

7563. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of citizens of Wilmington, Mass., in favor of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7564. By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, opposing the passage of the Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7565. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition to Congress against compulsory Sunday observance bills, signed by citizens of Erie, Pa.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7566. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of 96 residents of Williston, N. Dak., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7567. By Mr. SWING: Petition of certain residents of San Diego and vicinity, California, protesting against the passage of House bill 10311 or any other compulsory religious measures which may be introduced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7568. Also, petition of certain residents of San Bernardino, Calif., protesting against the passage by Congress of House bill 10311 or any other legislation upon the subject of religion; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7569. Also, petition of certain residents of Santa Ana, Calif., urging the passage by Congress of a bill granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and the widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, *March 2, 1927*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Our heavenly Father, we bless Thee for Thy constant care. We bless Thee for the continuous evidence of multiplied favors from Thy hand of love, and we ask that this day may be to us a day of triumph for best things and the realization of hopes, giving fruition to high endeavors. We ask that Thou wilt be with us. Help us the better to understand the obligations of great duties and be near unto us. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reading of the Journal.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal and that the Journal stand approved.

Mr. MOSES. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a point of order. The reading of the Journal can not be interrupted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule the Journal will have to be read.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. What is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is for unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal.

Mr. MOSES. I objected when the request was made before.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Journal will be read.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal, and having read for 15 minutes,

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I move that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The motion is not in order, Mr. President.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to dispensing with the further reading of the Journal?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the clerk will continue the reading of the Journal.

The reading of the Journal was continued, when,

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with, and that it stand approved.

Mr. MOSES. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue the reading of the Journal.

The reading of the Journal was resumed, when,

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COPELAND. Is there any way by which this absurdity can be done away with?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, yes, Mr. President. Just what is the status of the reading of the Journal? Has it been temporarily suspended by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue the reading of the Journal.

Mr. HEFLIN. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the reading of the Journal.

The reading of the Journal was resumed, when,

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be temporarily suspended in order that I may make a motion to reconsider the vote by which an amendment was adopted last night.

Mr. MOSES. I want to be very sure of the status of matters before my consent is given, Mr. President.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the reading be temporarily suspended.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from North Carolina a question? I understand that the motion he desires to make has to do with a bill in which my State of New York is very deeply interested, which passed last night with a certain amendment on it affecting the State of North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The purpose of the Senator from North Carolina is to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed, strike out the amendment, and re-pass the bill?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; that is it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not want that bill to be reconsidered here and then an objection made on its repassage.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall have to object if there is going to be discussion.

Mr. MOSES. I want to reserve all my rights about having the Journal read, Mr. President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not afraid of discussion. There will be none. I am afraid of an objection.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will just have the amendment disagreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is objection made?

Mr. OVERMAN. I withdraw my request if there is any objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue the reading of the Journal.

The reading of the Journal was resumed, when,

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I renew my request that the reading of the Journal be suspended, and that after action shall be taken on a motion I intend to make for the reconsideration of a bill passed last night that the reading of the Journal be resumed. There will be no debate on my motion.

Mr. MOSES. Temporarily suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal temporarily be dispensed with until he makes a motion, and after his motion shall be acted upon, that the reading of the Journal be resumed. Is there objection?

Mr. DILL. I object.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator state what the nature of his motion is?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Objection having been made, I insist on the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair heard no objection.

Mr. DILL. I objected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington objects. The clerk will proceed with the reading of the Journal.

The reading of the Journal was resumed and concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Journal will be approved.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 364, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WARREN. With the leave of the Senator from Missouri, I submit a report from the Committee on Appropriations, to go to the calendar.

Mr. MOSES. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1490. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York;

S. 2164. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Fort Smith, Sebastian County, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Poteau River;

S. 4330. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to make settlement of the claim of the Franklin Ice Cream Co.;

S. 4795. An act for the relief of B. F. Cowley;

S. 5352. An act to provide for one additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan;

S. 5479. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of certain parts of the frigate *Constitution*, to be used as souvenirs; and

S. 5548. An act to credit the accounts of Richings J. Shand, United States property and disbursing officer, Illinois National Guard.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) providing for the printing of 75,000 copies of the address delivered to the American people in the House of Representatives on February 22, 1927, on the proposed celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10465) granting the consent of Congress to the Mount Hope Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island.

The message also announced that the House had insisted on its amendments to the bill (S. 1339) for the relief of Katherine Southerland, disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. UNDERHILL, Mr. VINCENT of Michigan, and Mr. Box were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13503) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, hear, and determine the claims of individual members of the Sioux Tribe of Indians against tribal funds or against the United States; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LEAVITT, Mr. SPROUL of Kansas, and Mr. HAYDEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) to suspend until February 1, 1928, the jurisdiction, power, and authority of the Federal Power Commission to issue licenses on the Colorado River and its tributaries under the Federal water power act, approved June 10, 1920, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 9009. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon of a fireproof office building or buildings for the House of Representatives;

H. R. 12414. An act for the relief of homestead settlers on the drained Mud Lake bottom in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 17130. An act to conserve the revenues from medicinal spirits and provide for the effective Government control of such spirits, to prevent the evasion of taxes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 17371. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Caney Fork River in Tennessee.

The message also announced that the House had adopted a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That House Concurrent Resolution 43, adopted on February 6, 1925, providing for the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Congressional Directory up to and including the Sixty-eighth Congress, be, and is hereby, rescinded, and that in lieu thereof there shall be compiled, printed with illustrations, and bound, as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Sixty-ninth Congress (1774-1927); and that 6,500 additional copies shall be printed, of which 4,400 copies shall be for the use of the House of

Representatives, 1,600 copies for the use of the Senate, and 500 copies for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The message further announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 70. An act for the relief of Charles A. Mayo, T. S. Taylor, and Frank Hickey;

S. 105. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Colgate, administrator of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased;

S. 111. An act for the relief of the owners of the ferryboat *Oregon*;

S. 115. An act for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Neptune*;

S. 118. An act for the relief of all owners of cargo aboard the steamship *Gaelic Prince* at the time of her collision with the U. S. S. *Antigone*;

S. 227. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Connecticut;

S. 1642. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

S. 1914. An act directing the resurvey of certain lands;

S. 2081. An act placing certain noncommissioned officers in the first grade;

S. 2197. An act for the relief of Paul B. Belding;

S. 2322. An act to provide for the elimination of the Michigan Avenue grade crossing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2594. An act for the relief of Odelon Ramos;

S. 2597. An act authorizing the President to appoint and retire certain persons first lieutenants in the Medical Corps, United States Army;

S. 3403. An act to amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913;

S. 3418. An act to create an additional judge for the district of Maryland;

S. 3888. An act to provide for the elimination of grade crossings of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 4069. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange for lands in private ownership in Gunnison County, Colo., certain public lands in Delta County, Colo.;

S. 4746. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton;

S. 4851. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the city of Springfield, Mass., certain parcels of land within the Springfield Armory Military Reservation, Mass., and for other purposes;

S. 4863. An act authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Arapaho National Forest, and for other purposes;

S. 4964. An act transferring a portion of the lands of the military reservation of the Presidio of San Francisco to the Department of the Treasury;

S. 5083. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky., and to repeal certain former bridge laws;

S. 5213. An act for the relief of the Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School for Deaconesses and Missionaries;

S. 5266. An act to prohibit the sale of black bass in the District of Columbia;

S. 5402. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1926;

S. 5435. An act to provide for the widening of C Street NE., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 5523. An act authorizing the Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

S. 5727. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to accept an act of sale and a dedication of certain property in the city of New Orleans, La., from the board of commissioners of the port of New Orleans, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the acts of March 4, 1925, and April 13, 1926, relating to a compact between the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana for allocating the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1130. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Wayne County Council of the Veterans of Foreign

Wars, of Detro't, State of Michigan, two obsolete brass cannons;

H. R. 2229. An act for the relief of John Ferrell;
H. R. 2320. An act for the relief of Delmore A. Teller;
H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Charles O. Dunbar;
H. R. 3378. An act for the relief of Randolph Foster Williamson, deceased;

H. R. 3602. An act for the relief of Charles W. Shumate;
H. R. 3791. An act to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy in 1891 and entitled "Peace";

H. R. 3858. An act to establish in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce a Foreign Commerce Service of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5082. An act for the relief of David Barker;
H. R. 5264. An act for the relief of Ann Margaret Mann;
H. R. 6252. An act amending section 52 of the Judicial Code;
H. R. 7973. An act to provide American registry for the Norwegian sailing vessel *Derwent*;

H. R. 8852. An act for the relief of Thomas Maley;
H. R. 8894. An act for the relief of the Royal Holland Lloyd, a Netherlands corporation, of Amsterdam, the Netherlands;
H. R. 9787. An act to correct the military record of Samuel Wemmer;

H. R. 10111. An act for the relief of D. Murray Cummings;
H. R. 10465. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mount Hope Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island;

H. R. 10510. An act to prevent the destruction or dumping, without good and sufficient cause therefor, of farm produce received in interstate commerce by commission merchants and others, and to require them truly and correctly to account for all farm produce received by them;

H. R. 10662. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a roadway and walk leading to and around the Chalmette Monument, Chalmette, La.;

H. R. 11914. An act for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.;

H. R. 12217. An act relating to the appointment of trustees and committees;

H. R. 12218. An act amending sections 1125 and 1127, chapter 31, of the District of Columbia Code;

H. R. 12532. An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12551. An act for the relief of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland;

H. R. 12797. An act to authorize the sale of the Buckeye Target Range, Arizona;

H. R. 13971. An act for the relief of Ruth J. Walling;

H. R. 14567. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to disbursing agents of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in certain cases;

H. R. 14881. An act to relinquish to its equitable owners the title of the United States to the land in the claims of A. Moro and of Anthony Campbell in Jackson County, Miss.;

H. R. 14925. An act authorizing the sale of the new sub-treasury building and site in San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 15129. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Indiana Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at Evansville, Ind.;

H. R. 15131. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to modify agreements heretofore made for the settlement of certain claims in favor of the United States;

H. R. 15602. An act to amend the last paragraph of an act entitled "An act to refer the claims of the Delaware Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States";

H. R. 15827. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act authorizing investigations by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce jointly to determine the location, extent, and mode of occurrence of potash deposits in the United States, and to conduct laboratory tests";

H. R. 15906. An act to authorize the purchase of land for an addition to the United States Indian school farm near Phoenix, Ariz.;

H. R. 16183. An act granting relief to Thomas M. Livingston;

H. R. 16212. An act to authorize per capita payments to the Indians of the Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak.;

H. R. 16442. An act for the relief of Ira E. King;

H. R. 16507. An act to authorize an increase in the limit of cost of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16703. An act authorizing the President to appoint Capt. Reginald Rowan Belknap, United States Navy, retired, a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy;

H. R. 16973. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 17243. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution to authorize the President to pay to surgeons employed on the Alaska Railroad such sums as may be due them under agreement with the Alaskan Engineering Commission or the Alaska Railroad;

H. J. Res. 345. Joint resolution amending the act of May 13, 1924, entitled "An act providing a study regarding the equitable use of the waters of the Rio Grande," etc.; and

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of the economic conference to be held at Geneva, Switzerland.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 364.

Mr. MOSES. Regular order!

