federal prisoners, both before and after conviction, whereas the increasing number of Federal prisoners committed to county penal institutions of New York State has caused serious overcrowding in county jails and consequent violation of the laws of the State relative to the separation and classification of prisoners, as a result of which the officials in charge of these institutions find themselves in many instances unable to comply with said laws because of the large number of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3054. Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, advocating an adequate Postal Service wage standard; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3055. Also, petition of New York State League of Savings and Loan Associations, urging an appropriation by Congress for the purpose of an intercensal survey by the Bureau of the Census of building and loan associations in the United States; to the Committee on the Census.

3056. Also, petition of Flatbush Chamber of Commerce, of Brooklyn, N. Y., condemning the provisions of the section of the revenue act of 1924 which pertain to publicity in connection with income tax as radical and un-American; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3057. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of American Federation of Labor, urging Congress to speedily enact Senate bill 1898, which provides for wage increases for postal workers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3058. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of Mr. Daniel Meyer, jr., of Haledon, N. J., and 56 residents of Paterson, Haledon, and Hawthorne, N. J., for passage of Senate bill 1898, increasing salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3059. Also, petition of Mr. John J. Spruce, of Paterson, N. J., and 53 residents of Paterson, N. J., for passage of Senate bill 1898, increasing salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3060. Also, petition of Mr. Krine Patmos, of Paterson, N. J., and 81 residents of Paterson, N. J., for passage of Senate bill 1898, increasing salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3061. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Council 329, L'Union St. Jean-Baptiste d'Amerique, against the passage of any legislation tending to establish a Federal bureau of education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3062. Also, petition of St. Anthony's Society, of Ogdensburg, N. Y., against the passage of any legislation tending to establish a Federal bureau of education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3063. Also, petition of St. John the Baptist Society, protesting against the creation of a Federal bureau of education and the child labor amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3064. By Mr. SWING: Petition of the Methodist Church of Fallbrook, Calif., urging an amendment to the preamble of the National Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, December 3, 1924

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

Our Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, enable us to understand our relations to Thee as well as to each other and to the great country in which we live. Grant us Thy guidance in all matters and may we be willing to follow Thy lead as we can understand it and discern Thy ways for us. We ask in Christ's name. Amen.

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

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of the election of JAMES COUZENS, a Senator from the State of Michigan, which will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

We, the undersigned, State canvassers, from an examination of the election returns received by the secretary of state, determine that at the general election held on the 4th day of November, 1924, JAMES COUZENS was duly elected United States Senator for the term ending March 4, 1925.

In witness whereof we have hereto subscribed our names at Lansing this 1st day of December, 1924.

CHAS. J. DELAND,
Secretary of State;

FRANK E. GANNON,
State Treasurer;

THOMAS E. JOHNSON,
Superintendent of Public Instruction;
Board of State Canvassers.

State of Michigan. Department of State, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing copy of the certificate of determination of the board of State canvassers is a correct transcript of the original of such certificate of determination on file in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereto attached my signature and the great seal of the State at Lansing this 1st day of December, 1924.

[SEAL.]

CHAS. J. DELAND,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator elect from Michigan is present, and I ask that he be sworn in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator elect will present himself at the desk to take the oath of office.

Mr. COUZENS, escorted by Mr. FERRIS, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent for the entering of the order which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the order.

The reading clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the following Senators are hereby relieved from further service upon the following committees:

The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] from the Committee on Claims.

The junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] from the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] from the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] from the Committee on Military Affairs.

That the following Senators are hereby assigned to membership on the following committees:

The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MEANS] to the Committee on Claims; to the Committee on Immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.