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I reported an appropriation bill from the Committee on Appropriations, to go to the calendar.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	McKellar	Sackett
Bayard	Frazier	McLean	Schall
Bingham	George	McMaster	Sheppard
Blease	Gerry	McNary	Shipstead
Borah	Goff	Mayfield	Shortridge
Bratton	Gooding	Means	Simmons
Broussard	Gould	Metcalf	Smoot
Bruce	Greene	Moses	Stanfield
Cameron	Hale	Neely	Stack
Capper	Harrell	Norbeck	Stephens
Caraway	Harris	Norris	Stewart
Copeland	Harrison	Nye	Swanson
Couzens	Hawes	Oddie	Trammell
Curtis	Heflin	Overman	Tyson
Dale	Howell	Phipps	Underwood
Deneen	Johnson	Pine	Wadsworth
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Kendrick	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Edwards	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Ernest	King	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Ferris	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Fess	Lenroot	Robinson, Ind.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 364.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. MOSES. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. In his absence I will withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET]. He is absent on account of sickness. I do not know how he would vote if present, and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], is necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. BLEASE. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], is detained by illness.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—56

Ashurst	Bruce	Curtis	Frazier
Bayard	Capper	Dill	George
Borah	Caraway	Edwards	Gerry
Bratton	Copeland	Ferris	Goff
Broussard	Couzens	Fletcher	Gooding

Harrison	Lenroot	Pittman	Stanfield
Hawes	McKellar	Ransdell	Steck
Heflin	McMaster	Reed, Mo.	Stephens
Howell	McNary	Robinson, Ark.	Stewart
Johnson	Mayfield	Sackett	Swanson
Jones, Wash.	Neely	Sheppard	Trammell
Kendrick	Norris	Shipstead	Tyson
King	Nye	Shortridge	Walsh, Mass.
La Follette	Overman	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
NAYS—25			
Bingham	Gould	Oddie	Wadsworth
Blease	Greene	Philpps	Warren
Cameron	Hale	Pine	Watson
Deneen	Harrell	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Edge	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
Ernst	Metcalf	Schall	
Fess	Moses	Smoot	
NOT VOTING—14			
Dale	Harris	Norbeck	Weller
du Pont	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Wheeler
Gillett	McLean	Smith	
Glass	Means	Underwood	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 364) continuing during the Seventieth Congress Senate Resolutions 195, 227, 258, and 324, relative to senatorial campaign expenditures, and enlarging the authority of the special committee.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to perfect the resolution by certain amendments striking out certain words and including certain others, so that the resolution will read in accordance with the text, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution as perfected.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolutions Nos. 195, 227, and 258 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, and Senate Resolution No. 324 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, be, and they hereby are, continued in force during the interim between the Sixty-ninth Congress and the Seventieth Congress, and thereafter until the 30th day of December, 1927.

That the special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 195 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, is authorized, in its discretion, and/or at the request of either WILLIAM S. VARE or William B. Wilson, to open any or all ballot boxes and examine and tabulate any or all ballots and scrutinize all books, papers, and documents which are now in its possession, or any that shall come into its possession, concerning the general election held in the State of Pennsylvania on the 2d day of November, 1926.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understand that the Senator from Maine rises to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HALE. I do.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I presume that I could deny him the floor for the present, having it myself, but I should like to yield it to him with the understanding that I can have the floor when he is through.

Mr. HALE. I will say to the Senator that I sought to raise the question of personal privilege before, but was prevented from doing so by the reading of the Journal. I shall not take long.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield to the Senator.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, day before yesterday a unanimous-consent agreement entered into for the consideration of unobjected bills last night provided that such bills as might be reported during the session yesterday could be considered under the unanimous-consent agreement. Believing that the making of reports upon bills was a matter of routine, and before I had any intimation that there would be any objection to the making of reports yesterday from committees, and before the session began yesterday, I handed in to the desk reports from the Committee on Naval Affairs on bills H. R. 16507 and H. R. 16973, which bills were passed by unanimous consent last night.

The RECORD shows that these reports were made last night at the evening session, and in this particular the RECORD is incorrect.

I appreciate the fact that owing to the reading of the Journal there was no morning business yesterday, and that therefore there was no opportunity to report the bills except by unanimous consent. Had I known that there would be no morning business and no opportunity to present reports by unanimous consent, I should not have handed in the reports to the desk; and the action that I took was not with any idea or purpose of either violating the rules of the Senate or taking any advantage of the situation which existed yesterday. When I made the statement that the bills had been reported to the Senate, I supposed that I had the right to send the reports to the desk

as I did, and that the bills were properly upon the calendar last night. I did not know until this morning that I did not have the right under the rules to present the reports to the desk as I did or that there was any question that the reports were properly made.

I may say, further, that no one has raised this question with me; but upon reading the RECORD it seemed to me that this explanation was due the Senate. I would not wish Senators to believe that I had knowingly attempted to take any undue advantage of the Senate in this matter.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 364, continuing during the Seventieth Congress Senate Resolutions 195, 227, 258, and 324, relative to senatorial campaign expenditures, and enlarging the authority of the special committee.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has just come into the Chamber. When I had the floor this morning the Senator said he desired to hand in a report. I did not understand at the time that it was a report on a bill, and I certainly would have objected and would not have yielded if I had learned or known what I am now told is the fact, that it is a report on a bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as it is an appropriation bill, will not the Senator consent? The Senator from Wyoming had a right until 1 o'clock to offer it. Of course, he would not take the Senator off the floor; but it is only fair to let the Senator report the appropriation bill.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I know it seems fair; but it seems to me unfair to have this time consumed, and I think all of us have our eggs in the same basket.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Wyoming did not ask to take it up.

Mr. WARREN. There has been no move whatever to take it up.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming first, because I addressed an interrogatory to him. I understood that he wanted to interrupt me. I did not mean to deny him that right.

Mr. WARREN. If I may, then, I will ask the Senator now to yield to me to submit a report.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I can not do that, because the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been objecting to the reception of routine business for a day or two. I think the Senator ought to withdraw the report, because I yielded to him under a complete misapprehension of the fact this morning. I want to see the Senator's report come in; I want to see his bill pass; but we are confronted here with a filibuster of the rankest kind, and I must insist upon my rights here as they now exist to go on with this resolution. I hope the Senator will withdraw the report, because I allowed it to be submitted under a complete misapprehension.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator knows that I am not responsible in any way for this situation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I know that.

Mr. WARREN. And the Senator knows that it is my duty to proceed with these matters as fast as I can.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But not to get the floor—

Mr. WARREN. One moment. There seems to be a determination on the part of some Senators here to object to my reports, and to see that the bills to which they refer do not pass at this session. If that is the understanding I withdraw the report. I am willing to take my chances with the rest of the Senators if it is understood that a filibuster has originated here for the purpose of killing the appropriation bill. If the Senator misunderstood me, I withdraw the report, of course. I could do no less, as I wish to take no advantage—

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; there is no filibuster for that purpose.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I call for a vote on the resolution.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, has the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri been adopted yet?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it has been read.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator has a right to modify his resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is modified; and the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as modified.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, have the opening sentences in the original resolution been modified?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Some of them. I do not know what the Senator means by "the opening sentences."

Mr. MOSES. I am referring to the continuance in full force and effect of Senate Resolution 195, because I understood the

Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] the other day to take exception to the widespread powers given to the committee under the resolution; and Senate Resolution 195 does not stipulate any States, as the Senator from Alabama demanded. It gives the special committee a roving commission in all the States.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not intend to take up any time answering questions on matters with which the Senator is perfectly familiar.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania obtained the floor.

Several SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, that will not do any good.

I send to the desk and ask to have read an amendment by way of substitute for the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 1, strike out all after the word "Resolved" down to and including line 4 on page 2, and insert in place thereof:

That the Committee on Privileges and Elections is authorized and directed to take possession of and to open all ballot boxes and to examine and tabulate all ballots and scrutinize all books, papers, and documents which are now in its possession or in the possession of any standing or select or special committee of the Senate, or any that shall come into its possession, concerning the general election held in the State of Pennsylvania on the 2d day of November, 1926.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I have no questions to ask the Senator.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there were implications in some of the newspapers this morning that the opposition to the resolution of the Senator from Missouri was inspired by a desire to prevent an examination of the ballots cast in the Pennsylvania election. For two reasons that is not correct.

In the first place, we could not, if we were to desire it, prevent such an examination. The contest has been filed in due form, and it should be proceeded with in due form.

In the next place, Mr. President, no one can be more anxious than myself for a complete and exhaustive count of the ballots in that election and a judicial determination of the many untrue statements that have been circulated throughout the United States about supposed frauds in that election.

I have offered now a substitute, which will send this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the same committee that has examined every election contest that has arisen since the Constitution was adopted, the same committee that has been hearing election contests for 135 or 140 years. If that substitute be accepted, I will cheerfully see the resolution as amended passed at this minute, and there need be no further delay in the transaction of the business of the Senate. If my substitute is not accepted, then the matter, I think, will call for further debate.

Mr. President, there is no reason suggested, there has been no reason offered at any time, why this election contest in Pennsylvania should be treated differently from all of the election contests that we have seen throughout the Nation's history. Not one single good reason has been given, but I think I can suggest one, and that is that Mr. VARE's majority was so tremendous, upwards of 170,000 votes, that they know an election contest conducted in the usual way is bound to fail. Only by the peculiar methods of this investigating committee could there be any hope of success in this election contest for the Democratic contestant.

They have pointed to the zero districts in Philadelphia, and I believe that there were 19 of them, where Wilson received no votes whatever, according to the official count, and that has been broadcast through the United States as if it were conclusive proof of corruption on the part of Mr. VARE's supporters. But the people who have called attention to those zero districts, and have treated the mere fact of the zero as being conclusive evidence of fraud, have neglected to tell the Senate and the country that all through the rest of the State we find zero districts in which VARE did not get a single vote, and nobody has mentioned those, and nobody uses those as proof, conclusive proof, of fraud.

It is perfectly obvious to me that the sentiment differed so in Philadelphia and in the country districts, particularly west

of the mountains, that it is entirely reasonable and compatible with perfect good faith on everybody's part that there should be a zero district here and there, and there were just about as many districts where VARE got zeros as there were where Wilson got zeros, and it is high time that the country knew it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not want to yield the floor. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a former Senator on the question of the Pennsylvania election.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If I may yield to the Senator for that purpose without losing the floor, I am glad to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to have it come in the Senator's speech. I do not suppose he would want it to come in his speech.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; I would prefer that it should not.

Mr. NORRIS. I interrupted the Senator, because I wanted to put it in. Since he has kindly yielded, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is understood that I will not lose the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks in the RECORD, a letter from former Senator Owen on the Pennsylvania election, directed to the Chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate.

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

[The letter appears at the conclusion of the remarks of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania.]

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that letter appear at the end of my remarks. [See Exhibit A.] Frankly, I apprehend a motion to lay my substitute amendment on the table, and I do not intend to be cut off in the debate until I have stated my position on the pending resolution and on the substitute. That is why I am so tender about yielding without a distinct understanding that I retain the floor.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I have not some of the returns from Senator Owen's home State, but I would like to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to some of the zero districts in other States, as to which we have heard no suggestion of investigation, as to which nobody talks of this committee making any investigation, or holding any hearings. Although it is common knowledge, and every man of us who sits here knows, that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments are flouted in those States, although we know that the Constitution of the United States, to which we have sworn adherence, is flouted there, yet we prefer to go to Pennsylvania and set up an imaginary standard of good taste in the amount of the campaign expenditures, where we admit they do not violate any law, either of Pennsylvania or of the United States. We will go to Pennsylvania and erect an imaginary standard, and pillory VARE all over the Union for having spent more than that imaginary standard amount, and yet we shut our eyes on the frank violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution in the Southern States. I see some Senators smile. They may think that amusing.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; it is not true.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. They claim in their investigation in Pennsylvania that the primary is a part of the election. Over and over again we have heard that claim made here on the floor. If it be a part of the election, then can you refrain from commenting at least on the fact that in Texas the very statute prohibits a black man from voting in the primary election? If the primary is a part of the general election, then it is within our jurisdiction; and if the Texas statute directly violates the fourteenth amendment by such a provision, how can we shut our eyes to it?

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Without yielding the floor, I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not want the Senator to yield the floor, because I just wanted to comment, apropos of nothing, that I never heard of a negro who did not want to be a white man. I have heard of some white men who thought that the Lord made a mistake in creating them white.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Is that a question, Mr. President?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; that is just a comment. The Senator says that in Texas, for instance, the Democratic primaries are

white primaries. In Pennsylvania, I presume, a Republican primary is a Republican primary, is it not?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is.

Mr. CARAWAY. And Democrats are not presumed to participate in it?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Democrats are not supposed to. Sometimes they do.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not know how much it takes to get one in. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We try to keep them out, but sometimes it is hard to do it.

Mr. CARAWAY. What is the use keeping them out? You count the votes afterwards. There is no use keeping them out. But I do not care to ask any question.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Let me call the Senate's attention to some places where the committee might investigate with profit. Back in 1924, in the presidential election, in Marion County, Ala., which had a population, according to the last census—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, does not the Senator know that this resolution, by express terms, is confined to the election of 1926, and that we have no authority to go back of that time and have not done so in any State?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator calls attention to that. What I am trying to show is that the conditions in 1924 which I want to have investigated in Alabama were not sporadic. I want to show that they are habitual, and I am coming to 1926 very fast.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senator gets away from the Texas situation I want to ask him if it is not a fact that the courts have so far upheld the constitutionality of that statute relating to primary elections?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I do not know that the Texas statute has ever reached the Supreme Court. I never heard of its having done so.

Mr. MAYFIELD. I said the courts that have passed upon it so far have upheld its constitutionality. The State courts I had reference to. That question is now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I understand so; and that it was argued not long ago; but it has never been decided.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Until the Supreme Court declares that statute unconstitutional, how can the Senator from Pennsylvania state that it contravenes the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I can say very clearly that it contravenes the spirit of the fourteenth amendment, and let me show why without leaving Texas. In the last election for President that statute was in force, and no negro was permitted to vote in your primary, and you never held a general election in 12 counties in Texas. So, in those counties no black man got a chance to vote at either time, because you would not permit him to vote in the primary, and you did not have a general election at which he could vote.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, no white man was permitted to vote in the 12 counties which have been mentioned by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and that was due to the fact that no election was held whatever in those counties, and it was not due to the fact that there were a large number of negroes living in those counties.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator mean to say that the Democratic candidates were not returned as victors in those counties?

Mr. MAYFIELD. I certainly do.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator mean to say that the Democratic candidates did not sit in the legislature from those counties?

Mr. MAYFIELD. I do not say that, but I say that there were no elections held in those counties, and most of those counties are attached to other counties for judicial purposes.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is what I say, that there were no elections held in those counties, and yet the Democratic nominees for those counties sat in the legislature, and voted there, without challenge from anybody.

Mr. MAYFIELD. But the Senator from Pennsylvania leaves the inference, or undertakes to create the impression, that the reason why no elections were held in those counties was on account of the negro population in those counties. Those counties are very thinly settled.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Are they?

Mr. MAYFIELD. I do not suppose there are 25 negroes in the entire 12 counties.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I would like to answer that. In 1924 there were no elections held in Harrison County, Tex., and the population of that county, according to the 1920 census, was 43,565 persons.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. How many negroes?

Mr. HEFLIN. How many negroes?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not think I have the figures as to that.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator mean to take the position that a group of white people in any county in America, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, if they want to have a white primary, are not at liberty to do so for party counsel and for party purposes purely?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Not if the primary is a part of the general election, which is what the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have been arguing in order to support their investigation of the Pennsylvania primary.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then what would the Senator do with the State of Ohio, which has a provision in its constitution preventing any negro from holding office?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That provision is old. It was repealed by the adoption of the fourteenth amendment. There has never been an attempt to enforce it, and negroes do hold office in Ohio. That is an old thing. It goes away back to slavery days, and nobody except the Senator from Alabama speaks of it as being alive to-day.

Mr. HEFLIN. Ten years ago the question was submitted to the people of Ohio whether to vote it out of the present constitution, and they refused to do it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Then Ohio ought to be investigated.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator would like to investigate all of them without any excuse.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Indeed, I would investigate them, and I think there is excuse.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I wondered whether the attention of Senators had been called to the fact that the provision of the Ohio constitution to which the Senator from Alabama refers is not at all in the form in which the Senator quotes it. It is a fact that there is yet such a provision in the Ohio constitution, null and void, of course, since the amendments adopted after the Civil War, but it did not provide and does not provide against the holding of office by negroes, and negroes in the State of Ohio have held and do hold office.

Mr. CARAWAY. Everybody knows that.

Mr. HEFLIN. What does the constitution provide?

Mr. WILLIS. I just got through stating that the constitutional provision of the constitution of Ohio provides against negroes voting, but since the adoption of the thirteenth and fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, of course, it is a nullity, but there is no provision against office holding.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then the provision is still in the constitution, and the people refused to vote it out. Is not that true?

Mr. WILLIS. The provision against voting is still in the constitution, and the State refused to vote it out, though it is a nullity, and has been since the fifteenth amendment was adopted.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I presume the Senator from Pennsylvania will not be able to finish by 1 o'clock, and so I feel I am not interrupting in asking him this question.

Aside from the primary law of the State, to which the Senator has referred, will the Senator be able to cite us to any provision upon the part of any State in a statute or constitution which interferes with a negro voting at a general election?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am not sufficiently familiar with the devices used in the various States to prevent negroes from voting, but I have data as to a number of States and counties to which I want to call the attention of the committee and of the Senate, showing the size of the negro population, and showing that not one single vote was cast for President Coolidge in those counties, not one single vote cast in 1926 for the Republican candidate. I think the committee ought to investigate and find out what device is used so effectually to smother the negro vote.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have examined the primary laws of the Southern States, particularly the one of Texas, and, speaking for myself, I think that statute does clearly and unmistakably contravene the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments; but, of course, that depends ultimately upon whether the Supreme Court holds the primary to be a part of the election process under the Constitution.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. But that is an open question.

Mr. BORAH. I think that ought to be the law. But I have not been able to find any statute in the Southern States contravening the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, wherein the law undertakes to interfere with the free exercise of the

right of franchise upon the part of the negro in a general election.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I presume that even they realize that to put that in any law relating to a general election would so obviously offend the Federal Constitution that it would not be worth the ink it would take to write it.

Mr. BORAH. If they do not write it into the law, if it is not action upon the part of the State, it is in contravention of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I want to ask the Senator, in view of the fact that it is two minutes to 1 o'clock, if he will not permit us to have a vote.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; Mr. President.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I was just going to state—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for a question.

Mr. EDGE. I was just going to state to the Senator from Idaho that as a matter of practical effect, the primary in the Southern States, particularly in the State of Texas, is in reality an election.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Of course it is.

Mr. BORAH. I am not arguing that. I think the primary is a part of the election process, and I trust the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Pennsylvania will take the same position when it comes time to act on that.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is a tough question to answer with a single word. It is quite easy to imagine that a popular primary is a part of the general election process.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Let me finish. But suppose the selection of party candidates is made by convention. Would the Senator say that that convention, and the election of delegates to a State convention, are also part of the general election?

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt of that at all. I have no doubt but that the Congress of the United States can take complete control from the nomination to the election of the Members of the Senate and Members of the House.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Then, let the Senator come with me one step further. In many States candidates are put on the ballot by a petition signed by a given number of voters in the State. Would the Senator say that the preparation of such a nominating petition was within our jurisdiction as part of the election?

EXHIBIT A

Mr. Owen's letter, submitted by Mr. NORRIS, is as follows:
WASHINGTON, D. C., January 28, 1927.

HON. RICHARD P. ERNST,
Chairman Committee on Privileges and Elections,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ERNST: As a long-time Member of the United States Senate, having represented the State of Oklahoma for 18 years therein, I am deeply concerned in the question of the prestige of that body, and in the question now pending before the Senate, growing out of reports of the Senate's special committee investigating expenditures in senatorial primary and general elections, in the cases, among others, of Mr. WILLIAM S. VARE, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FRANK L. SMITH, of Illinois.

These two notable cases are unavoidably linked together in the public mind as involving a proven expenditure of approximately \$4,000,000 in the contest for nominating candidates for the two senatorial seats now sought by these two successful contestants.

Enormous publicity through the American press has been given by front-page dispatches, broadcasted to every section of America. The facts are notorious. There is no dispute with regard to the substantial facts. Nor has the refusal and evasion of witnesses escaped the public's notice. The real question now before your honorable committee is not a technical one of whether Mr. SMITH should or should not be sworn in, should or should not be subsequently expelled, but whether the Senate of the United States by its action responds to the public opinion of America, and will seriously rebuke the practices set forth in this evidence by refusing to seat the applicants for membership.

Some weeks ago a copy was sent me of the *Vanishing Rights of the States*, written in the interest of Messrs. VARE and SMITH by James M. Beck, LL. D., formerly Solicitor General of the United States, author of *The Constitution of the United States*, entitled by the author, "A discussion of the right of the Senate to nullify the action of a

sovereign State in the selection of its representatives in the Senate." This volume was, I am informed, sent as a circular to every Member of the United States Senate, and to others of influence. I read the book with interest and astonishment.

A few days ago the public press announced that Mr. Beck had volunteered "as a crusader in behalf of the Constitution," without compensation, to defend these sovereign States by appearing as counsel for the contestants. Thereupon, I reread Mr. Beck's book of 126 pages on the *Vanishing Rights of the States*, which was in reality a piece of special pleading in behalf of Messrs. VARE and SMITH, and appeared to have no discernible value as to the substantial rights of the States to choose their own representatives, a right which is not challenged, provided the candidates chosen, or alleged to be chosen, have the necessary qualifications to meet the judgment of the United States Senate.

Mr. Beck strenuously argued that the only qualifications laid down by the Constitution are that the candidate must be 30 years old, 9 years a United States citizen, a resident of the State, not a United States official, and not disqualified as a rebel under the fourteenth amendment. Otherwise the sovereign State of Illinois, for example, has no constitutional limitations put upon its choice of a representative. The candidate may be a notorious criminal and a homicidal lunatic, and Illinois is within its sovereign rights to require the United States Government to accept this ambassador.

He may be a notorious horse thief and the chief beneficiary of a well-known gang of counterfeiters, and the Senate would have no right to reject him, if he was 30 years of age and not expressly disqualified by the five constitutional inhibitions above referred to.

If the candidate was not barred by being under 30 years of age, not having been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and not being a resident of the State, he would be entitled to have his seat in the Senate, even if he had leprosy, or some other deadly contagious disease, and the Senate would be powerless to defend itself.

Mr. Beck does not think that the Senate can expel a man constitutionally, and says:

"It may be—but I do not concede it—that if a Senator, during the period of his service, is proved to have been guilty of some crime, he can be expelled, even though the crime has no relation to the discipline of the Senate" (p. 50).

The refusal of the author to concede this will be very embarrassing to those Senators in the future who have to pass upon such a case by depriving them of the reasonable liberty a Senator should have to exercise his own judgment.

The author says:

"To permit the Senate to expel a Senator on the ground that before his election he has been either a fool or a knave would revolutionize our theory of constitutional government. All this had been passed upon before the Constitution was framed in the great John Wilkes controversy" (p. 51).

I deeply regret that this permission is not extended the Senate by the author, except upon the hard condition that such permission would revolutionize Mr. Beck's theory. The author gives a large part of his book to the wonderful John Wilkes case—pages 29 to 41, inclusive, and pages 85 to 124, inclusive.

In the John Wilkes case Mr. Beck found a precedent to justify his remarkable position with regard to the powers of the United States Senate.

He had to go abroad to find his precedent in a British case.

He had to find the precedent prior to the writing of the Constitution of the United States, and finally he found a case in which a thoroughly corrupt Parliament controlled, as the author himself says, by "A system of wholesale bribery and intimidation never surpassed," "Where the members flocked and received the wages of their venality in bank bills" (p. 31), and a candidate who was elected by an uncorrupted constituency. The case of John Wilkes is the reverse of the case of VARE and of SMITH.

John Wilkes had severely criticized a minister of George III, a corrupt tyrant. George III ordered a corrupt Parliament to expel Wilkes from Parliament. A corrupt Parliament did as they were instructed—on untenable grounds as Parliament later confessed. The people reelected Wilkes, without any charge of the electorate being corrupted. The corrupt Parliament a second time expelled Wilkes. The uncorrupted people elected Wilkes a third time. The corrupt government expelled Wilkes a third time. The uncorrupted electorate returned Wilkes a fourth time, and, upon threats of a revolution made against the government of George III, he surrendered, and Wilkes took his seat in Parliament.

Wilkes, in an appeal to his constituents at one time, said:

"If ministers can once usurp the power of declaring who shall not be your representatives, the next step is very easy and will follow speedily. It is that of telling you whom you shall send to Parliament, and then the boasted constitution of England will be entirely torn up by the roots."

Wilkes was speaking of corrupt ministers, and a corrupt Parliament, and an uncorrupted electorate. The author, Mr. Beck, then says:

"Change the word 'ministers' to 'Senators,' 'Parliament' to 'Congress,' and 'England' to the 'United States,' and his words will fit as a glove the coming controversy in the Senate" (p. 37).

In other words, Mr. Beck thinks the Wilkes case, where the ministers were corrupt, if changed to Senators would fit like a glove the coming controversy in the Senate.

Mr. Beck thinks that to change the word "Parliament," which was notoriously corrupt in the case cited, to "Congress" would fit as a glove the coming controversy in the Senate. It is obvious that Mr. Beck, in his anxiety to show that the uncorrupt electorate of Middlesex was entitled to choose its own representative, did not perceive how unsound his comparison was, for Mr. Beck is incapable of intentionally insulting the Senate or the Congress. The weakness in the precedent of John Wilkes is that the Parliament was corrupt, hopelessly corrupt, thoroughly corrupt, and that the electorate who sent the courageous John Wilkes to Parliament was uncorrupt. In the Vare and Smith case the Senate of the United States is not corrupt, and the charge made and the evidence taken in the Vare-Smith case is that they found their way to the doors of the Senate through corrupt processes that affected the integrity of the nominations and elections, because of the use of money on so gigantic a scale that it is impossible to escape the conclusion that these processes were corrupted.

In the John Wilkes case the corrupt Parliament expelled him on a pretext, and although he had been imprisoned by a corrupt charge for political reasons, the people nevertheless had confidence in the courage and integrity of Wilkes. If Parliament had been honest and decent the controversy would not have occurred. The case of John Wilkes is a complete misfit, both as to time, place, and circumstances.

Mr. Beck might have found better precedents in the Senate itself and in the House, but these precedents would not have served to support Mr. Beck's remarkable "theory of the Constitution."

Mr. Beck's theory of the Constitution is that if a candidate brings to the door of the Senate a certificate of election, that the Senate might be permitted to consider whether he was 30 years old, 9 years a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State, and was not a United States officer, nor an unpardoned rebel; if so, the Senate would be obliged to admit him or the boasted Constitution of the United States "will be entirely torn up by the roots."

Except for the fact that Mr. Beck has been Solicitor General of the United States and rendered services of distinction as a lawyer, his book on the "Vanishing Rights of the States" could not possibly attract any notice.

It has no merit. It violates every canon of common sense. Its interpretation of the Constitution is entirely unsound.

THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of the United States is a document of great nobility and of majestic strength. It declares fundamental principles in the fewest possible words and by the most orderly processes of reasoning.

After the preamble, which declares the purposes of the Constitution to be to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty," Article I establishes the Congress of the United States, with its two branches—the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States—and assigns to each its powers.

It is perfectly clear that the power to judge the elections, returns, and qualifications of membership in the Senate and in the House of Representatives must be placed somewhere to avoid confusion on the question of membership.

This common-sense requirement was not overlooked by the framers of the Constitution. They did the most natural thing in the world by placing this power in the hands of each House over its own Members. It is possible that each House might, on some occasion, violate justice in exercising this power, but that is equally true of any other possible authority who might be authorized to pass on the question. Our forefathers did the wise thing in putting this power in the hands of each House, which they did by a sweeping provision, about whose interpretation there is no doubt whatever, for the language is perfectly simple and plain and without any limiting words.

The language of Article I, section 5, is as follows:

"SEC. 5. Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members."

Nothing could be clearer than this. To attempt to explain this simple elemental language is to weaken it. It is a sweeping grant of power in each House to pass on the elections, returns, and qualifications. And there is no appeal from this decision, except to the constituencies who may hold another election, or to the appointing power who may make another appointment. It does not in any way whatever deprive the State or a constituency of its right to a representative. The framers of the Constitution relied, and were obliged to rely, on the integrity and intelligence of the Members of each House to discharge their duties with fidelity. If they did not, they could be punished at the next election by the people whose representatives they were. If the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States should prove to be unworthy of trust, and the people who elected

them to office should prove to be incapable of correcting their delinquencies, there is no remedy possible through any form of government to correct such an evil. It is an impossible hypothesis. The educated American people are thoroughly capable of selecting trustworthy representatives to the Senate and House, and to correct any blunders they may individually make, by sending better-qualified representatives at the succeeding election. This simple and wholesome process is the only and the best means by which our liberties can be preserved. The one great danger to the liberties of the American people is the unrestrained use of money, and its evil influences in corrupting the electors, the election machinery, the ballot boxes, the returns, the certificates of election, etc., and this happens to be the issue in these cases.

Mr. Beck finds great solace in section 3 of Article I, which reads as follows:

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

And he thinks the Constitution means that the only qualifications a candidate need have should be the age, citizenship, and residence referred to.

Mr. Beck says:

"To hold that 'qualifications' has a broader meaning, and invests the right in either House to determine whether the chosen Representative of the State is in other respects fit to take his seat, would be a nullification of the right of the people in each State to select their Representatives, and the right of the legislature of each State to select the Senators. It is preposterous to claim that the word 'qualifications' means intellectual or moral fitness, for if this were so, the rights of the States to be represented in the Congress in their own way would be reduced to the vanishing point."

Mr. Beck can not escape from the subconscious John Wilkes Parliament, and the idea that the Senate will act corruptly.

The right of the Senate to pass on the qualifications of its Members is unrestricted, except as stated by section 3 that the candidate may not be admitted by the Senate if he is less than 30 years old, if he has not been 9 years a United States citizen, and is not a resident of the State. If a State sends a person who is morally, grossly unfit in the discretion of the Senate, the Senate would be within its right to say that he had not the proper qualifications. It is inconceivable that the Senate would reject a man on a pretext. If it did there is a remedy that the people of the United States would defeat, at the succeeding election, all Members who had violated their oath of office in this base manner. The framers of the Constitution were entirely justified in saying that the Senate in passing upon the qualifications of a candidate for the Senate should not admit to the Senate as qualified a person who is not sufficiently mature. It is necessary to set a standard, so they put it at 30 years. It is necessary to say that one of the qualifications, which the Senate must require, is citizenship of the United States; the Constitution fixes a reasonable period of time. The Senate is not permitted in passing on qualifications to say that a man not resident of the State is qualified, but these provisions are limitations on the sweeping powers of the Senate, to make sure that Members of the Senate shall not be admitted by the Senate as qualified, unless they meet these reasonable requirements.

The people of the United States were justified, in the fourteenth amendment, to say that when a man had taken the oath of office to sustain the Constitution, and then violated it, should not be permitted in the Senate, and the right of the Senate to pass on qualifications broadly was again modified to this extent.

All of these qualifications are merely limitations on the sweeping authority given by section 5. It is not adding to the power of the Senate, but taking from the sweeping powers given in section 5.

Mr. Beck, strangely enough, incomprehensible for a student of the Constitution, completely reverses the natural interpretation of the Constitution, and insists that the Senate is limited in passing on qualifications to the restrictions placed upon the sweeping power of the Senate. There is no reason for misunderstanding the Constitution of the United States in this matter. The Senate is given by section 5 the sweeping power to pass on the elections, returns, and qualifications, and if it appears from the evidence in the Vare-Smith case that the elections were corrupt and the returns leading to the door of the Senate, and/or the certificate borne by the candidate was corrupt, or that the candidate himself comes to the Senate with evidence of personal corruption, the Senate is well within its rights to declare that he is not qualified to take the oath and become a Member of that honorable body.

If the Senate believes that the candidate for admission to the Senate has put himself under such obligations to others for money contributions in securing his seat in the Senate; that he does not come with clean hands to the door of the Senate and free to exercise an impartial judgment as a Senator because of his participation in such corrupt processes, the Senate is within its right to say he has not the qualifications necessary to justify administering the oath to him. If the Senate finds that his certificate of appointment, as in the case of Mr. SMITH, springs from an election which has been corrupt, the Senate is within

its right to say that he is not qualified to take the oath and become a Member of that body.

The Senate of the United States is the most distinguished legislative body in the world. It represents 48 great States of the most intellectual and powerful people of earth. Its honor and its dignity is a precious possession of the people of the United States, and the Members of the Senate are charged with the solemn responsibility of preserving the prestige, the honor, and the dignity of the United States Senate unimpaired.

The Senate was well within its rights in expelling Burton and Lorimer and Newberry. It is much more orderly and much more becoming for the Senate to refuse to receive a Member than to absurdly administer the oath with a view thereafter to expelling him upon the same evidence. The obvious reason for urging this proposal is in order to make it necessary to have a two-thirds vote to expel, hoping that one-third may be found who will tolerate the conditions complained of. This is merely a piece of petty, political strategy, which it is beneath the dignity of the Senate to permit.

By the corrupt practices act of 1911 the Senate gave solemn warning against the corrupt use of money in nominating or electing a Senator. The ultimate expulsion of Lorimer and Newberry has emphasized this doctrine. The fact that Newberry escaped imprisonment on a technical ground under a primary previous to the seventeenth amendment is immaterial. The Senate is the judge of the qualifications, and Newberry was compelled to retire, notwithstanding the Supreme Court decision. He narrowly escaped imprisonment and was compelled to retire.

Mr. Beck's interpretation of the Constitution would defeat the great purposes of the Constitution as declared in the preamble. The people could not expect to establish justice under Mr. Beck's pleading, or insure domestic tranquillity, or promote the general welfare, or secure the blessings of liberty, by allowing the wholesale corruption of the electorate by incredible sums of money.

The most insidious and dangerous evil now threatening the people of the United States is the gigantic corruption of the ballot. It is deplorable that a man of Mr. Beck's learning should be anxious to throw himself as a crusader in defending these evil processes. He wraps himself in the glorious flag of State sovereignty and of State rights, and in the name of these abstractions is defending the wholesale corruption of the electorate by money.

He shouts with a loud voice that to rebuke the beneficiary of these evil processes will revolutionize the Government and destroy the rights of the State.

The answer to this tirade is a simple flat negative. It will do nothing of the kind. The governors of the States can immediately appoint their successors within a reasonable time, uncorrupt elections can be held, and the voice of the people expressed without being misled by such evil processes. The State is denied nothing to which it is fairly entitled. It is not entitled as a sovereign right to ignore the sovereign rights of the United States. The United States Government is entitled to be treated with respect, and the 47 States whose affairs and interests will be voted on by the beneficiary of corrupt elections have a right to object.

Even in modern international intercourse a sovereign State sending an ambassador must send an ambassador decently qualified, and he must be *persona grata*.

This is going much further than either House would ever go, because the Senate of the United States is not concerned if the candidates sent have opinions of one kind or another, be intellectual or not intellectual, but they have a right to say that he shall not be the beneficiary of corrupt processes, no matter what may be his social, financial, or political prestige. The problem is one of extreme simplicity and can not be obscured.

The American people understand it perfectly, and they will judge Senators who now sit upon this case according to the wisdom and justice of their decision.

The Senate is face to face with a crisis produced by the candidate himself, whose conduct has affronted and outraged public opinion of men of all parties in every State of the Union.

The plain question is, Shall the electorate be corrupted, and the candidate fatally committed to sinister interests and the beneficiary of such corrupt processes be seated, with enormous power for six years to decide every question of policy and every law of the United States by his vote? It will be unfortunate if any substantial number in the Senate shall finally be misled by specious pleading or technical quibbling on matters affecting this issue.

With sentiments of the greatest respect for your honorable committee, I remain,

Very faithfully yours,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

BUREAUS OF CUSTOMS AND PROHIBITION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 10729.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10729) to create a bureau of cus-

toms and a bureau of prohibition in the Department of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I hope to have a chance to continue my remarks on another occasion.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRUCE. I am sorry; I can not yield. The Senator knows my time is limited; otherwise I would be glad to yield.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without taking it out of his time?

Mr. BRUCE. I am sorry. I just declined to yield to the Senator from Utah. The Senator from Idaho knows that my time is limited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I have not a word of criticism to utter about any views that any Member of this body may have with reference to the merits of the pending bill. It is the right of every Member of the Senate to form such views about them as he may see fit to do. There is doubtless not an inconsiderable difference of opinion in the Senate with respect to the merits and demerits of the bill. But I do say that my whole soul is filled with indignation and disgust when I think of the manner in which closure was applied to it. There had been no filibuster. With the exception of some brief observations by myself, few remarks of any kind had been made by any Member of the Senate upon the bill. There was no danger of its ordinary progress being arrested, not the slightest; and yet, without difficulty, a two-thirds vote was obtained in this body to apply closure to it.

In the history of the Senate rule relating to closure, which is some 10 years old, closure was four times sought between the year 1917 and the year 1922. During that period of five years closure was only once applied. Since that time down to date closure has been only thrice applied, and in one of these cases to the pending bill. What is the explanation, therefore, of the fact that closure was so promptly and so ruthlessly applied to the pending bill? The reason will be obvious when I recall the circumstances which preceded its application.

When the pending bill came before the Senate I announced that I had no objection to its provisions so far as it sought to create a separate bureau of customs and a separate bureau of prohibition; that all I asked was that it should be so amended that the office forces of the two proposed bureaus would be expressly subjected to the provisions of the Federal civil service laws and regulations, and that the provisions of the bill subjecting the prohibition field force to the civil service laws and regulations would be eliminated. With those changes, I stated more than once that I had no objection to the passage of the bill.

What then? The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] said that he did not object to the amendments which I proposed—indeed, would accept them. Afterwards, when the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] took charge of the bill, he, too, stated that he did not object to the amendments. Both of those Senators did everything in their power to bring about the immediate passage of the bill with those amendments.

What then? Why, I was informed by Senator SMOOT that the amendments did not meet with the approval of Wayne B. Wheeler, the third house of Congress.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I do not suppose the amendments would meet with the approval of the employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, who are in the galleries now watching the proceedings here.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not know, but since the Senator has risen, I desire to pay him the tribute of saying that he is the only Senator since I have been here who has had the courage to tell Wayne B. Wheeler, this hireling of the Anti-Saloon League, what he was and to what measure of attention his approaches to Congress were entitled. When a bill similar to the pending one was pending before the Civil Service Committee, of which the courageous and resolute Senator from Michigan was chairman, and Wheeler entered the committee room of that committee, the Senator promptly told him that the business of the committee would not proceed until he left the room. In other words, the counsel of the Anti-Saloon

League came into that committee room to tell the Senator from Michigan "where to get off" only to be told by the Senator from Michigan where to get out.

It was, therefore, the interposition of Wayne B. Wheeler, backed by the browbeating organization of which he is the spokesman, which caused the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] to say to me that he was very sorry that nothing could be done in relation to my amendments, and that he had exhausted every effort to obtain the acquiescence of Wheeler, but that he had been unable to do so, and that I would have to pursue whatever course I saw fit.

Under those circumstances the course which I proposed to pursue was to insist upon the office forces of those two bureaus being made expressly subject to the civil service laws and regulations, and upon the provisions in the bill subjecting the prohibition field force to the civil service laws and regulations being stricken out. I was not allowed that privilege. I was afforded no opportunity for the discussion of my amendments. No other Member of this body who shares my views was afforded any such opportunity. The whole machinery of closure was put in motion, with Wayne B. Wheeler at the lever, and closure was applied with despotic, overpowering, merciless force to the discussion of the pending bill. Wayne B. Wheeler had taken snuff, and the Senate, as usual, sneezed. Wayne B. Wheeler had cracked his whip and the Senate, as usual, crouched.

After this body had over and over again declined to apply closure to the discussion of measures pending in the Senate, this professional agitator and unofficial interloper came into the Senate, whip in hand, and without the slightest difficulty suppressed all real discussion of the pending bill. Just think of the cowardice which that action of the Senate indicates. Only a few hours before there had been under consideration here the Boulder dam bill, which affected in the profoundest degree the happiness and welfare of a vast region of this country, but notwithstanding the fact that that bill had been discussed hour after hour and day after day, and the discussion had even included an all-night session, this body refused to apply closure to it. Only a few hours before, too, notwithstanding the fact that the emergency officers' retirement bill had been discussed, and ably and fully discussed pro and con by some of the Members of the Senate, and had come up for consideration by this body more than once, the effort to apply closure to that bill failed; and other efforts to apply closure had failed over and over again, as I have pointed out, in the history of this body.

But no sooner did Wayne B. Wheeler raise his head in the gallery of the Senate Chamber than, like some well-oiled crushing mechanism, the closure rule was applied to me and to every other Member of the body who desired to discuss the merits of the pending bill.

As I have said, I have no disposition to criticize any Senator really or putatively out of sympathy with prohibition because he has intended or intends to vote in favor of the pending bill, but I do say that I have the right to harbor feelings of the strongest resentment when I remember that if only one of the supposedly wet Senators in this body, who voted in favor of closure as to the pending bill, had voted against closure, closure would not have been applied. If the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who was elected, as I understood it, as an opponent of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act, had voted against closure, closure would not have prevailed.

If the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES]—and I speak of him with greatest respect—who was elected, as I understood it, as an opponent of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act, had voted against closure, closure would not have prevailed. If the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], who was supposed to have changed his views about prohibition overnight and to be ready to acquiesce in the overwhelming result of the recent New York referendum, had voted against closure, closure would not have prevailed. If either of the Senators from Nevada, representing a State which has recently committed itself to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, had voted against closure, closure would not have prevailed.

I say that if there is to be any such thing as a common cause in the matter of opposition to prohibition, if there is to be any such thing as joint effort, if there is to be any such thing as joint responsibility, or any such thing as helpful comradeship, then those Senators should not have voted as they did. If the rest of us are in truth their political associates, they should have given us an opportunity to discuss the bill, to offer any amendments to it that we saw fit, and to present the merits of

those amendments as we saw fit. They at least should have set an example of independence of spirit; they at least should have told Wayne B. Wheeler that legislative subserviency ceased when it reached them; they should have stood here hour after hour, day after day, if necessary, and insisted upon our right to discuss the bill. There was nothing to prevent them from doing so. There had been no filibuster against the bill; there was no intent on the part of anybody to filibuster against it so far as I know—certainly not on my part; yet, notwithstanding that fact, without lifting a finger in our defense, without giving us any aid or comfort whatsoever, nay, indeed, striking hands with our sworn parliamentary and political foes, they made possible the application of closure to the bill.

Mr. President, I recollect that God said to Jonah, "Dost thou well to be angry?" and Jonah replied, "I do well to be angry." So if Senators ask me whether I do well to be angry with those Senators who, as I see it, have deserted us at a critical moment, I say, "Yes; I do well."

The Senator from Massachusetts, forsooth, says that he believes in law enforcement; that he does not believe in the nullification of law. So do I believe in law enforcement. One of my most recent acts was to secure the creation of another Federal judgeship for the State of Maryland, rendered necessary by the onerous burden which the prohibition law imposes upon the district court of Maryland. Providing ordinary appropriations for the enforcement of the prohibition law and the necessary judges and administrative officers for the same purpose is, however, a very different thing from giving assistance to a further legislative program put forward by the Anti-Saloon League with the object of riveting the fetters of its tyranny still more tightly upon the wrists and ankles of a helpless people.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRUCE. I do.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Of course, the law we are now under is the second law that has been enacted strictly in accordance with the demands of the Anti-Saloon League; so that instead of nullifying the law, those who oppose this amendment simply propose to go on under a law that was written by the temperance forces themselves. The question, then, is not at all one of nullification.

Mr. BRUCE. That is true; and an additional thing must be remembered: The pending bill is but the starting point of another general agitation by the Anti-Saloon League for the reinvigoration of the national prohibition act, which has been steadily declining in popular respect. For the life of me, I can not understand why our prohibition friends in this body, when they saw so plainly the extent of the abject servility to which it was prepared to reduce itself in its relations to the Anti-Saloon League, have not asked also for the passage of the Goff measure, authorizing the entry of prohibition agents into private homes, which has for a long time been upon the calendar of the Senate. Why, when I see the prohibitionist Members of the Senate content with this prohibition reorganization bill—which is a matter of minor significance to the Anti-Saloon League as compared with other legislation that they are seeking—I can not but be reminded of the exclamation of Lord Clive when he was taxed with rapacity in India: "By God! When I think of my opportunities, I am astonished at my own moderation." In other words, even the Anti-Saloon League miscalculated the extent to which the majority of this body was bound by chains of servitude to its insolence.

Make no mistake, you who voted in favor of closure, whether drys or wets or half-hearted wets: The next bill to which closure will be sought to be applied will be the Goff bill, which seeks to get the nose of the camel under the flaps of the tent, by authorizing prohibition agents to enter private homes in search of liquor; and then will follow, when that bill has been enacted, the attempted execution of the last prohibition pronouncement put out in Baltimore a few days ago by five ministers connected with the Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Morals.

I always hate to speak of any clergyman connected with the Anti-Saloon League or that board as a clergyman. I have a deep reverence for the clerical character at its best—that clerical character of which, as John Randolph once said, humility is the Alpha and the Omega; that clerical character which in all the personal and domestic relations of life, in imitation of our pure, gentle, and wise Saviour, holds up the highest standards of moral conduct to the flocks which look up to it for guidance. But when I think of some of these pastors, ministers, or clergymen, whatever you call them, connected with the Anti-

Saloon League agitation, I recall the spiteful classification of the wit who said that there are three sexes—men, women, and clergymen.

These supposed spiritual leaders to my mind belong to some kind of third sex. They are part preachers and part stump orators, part clergymen and part political intriguers and agitators, whose political instruments are scurrilous abuse, bulldozing, and the lavish use of money in political campaigns. They had better go back to the home and try to stay the progress of those social sins which were supposed once to furnish them with a peculiar field for their professional efforts. The last statistics of the Department of Commerce show that at the present time there is one divorce for every six marriages in the United States. Let Dr. Clarence True Wilson and the other directors of the Anti-Saloon League and the Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Morals turn their attention away from the political fields, where they do not belong, to the private fields where once, at any rate, all the ministers of the Gospel were supposed to belong. Let them seek to bring more purity and self-restraint and higher standards of integrity to all the personal and social relations of the American people. Let them seek to check the freedom of divorce, that is not only undermining the home, but also the commonwealth, upon which the home is based. Let them seek to reform the criminal conditions which are so prolific at this hour of banditry and murderous outrages.

Oh, no; not satisfied with such commonplace offices as those Dr. Clarence True Wilson and his four companions opened up in the pulpits of Baltimore a few Sundays ago, and shaped up a still more oppressive program than any to which the Anti-Saloon League and its affiliated associations have yet committed themselves. Four planks were framed by them:

First, every man who violates the Volstead Act by having a spoonful of liquor in his possession, for instance, even though he be a first offender, is to suffer nothing less than a jail sentence.

Secondly, a padlock is to be clapped upon the door of every building in the land in which the Volstead Act is violated.

Thirdly, every alien who violates the Volstead Act is to be deported.

Fourthly—what do you think of this?—Every man who buys a drop of liquor is to be held to be equally culpable with the man who sells it to him.

I say without hesitation that if that last plank is widened so as to embrace gifts of liquor, a large part of this body may find itself in jail. I ask nobody to call on me to produce the proofs on which that statement rests. It would not be pleasant for me to go too fully into details because there are social confidences which a gentleman would rather go to prison than disregard.

To come to the merits of this bill, I have, as I have said, no objection to the organization of a bureau of customs or of a bureau of prohibition in the Treasury Department, and I am entirely satisfied with the amendments which have been inserted in the bill subjecting the office forces of those bureaus to the civil service laws and regulations. I have, however, offered an amendment striking out the provisions of the pending bill which subject the prohibition field force to those laws and regulations; and I have done so because all my life I have been an earnest, enthusiastic advocate of the merit system of appointment, Federal, State, and municipal, and I am not willing that that splendid system of appointment in the sphere of the Federal Government shall be contaminated and debased by close association with the corrupting influences of prohibition.

All of you know what has happened to the Coast Guard, at one time one of the most honorable agencies of the Federal Government, and still directed by a chief who is eminently deserving of respect. During the last 12 months or so whole groups of Coast Guard men, not to speak of individual guard men, have brought themselves by official faithlessness within the toils of the depraved Volstead Act. At times along the Atlantic coast even whole Coast Guard crews have been engaged in conspiracies to land the very cargoes that it was their duty to intercept.

Everybody knows what has happened to the prohibition force itself. Some 10,000 men have constituted, since the enactment of the Volstead Act, the prohibition force. General Andrews testified before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee last spring that no less than 875, nearly 10 per cent of this number, had been dismissed from the public service, mostly for violations of the Volstead Act or downright rascality in some form or other. Out of 24 prohibition administrators General Andrews—the upright, courageous, and intelligent head of the Prohibition Unit—has had to dismiss all but nine. Scarcely a day passes that does not bring to us, through the press, the

fact that some Coast Guard man or body of Coast Guard men or some Federal prohibition administrator or some Federal prohibition agent or group of Federal prohibition agents have succumbed to the fatal temptations of the Volstead Act, largely, if not altogether, because they felt in their hearts that that law was a violation of human reason and of human nature, and had no real moral sanction behind it; and because everyone, high or low, around them or near them was in one form or another violating it.

In the State of Wisconsin—in which, I am glad to say, a United States Senatorship has passed down from father to son as if it were a sort of hereditary possession—three prohibition administrators in succession were convicted of violations of the Volstead Act.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I trust the Senator will make it clear that those were Federal enforcement agents, not State agents.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; they were, and that is an interesting fact, if the Senator will allow me to comment on it for just a moment. We have never consented to have any prohibition enforcement law in the State of Maryland, and what is the result? We are not willing that our respectable, dutiful, faithful policemen should have any kind of working connection with Federal prohibition agents or in any manner with the enforcement of such a debasing law as the national prohibition act; and, as I stated a few days ago, we have reaped the benefits of our foresight and wisdom, for, so far as I can recall at this moment, not a single Baltimore policeman has ever been found in corrupt collusion with the Federal prohibition agents.

As I have said, every day brings us some new scandal, some fresh abuse connected with the workings of the prohibition law. Sometimes as many as 25 or 30 police officers of one sort or another are convicted in the courts of conspiracy to violate the Volstead Act and fined or sent off to prison. Now, then, I ask, Are we to allow this classified Federal service of ours, which, in my opinion, is one of the noblest features, if not one of the ornaments, of our system of Federal administration, to be degraded and demoralized and debauched by intimate contact with the practical workings of prohibition? Just pause for a moment and let me give a few illustrations of what that would mean. Just let me call to the attention of the Senate merely three typical illustrations of the violence and outrage and reckless disregard of all social decency which is found in the careers of some of the present prohibition field agents.

Here is the case of a wretched woman, widowed by the atrocious act of a prohibition agent in the State of West Virginia. Poor thing! she writes to the editor of the Chronicle in Nicholas County, W. Va., as follows:

THE CRUEL MURDER OF CHARLEY SINGLETON
Written by his wife

GEM, W. VA., January 23, 1927.

EDITORS OF THE CHRONICLE: Will you please give me just a little space of your paper so as I can correct the horrible mistakes that are circulated in regards to the cruel and horrible way my husband was shot down and murdered before my eyes, and I was not even able to get up and go to him for my little baby was only 3 days old. The officers reported they emerged from the woods to the house. They did not do so. They came up the road past my husband's father's that just lives a little distance below my home, and came all the way up the road to my home; and another report that was a mistake—my husband did not come from the barn. He was at his shop shoeing a horse for his uncle. He saw the officers coming and came to the house to inform me of it so as I would not be frightened. I will tell you just as I saw it with my own eyes. Two officers entered the door by the front way just facing my bed, and two came in the back way. My husband met the two at the front way and they commanded a search; and he asked them to read him the warrant, and one of them came from the kitchen way and took some papers out of his pocket. Him and my husband were talking. The warrant was not as much as opened until one of the officers that was standing just on the front steps pushed the other officer back a little, and drew his gun and fired. I screamed and cried for him not to shoot my husband, and he did, and so that was the first shot; and then there were several shots fired. I did not see my husband as much as draw his gun. They shot him down, and my little children all standing around him screaming and crying. When the smoke went out of the house so as I could see, my husband was lying with his head almost in the fire just in facing of my bed. The officer never much as came back in to see about me or my little children, to see if we were all right. Oh, if every officer only knew how it hurts me to know that my husband was shot down for an unjust cause, they would not be too hasty and there would not be so much heartache and sorrow. If they had just went

ahead and searched so as they would have been convinced that they took his life for nothing that day; for there was nothing to be found. There were several shots fired right past my face and my bed from the door that opens from the kitchen. The shots all went in his back, except the one that went in from his left side. Mr. Humphries reported that they could get no immediate assistance in this community in caring for the wounded. That is all false reports, for my husband's own uncle took them into his house and gave them a good cot to lay on, and also sent a team with them to Burnsville; and that was more than they done for me. I am left alone with 10 small children, the oldest one a cripple one, to make my way. Mr. Skidmore went as far as to say before my husband's cousin that if the other officers had not been too hasty that would not have happened.—Braxton Chronicle.

Here is another typical West Virginia case. I read from the Charleston Daily Mail of January 11, 1927:

DRY RAIDER'S BULLET IS FATAL TO WOMAN—OFFICERS HELD WITHOUT BOND AFTER BOONE COUNTY RESIDENT, WHO SOON WOULD HAVE BEEN MOTHER, DIES IN HOSPITAL OF WOUND

Mrs. A. D. May, of Nellis, Boone County, died at 11 o'clock this morning in the McMillan Hospital of a bullet wound inflicted Sunday night when officers served a liquor warrant upon Fleming Ramsey, a boarder at the May home.

The officers, Sam Morrow, State prohibition agent, and Constable Clinton Carnes, of Peytona district, were arrested yesterday by order of the Boone County sheriff and placed in the county jail at Madison for hearing to-morrow afternoon before Magistrate C. F. Hager, of Scott district.

Last night Mrs. May signed a statement declaring that Sam Morrow fired the shot that hit her. This statement was mailed to the sheriff's office at Madison last night. Dr. W. A. McMillan telephoned there yesterday after Mr. May had told the story and the men were arrested upon that information. The officers were held without bail until the hearing.

Sunday night the officers appeared at the May residence and producing a warrant demanded the surrender of Ramsey. The man attempted to run from the house and escape. The officers then, according to Mr. May, fired several times. Ramsey stopped and he was taken at once to a district justice of the peace and arraigned for being drunk. May obtained medical aid for his wife and brought her to Charleston, arriving here early yesterday morning.

When arrested yesterday the officers said that they did not know that Mrs. May had been shot during the raid.

Mrs. May was to become a mother soon, it was said at the hospital to-day.

The body will be returned to her home to-day or to-morrow. County officers have not had an opportunity of questioning Mr. May in regard to the shooting, it was said to-day at Madison.

Here is still another incident that goes to show how completely at the mercy of some perjurer under the Volstead Act is the peace of a home. I read an editorial from the Charleston Gazette:

SNOOPING

* A subscriber sends us the following from The Hinton Daily News, which quotes it from the West Virginia News:

"Acting on a reckless statement of an irresponsible roustabout, we learn from newspaper and other well-supported reports that another outrage was perpetrated in the name of prohibition enforcement near Alderson. On Wednesday before Christmas, a snooper working under or with Federal Prohibition Agent Boggs, of Hinton, it is said, appeared in Alderson to see what he could find, and, using the public's money to bribe youth into crime, a gross immorality recommended or rather dictated by those who govern the alleged great moral forces of the Nation, met one Howard Adkins, a youth, and initiated a deal with him for the sum of \$2.50 whereby Adkins was to secure for this agent of Government some moonshine liquor. Adkins is reported to have told his seductor that he would get the liquor from Hazel Adkins, who was staying at the home of a poor but respectable family.

"Howard Adkins failed to return with any liquor, and the snooper reported to his chief in Hinton the circumstances. Agent Boggs immediately dispatched himself to Alderson and gathering a gang of State police, as is customary so that the largest possible number of officers may claim their separate fees for making an arrest, and all attacked the house of Alexander DePriest, the alleged abode of the man from whom some liquor was to be obtained. A minute search of the DePriest home was instituted in a thoroughly indecent and, it was believed, entirely lawless manner without warrant.

"In this poor home at the time were two critical cases of typhoid fever. Notwithstanding that a daughter of the family, Florence, aged 18 years, was desperately ill at the time, her bed was searched, both pillows and the mattress under her, being ransacked over the protest of a public-health nurse, who was in charge at the time. The man being hunted was not found in the home. No evidence that the DePriests were criminals was found.

"The youth with whom the immoral deal of the alleged agent of good morals was made was then hunted up. He was found in bed, and when roused admitted he had lied to obtain the money from the agent for Christmas spending.

"The young girl whose bed was violated in this lawless and indecent manner died later.

"These details come to us as facts. If they are, Prohibition Director Andrews ought to make himself one agent short, and the State police force might need recruiting, for to take part in such a lawless episode at the command of a Federal agent, is merely an excuse, to say the best of it."

Of course, should the Goff bill go into effect, authorizing the entry of private houses in the manner contemplated by the measure, there would be shocking repetitions of reckless brutality, like those exemplified in these newspaper clippings, multiplied over and over again.

Let me turn, by way of summary, for my time is short, to a statement which has recently been published as to the number of persons who have been killed or maimed in the United States by prohibition agents. Here in tabular form is a list of 33 persons killed or wounded in the administration of the Volstead Act by them. Of the 33, 25 were killed. In 27 of the cases no liquor was found. Think of that, in 27 of the 33 cases where the citizen was either killed or wounded, no liquor was found! This table also shows that quite a number of all these 33 persons were shot in the back.

- "Shot in the back."

So the dreary, tragic record runs.

I ask permission to publish this table in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Killed or wounded in the administration of the Volstead Act

Wm. E. Weisheit, Glenmore, N. Y.	*Nov. 18, 1921	Speech of Senator Wadsworth.
Wm. Stanton and James McFarland, Orange, N. J.	*Dec. —, 1921	Shot in the back, Newark, N. J., papers.
F. W. Sautter, Pleasantville, N. J.	*June 12, 1922	Held up and beaten.
2 Y. W. C. A. women, Asheville, N. C.	*Apr. 13, 1923	Petersburg (Va.) Index.
Helen G. Finklin, Washington, D. C.	*July 7, 1923	Washington Times, July 7, 1923.
J. Tom Britt, Columbus, Ga.	Killed.....	*Apr. 13, 1923	Shot in the back.
Carl Stierle.....do.....	*July 19, 1923	Indiana Tippecanoe County Democrat, July 20, 1923.
Elisha Northcutt, Indianapolis.do.....	Aug. 8, 1923	Indiana Tippecanoe County Dem. crat, Aug. 10, 1923.
Chalmers McAlpin (a boy), Longs Store, Ala.do.....	Birmingham New.
Philip Kolb, Monroe, Mich.do.....	*Jan. 13, 1924	Shot in the back
Thomas Monteforte, Brooklyn, N. Y.do.....	*Apr. 24, 1924	Brooklyn papers.
Joe and Herman Bazemore, Sylvania, Ga.do.....	*July 15, 1924	A. P. Report.
George Hoffman, Valley Stream, N. Y.do.....	*July 21, 1924	Washington Post; frightened to death.
Two boys, George Clark and William Adams.	Crippled for life.....	*Oct. 13, 1924	A. P. Report, Corbin, Ky.
Harry Bowen near Charleston, W. Va.do.....	*Apr. 20, 1925	Wheeling Register, Apr. 21, 1925.
J. Pitman, an aged trapper, Beaufort, N. C.	Killed.....	*May —, 1925	Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer-Sun, June 3, 1925.
Stephen S. Holt, Smithfield, N. C.do.....	*June 2, 1925	Asheville Citizen, June 2, 1925.
Leonard Triplett, Blowing Rock, N. C.do.....	*June 21, 1925	Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, June 22, 1925.
Roscoe E. Brunner, Norton, Va.do.....	*July 1, 1925	Shot in the back. Newport News Herald, July 2, 1925.
James Jones, a boy, Tilden, Nebr.	Killed.....	*July 8, 1925	Norfolk (Nebr.) News, July 8, 1925.
Adam Ballenger, Spartanburg, S. O.do.....	*July 20, 1925	Shot in the back. Washington Times, Jan. 29, 1925.
John Buongore, Havre de Grace, Md.	Entrapped and killed.	Aug. —, 1925	Chicago Tribune, Aug. 24, 1925.
Otto Eske, New York City (near Cooperville, N. Y.).	Killed.....	Aug. 11, 1925	New York Times, Aug. 11, 1925.
Wm. Risk, Divide, Colo.do.....	*Sept. 11, 1925	Shot in the back. Denver Post, Sept. 12, 1925

Killed or wounded in the administration of the Volstead Act—Continued

Negro (name unknown), Authority Representative J. T. Deal of Virginia.	Killed.....	Sept. 19, 1925	Shot in the back while running away. Newport News Press, Sept. 19, 1925.
Robt. H. Brooks, Savannah, N. Y.do.....	Oct. 17, 1925	Shot in the back by State trooper. A. P. report.
Mrs. Peter Sanders, Chestertown, N. Y.do.....	*Jan. 7, 1926	Shot by State troopers. A. P. report.
D. C. Shannon, Fla.do.....	Feb. —, 1926	Shot in the back by Coast Guard. A. P. report, Mar. 3, 1926.
Paul Pietrowsky, Acorte, Wash.do.....	*June 3, 1926	Shot by Coast Guard. A. P. report, June 3, 1926.
Sam Scrim, of Augusta, Ga.do.....	*July 8, 1926	Shot near Bryson City, N. C. Charlotte Observer, July 11, 1926.
Cecil McClure (a boy), Cherokee County, N. C.do.....	July —, 1926	Asheville Times, July 26, 1926.
Wm. Trute, Tecumseh, Nebr.do.....	*July —, 1926	Scottsbluff (Nebr.) report, July 23, 1926.
Lloyd Kaster, Meadville, Pa.do.....	*Sept. —, 1926	Meadville Tribune report, Sept. 9, 1926.
Mrs. Ida Waldman, Philadelphia, Pa.	Frightened to death, killed.	*Dec. 29, 1926	Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 30, 1926.
Mrs. A. D. May, Nellis, W. Va.	Killed.....	*Jan. 11, 1927	A. P. report, Jan. 11, 1927.

NOTE.—Cases marked * there was no liquor found.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I have no time to present any more illustrations of misconduct on the part of prohibition agents, but I want to make a few words of comment on the observations of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] yesterday.

I have no unkind feelings toward the Senator from New York; I should be very glad to be spared the duty of referring in any manner to what he said. He has really become a convert to our cause so recently that I can hardly take in the abrupt and convulsive manner in which he landed in our midst.

When I said that I intended to hold the Members of the Senate who professed adherence to our cause to their just responsibility, I did not have the Senator from New York or any other Senator particularly in mind. With due respect to the Senator, I think it is unnecessary for me or any other individual wet here to see to it that he does not secure reelection to this body. I think that the people of New York, of that great and enlightened State, will see to that without any help from me or any other Senator.

Lord Chesterfield, coming in from his first fox hunt, is said to have asked whether anybody ever went fox hunting twice, so folted and bruised was he; and I am prepared to say that I can conceive of the stars as shooting madly from their spheres, I can conceive of the seas as turning blood red, I can conceive of rivers as running backward, and of the earth as failing to yield her usual abundance, I can conceive of almost any gross anomaly, or almost any monstrous prodigy, but I can not conceive of the Senator from New York as being elected a second time to the United States Senate by the Democrats of the State of New York, whose strongest convictions and sentiments he has, it seems to me, so poorly interpreted.

He said that I rail at every one who questions my leadership in the cause of personal liberty upon this floor. What Member of the Senate ever knew me to arrogate to myself the function of leadership upon this floor in that cause? Was it my friend the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], or my friend the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS], or my friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], with all of whom I am bound by such close fellowship? I am no leader. I am simply pledged heart and soul, by the deepest instincts of my nature, to the cause that has enlisted the hearts and minds of men as no other cause has ever done; that is, the cause of human freedom in all its varied manifestations. But I will say this, that if I were a leader, I should have but little desire to have the Senator from New York as one of my followers. Anyone who is a manly, robust consistent leader, political or otherwise, wishes to be assured first of all of the constancy and the fidelity of his followers.

A short time ago the Senator from New York was a fervid partisan of Mayor Hylan and a foe of Gov. Alfred E. Smith, of New York. Senators will recollect that the Senator once even spoke of Governor Smith, of New York, as if he were some poor mutilated Venus de Milo. To-day the word "Hylan" never falls from his lips, and apparently Governor Smith has no more obsequious or noisier adherent than he. With his long familiarity with human character the governor doubtless knows just what degree of value to attach to the Senator's new-born allegiance.

The Senator from New York is no real convert yet. If I may use the homely illustration that comes to my mind at the moment, he is like a chicken that has been hatched out with

parts of the eggshell that inclosed him in a previous state of existence still sticking to his back. He is but a raw, crude convert yet, and I, for one, if I am a leader, and any discipline and organization are to be preserved in our ranks, do not care to have him as a follower. A Republican in Republican Michigan and a Democrat in Democratic New York, the Senator reminds me of a famous Democratic professional politician in Maryland, named Jesse Hines, who, on being told, on a certain occasion by another Democratic professional politician that Maryland was turning Republican replied that it could not turn Republican any quicker than he could.

I want to see the men in this body who are opposing the detestable system of tyranny generated by prohibition stand together, like a band of sworn brothers, prepared to make any sacrifice for their cause that they may be called on to make and to bear any hardship, to endure any degree of popular misconception or misrepresentation that they may be required to bear or endure; in other words, to see that the plow to which they have set their hands runs its course straight and true to the end.

Of course, there is ever so much more that I could say upon this subject, it ramifies out into all kinds of interesting directions, but a glance at the clock shows me that I am so near the end of my allotted time that I might as well conclude at this point as later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN obtained the floor.

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

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

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

Ashurst	Frazier	McLean	Sackett
Bayard	George	McMaster	Schall
Bingham	Gerry	McNary	Sheppard
Blease	Goff	Mayfield	Shipstead
Borah	Gooding	Means	Shortridge
Bratton	Gould	Metcalf	Simmons
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Bruce	Harrell	Neely	Steck
Cameron	Harris	Norbeck	Stephens
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Stewart
Caraway	Hawes	Nye	Swanson
Copeland	Hefflin	Oddie	Trammell
Couzens	Howell	Overman	Tyson
Curtis	Johnson	Pepper	Underwood
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Phillips	Wadsworth
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Dill	Kendrick	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Keyes	Ransdell	Warren
Edwards	King	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Ferris	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Fess	Lenroot	Robinson, Ark.	
Fletcher	McKellar	Robinson, Ind.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

WAR SITUATION IN MEXICO

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the speech of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE], as he excoriated the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. I want to speak at this time for a little while about another matter.

The Washington Star of yesterday said:

BORAH faces rift with President on note to Calles. Apparent break hinges on Senator ignoring officers of State Department. Mexico's reply also violates propriety. Effect on American Senate is apprehended as real question at stake.

Mr. President, I see no impropriety in the conduct of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I read the communication which he addressed to the President of Mexico and I read the reply from the President of Mexico. The Senator from Idaho, as chairman of a very important committee in this body, should have the interests of the American people at heart. I believe he has. If war is to be had with Mexico, Congress will have to declare it. The Senator from Idaho is to be encouraged rather than condemned for ascertaining all the facts possible regarding a matter so serious and threatening as war with Mexico.

Criticism has been made recently in press and pulpit and by patriotic societies throughout the country of the Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg. Criticism has been made of our ambassador to Mexico, Mr. Sheffield. I have indulged in some of it myself. It has been pointed out that those two officials have changed their attitude upon the Mexican question. That seems to be true. Instead of doing everything possible to prevent trouble with Mexico, it is charged by many that those two officials are now showing friendly leanings toward those who want

war with Mexico. What influence is it that has brought about this change?

Mr. President, I repeat that war is a serious thing, a very gruesome and costly thing. War signs are appearing now above the American horizon. To the American who loves his country and puts his country first these signs are disquieting and alarming. The well-informed American citizen knows that there is no valid reason for going to war with Mexico, and he does not want war with Mexico.

The Protestants and Jews of the United States, constituting 100,000,000 of our population, are united in their opposition to the Mexican war program of the Knights of Columbus.

Three weeks ago in this Chamber I said that about the time Congress adjourned we would have a report from Nicaragua saying that our troops had been fired upon. That prophecy has come true. I stated that it would be said at first that "No one was injured." The story published here yesterday contains that very sentence. "But that bullets had struck in the vicinity of our boys." The story from Nicaragua said that shots were fired at a car in which our boys were riding and eight bullets struck the car. I said that later we would have another notice saying that some of the boys had been shot. The Washington Herald said this morning that some of the marines down there had been killed and that it is being kept a secret. I understand that that statement has been denied by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Navy.

I trust that the statement about killing American boys is not true. If anyone has been killed down there carrying our flag and wearing our uniform the people of the United States are entitled to know it before Congress adjourns. Why is such information kept from the Congress and the country? Are they covering up something down there which if known now might cause a majority of the Members of both Houses to determine to hold Congress and force an extra session? What is taking place in Nicaragua that affects the welfare of this Nation and that endangers the lives of American boys that is not being told to the American Congress and the American people?

I observed in the press this morning a statement that we have just sent a very important note to Mexico, an exceedingly important note, but nobody could find out what it was about. Nobody over there would give it out, nobody here would tell the contents of the note, which brings me to remark again that the Chicago correspondent, under the Romish influence, who made his report to a Chicago newspaper from Mexico on the 8th of August last year giving in minute detail the information contained in notes which had gone from this Government to Mexico and from Mexico to this Government, shows that he was on the inside and got information which he had no business getting, information which belonged alone to this Government and the Government of Mexico.

Did our ambassador to Mexico, Mr. Sheffield, furnish the Roman Catholic correspondent to the Chicago paper the inside information he had last August?

But we are told that no information can be obtained regarding this last note to Mexico. This note, it seems, is being guarded very carefully. What is it about? Are we about to go to war with Mexico by way of Nicaragua? I fear that that is true. Is our Government continuing to send troops to Nicaragua, battleships and airplanes, so as to be ready when Congress adjourns to carry out the plans for war with Mexico? I am uneasy. I fear that those who are so anxious for war with Mexico are succeeding in having their influence felt at the White House.

Mr. President, five-sixths of the people of the United States do not want war with Mexico. There is no occasion for war with Mexico. The United States ought to be friendly, patient, and helpful to Mexico. Mexico is trying to be forever free from the sickening burden that has held her down for 400 years and more. The Mexican people are entitled to self-government, and they are fashioning their Government after our Government, the greatest Government in all the world. Why should we condemn the Mexican people, why should we refuse to give them a helping hand when they are doing just what this Government has done? The genius of free America stands with drawn sword at all times on the dividing line twixt church and state. Mexico has at last broken the strangle hold of Roman Catholicism upon the throat of the Mexican Government, and she has at last brought about separation of church and state. Should we not congratulate her and assure her of our friendship and good offices in the great work that she is doing?

Why should our Government permit itself to be driven or lured into a foreign war to protect the oil properties of Doheny, a corruptionist, branded by the United States Supreme Court as a criminal, and there he stands convicted of high crimes and misdemeanors at the judgment bar of public opinion? On yes-

terday the Supreme Court of the United States, by a unanimous decision in the oil-fraud cases, branded him as a fraud, corruptionist, and criminal.

He owns a good, large portion of the oil lands in Mexico. Sinclair, who is under indictment in this city, who has defied the United States Senate and refused to answer its questions regarding the fraudulent oil leases, is another one of those who own oil property in Mexico, and he and Doheny are holding out and refusing to comply with the oil laws of the Republic of Mexico. They are hoping that the United States Army will go over to Mexico and protect their property.

Mr. President, some weeks ago, when the Nation was shocked by a Washington jury's acquittal of Fall and Doheny, I, as a United States Senator, condemned that unjustified and scandalous performance. I have been vindicated by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. My course had been approved by the great mass of honest men and women in the Nation. The circuit court of appeals, presided over by an honest and able judge, Judge Kenyon, had already branded Doheny and Fall and Sinclair as criminals and had declared that their transaction with Fall and Denby was a corrupt and fraudulent one. The Supreme Court of the United States has sustained that finding; so these men, arch enemies of the country, arch criminals of the Nation, are properly branded at the judgment bar of the American people as unworthy citizens of the United States. And yet in spite of all that, we now have troops at Nicaragua and airplanes and battleships down there.

Think of it! There is nothing inspiring or comforting to the American patriot in it. What really is at the bottom of it all? Nicaragua bonds bought by the gamblers of Wall Street. They bought them for a small sum, for less than 45 cents on the dollar, in Nicaragua we are told, and when this Government calls out its soldiers and goes in and takes charge they enhance in value to 100 cents on the dollar, and Wall Street claps its hands for joy. Let me tell you about the oil properties of certain people in the United States who went into Mexico without obtaining the consent of the American Government. Without even giving notice to the Government that they were going off on this adventurous journey—they went into Mexico knowing the situation was dangerous, in the midst of insurrection and revolution, and on their own risk made their investments in oil lands, and now they are crying to the American Government to send its Army to protect property thus acquired in a foreign country—I am not in favor of sacrificing the lives of American boys for such a purpose.

The President should stop, look, and listen a long time before it is too late. If Congress is called back in extra session for Mexican war purposes, the country will hear a lot of plain truths that it has the right to hear.

On top of these two interests that I have just mentioned, Nicaragua bonds and Mexican oil, I have shown that the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus of the United States have unitedly and determinedly gone to work to bring about a severance of diplomatic relations with Mexico. That, of course, means war.

I have proven that to the satisfaction of every intelligent American man and woman in the country. For doing that I have been denounced by the Knights of Columbus and Roman Catholic press. The vilest things they could say about me they have said. But they have never disproven anything I have said. I have some editorials and articles that are favorable, which I ask leave to print at the conclusion of my remarks, and also, Mr. President, so that I may not take the time now to read them, some letters indorsing my position on this Mexican situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit A.)

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, as I was saying on top of the bond and oil propositions that I have mentioned, the Knights of Columbus of the United States became exceedingly active and passed a resolution denouncing the United States Government's position toward Mexico. They did not request but demanded of the President of the United States that he cease the policy of "watchful waiting." That meant the breaking of diplomatic relations with Mexico. Anybody with any sense knows that.

I showed in addition to that that a Roman Catholic Congressman from Al Smith's State of New York introduced in the House a resolution asking for the severance of diplomatic relations with Mexico; and I showed that the telegrams and letters sent in in support of that resolution from all over the country came from nobody but Roman Catholics in the United States. I proved, by the facts that I got out of the hearings in the House on that resolution, "which were never published," that what I am say-

ing is true; that it was a Roman Catholic movement from beginning to end; and on top of that the Knights of Columbus have circulated at great expense throughout the Nation a little pamphlet called "Red Mexico," from 3,000,000 to 6,000,000 copies of it, telling of conditions, according to their view, in Mexico. They are still speaking through the South and the North and the East and the West, telling audiences about their imaginary impressions of the horrible conditions in Mexico. All this is being put forward for the purpose of bringing about war between the United States and Mexico. Everybody knows that now.

Mr. President, I have proven every charge that I have made. I submitted the testimony to the Senate, but only one paper that I have been able to find carried the point that I made, out of all the press of the United States whose correspondents are assembled at the Capital of the Nation.

The people over the country are having my speeches printed and are seeing to it that the subsidized press shall not suppress the truth of this important question. They are getting them out in pamphlet form. They have sent me quite a number of them, saying to me—

The newspapers will not tell us the truth. We can only get it from your speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and we are putting them in pamphlet form and circulating them, in order that the people may be informed.

Mr. President, I want every American citizen who desires my speeches to have the truths that I have uttered here, and I intend to send a copy of all my speeches to those who write me for it. The refusal of newspapers to print my speeches is another part of the Knights of Columbus program to pull off a war without letting the people know the truth about it. If they can keep from the people what I am saying here, then, of course they will not know the truth and conditions as they really are. "They" are very anxious to bring about this particular war; and what was the reason given by the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus in Maryland for wanting diplomatic relations severed? Listen to this, Senators:

The "persecution of Catholics in Mexico" and an "effort to destroy the Roman Catholic Church" over there.

That is none of our business as American citizens and as an American Nation. What business have the citizens of the United States to meddle with a religious question like that? That is "their" reason set out in "their" resolution for wanting the United States to sever diplomatic relations with Mexico. The other resolutions that came in to that House committee in support of the resolution of the Roman Catholic Congressmen were confined to the religious question and mentioned the effort "to destroy the Roman Catholic Church" in Mexico! Mr. President, for telling the truth about that, I have been slandered and vilified by every Roman Catholic paper that I have seen and by every little weaselled, weak-kneed Protestant pen-pusher that they could hire for a dime. [Laughter.]

They have even had attacks made on me by one of their brethren in the House. A speech was printed in the RECORD there the other day by a Roman Catholic Congressman and a Knight of Columbus from Massachusetts, by a man named GALLIVAN. If the RECORD tells the truth in its report of his request to print, he got it in under false pretenses. He stated that he wanted to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the point of order that was before the body, and he turned to the minority leader [Mr. GARRETT] and said that he would not print anything that the minority leader would object to. So he slipped it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—an attack upon me—and listen how his Romish brother, the newspaper man, sent the news up to Boston. His name is Robert L. Norton. The newspaper article reads:

Congressman GALLIVAN, of Boston, on the floor of the House to-day "opened up" on Senator TOM HEFLIN, of Alabama, and delivered a sizzling speech which pictured HEFLIN "as the object of public contempt and disgust."

Just as though he had made a speech in the House. He never said a word of it on the floor of the House, but he slipped it into the RECORD, to be franked out and then had the newspaper in Boston carry a story to the effect that he had delivered it on the floor of the House. In that statement he said that I made a speech in Boston 14 years ago to the Knights of Columbus and that I eulogized the Irish. I will do that again. I am part Irish myself and am proud of it. I spoke up there on the occasion of the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill. I did not know that the Knights of Columbus had anything to do with it. They may have had it in charge.

Mr. President, until I found the Knights of Columbus in the act of trying to involve us in war with Mexico, I had never said anything about them. I knew nothing about them or their activities; but I will say this: If what I have uncovered here

is a sample of their activities, they will bear watching from now on. If that attempt at Philadelphia to involve this country in war is a sample of their Roman Catholic activities, it is well to keep your eyes on them. I am against anybody's society or organization that seeks to involve my country in war for anybody's church; as I said before I do not care whether it is the Protestant church, the Hebrew church, or the Roman Catholic church.

Mr. President, in the brief time that I have I can only touch briefly certain phases of this subject. Here is a statement from William Green, head of the American Federation of Labor. He is pleading for patience on our part, and for help on the part of this Government for the Mexican people. I have here another statement showing how President Calles is establishing agricultural schools over the Republic of Mexico, teaching those poor, ignorant people who have been priest-ridden for 400 years how to farm intelligently.

This article tells how President Calles is having the Mexican Indians taught the art of intensive farming.

They have been oppressed so long and kept in ignorance and darkness so long that they will not plant their crops, they will not plow the ground, they will not hit a lick of farm work until the Roman Catholic priest comes to every fellow's farm and pronounces a blessing on the ground to be planted. Until that is done, they believe that it will not produce; and the Indians go out and toil in various ways to get money to pay the priest to bless the soil in order that the earth may yield its increase.

Think of that, Senators! Priests claiming to speak in the name of the Son of God holding up these poor Indians in Mexico and taking money from them, charging a fee to permit the soil to produce a crop. And the Indians are taught to believe that the soil will not produce until a priest has blessed the ground. God help Mexico in her efforts to be forever delivered from such ignorance and miserable holdups by Roman Catholic priests.

A United States Senator now in or close about this body told me that he was in New York some time ago, talking to a man, and they were looking out of the window of a certain building, and his friend said: "Do you see that building over there?" The Senator said, "Yes." His friend said, "I have seen piles nearly that high of the bones of Mexican peons that have been taken out of the earth and thrown there by order of the priests because their people could not raise the money to pay the charges of the priest to pray their souls out of purgatory."

So the poor are robbed and made miserable by priests who claim to speak for Him who, without money and without price, healed the sick and raised the dead to life. They ask us now to use the Army and carry on a war to restore the old Roman Catholic conditions in Mexico. The patriotic people of America will not consent to such a course.

Mr. President, I know that enough can be done down there at Nicaragua to get us involved in dangerous military activities, and when we come back here conditions will be grave indeed; but we are not going to be stampeded into war with Mexico. Remember that. When I vote for war, there will have to be just grounds for war. I think more of the welfare and safety of the boys of America, whose lives would be lost in that conflict, than I do of the Pope of Rome's program in Mexico, the oil kings' plans, and the plans of the New York citizens who own the bonds of Nicaragua.

Mr. President, I know that our country is run by politics, by political parties, and properly so. There is a wing in the Democratic Party, or there has been, known as Roman Catholics. When it has suited their purpose they have voted the Democratic ticket, and when it was to their interest they have voted the Republican ticket.

Mr. President, I am going to speak plainly. This probably will be the last speech I shall make on this subject at this session of Congress. I want the facts in the RECORD.

Some of these facts involve the most colossal and diabolical political deal ever put over in the history of our country.

Mr. President, I have told here before about seeing the Democratic convention in New York, when Al Smith and his partisan cohorts were seeking to destroy the Democratic Party. I saw them pitilessly and mercilessly stabbing the party in the back. When the convention met our chances for success in the fall election were splendid. We had a good chance to win on the record of our party as against the record of the Republican Party, and I begged them not to inject side issues into the contest that would destroy our party and its prospects. They turned a deaf ear to our appeals. They went on with their deals, and there is no doubt in my mind, and never will be, that they had a deal with Republican leaders that the Al Smith forces would vote for Cal Coolidge in the general election. I have no doubt of that. That the

plan was to elect Cal Coolidge President and Al Smith Governor of New York State is certain in my mind.

Why do I say that? Because Tammany, a Democratic organization, gave about the same majority to Cal Coolidge, a Republican, that it gave to Al Smith, a Democrat. Why did they make that deal? The Democratic convention, you remember, declined to denounce the Ku-Klux Klan, as the Roman Catholics under Al Smith leadership were asking it to do.

The Republican convention at Cleveland, Ohio, had refused to say a word on the subject, and when a company of priests called on Mr. Coolidge, the story goes, and told him that John Davis had denounced the klan in a speech up in New Jersey, and that he should come out and denounce it, that he told them that he never made a chatterbox out of his mouth about things that were not in the platform. He would not say anything at all on the subject, so why should the Roman Catholics vote for him?

Listen, Senators. They did vote for him. He got the Roman Catholic vote of the United States. I am not charging that Mr. Coolidge personally had anything to do with it, but some of those who managed his campaign and controlled the Republican machinery negotiated the deal. And the interests of Roman Catholics in Mexico was at the bottom of the deal, and in my judgment the secret promise by somebody close to those in authority that this Government would sever diplomatic relations with Mexico was the thing that caused those Roman Catholics who claim to be Democrats to vote for Mr. Coolidge.

If it is agreed that diplomatic relations with Mexico are to be severed, we will give the Roman Catholic vote to Mr. Coolidge. Senators, I am speaking my mind very frankly. I believe that deal was made. The plan was to elect Al Smith President, and when that failed they made a deal with Republican leaders to vote for Mr. Coolidge. A Democratic paper in Pennsylvania said in an editorial that Senator HEFLIN had caught Mr. Coolidge fishing for a third term in Roman Catholic waters. Have I? Is Mr. Sheffield the proper man to represent us in Mexico at this particular time? He comes from New York. He is an able lawyer, I am told, but has no talent for the work he has in hand. Mr. Herring, who has been in Mexico a great deal, says Sheffield does not understand the Mexican people. He says they are emotional and childish—many of them. He suggests, and properly, I think, that we should send somebody who does understand them, and who is in sympathy with them.

Mr. Kellogg is not now handling the situation in the right way. He is fumbling and blundering all the time. Why does the President continue to keep him in the office of Secretary of State? Those are questions that the American people are entitled to have answered. Why have we sent troops and battle-ships down to Nicaragua? What business is it of ours to meddle with the local affairs of a foreign government? Have the oil kings of the United States, the owners of the Nicaragua bonds, and the Knights of Columbus induced that course?

I know this, that the Knights of Columbus are still insisting on their policy. They are still sending their lecturers through the country. They are still flooding the South with their propaganda about affairs in Mexico. Why all this? What are these continued and persistent activities for if they have not some understanding with somebody in authority?

I told the Senate what that Roman Catholic editor said in Buffalo, N. Y. He said, "Will the President do the 'work cut out for him'—mark those words; I commented on them before—"or will he pass it on to another administration?" In other words, if he refuses to use the United States Government and its Army to carry out the Roman Catholic program in Mexico, he will bring down upon his head the political wrath of the Roman Catholics of the United States.

The Bible says:

My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.

The American people are entitled to have the truth on this particular subject.

Over in Ezekiel the Bible says, in substance:

He who sees the sword approaching and gives not warning, I shall hold him responsible for the blood that is shed.

Mr. President, in spite of what may come after Congress adjourns, I shall feel that I did my duty. I am going to tell you in a minute of some strange doings, not only in this country but in a foreign country, working with those in authority in this Government.

War clouds are seen in the vicinity of Nicaragua and war signs are multiplying in the press of the country as Congress nears adjournment. The foundation for war with Mexico has been laid since Al Smith and his followers sought to kill the Democratic Party in 1924, and finished the job, so far as they were concerned, when they turned traitor to it and struck it down in New York State and voted the Republican ticket. Then

they talk about putting Al Smith at the head of the great Democratic Party. I can beat him, and I am in no sense a candidate. Talk about running him for President! He will never be nominated by the Democratic Party. God forbid!

I am not going to mince words on this subject. Al Smith is a "wet." As Governor of New York he nullified the Federal law, so far as his State was concerned. He approved a statute which declared in effect, "We have no sympathy with and no support for the eighteenth amendment." Nobody can truthfully deny that.

Al Smith as governor slapped the Nation in the face when he approved the act of the New York Legislature nullifying the eighteenth amendment. He helped to split the Democratic Party and tear it to pieces in the convention in New York in 1924 and then helped to defeat it at the polls in the national election.

What were some of the things back of all that? I have not the slightest doubt that armed intervention in Mexico was one of them. But Congress alone can declare war, thank God. Things were shaping rapidly for war with Mexico. The Roman Catholic editor of Buffalo, N. Y., predicted we would be in Mexico by the 1st of June. The thing was ready, I am telling you; the war stage was all set, the war triggers were ready to be touched off, American blood was about to be shed at the instance of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Knights of Columbus, all because the Roman Catholic Church had been driven from control of the Mexican Government.

Mr. President, I love the Democratic Party, I love its clean and honorable history, its traditions, tenets, and principles; but I would denounce my party if I found it truckling to any power that led in the direction of these dangerous and deadly evils. All those who do not want to remain in the Democratic Party with that plain and unmistakable understanding may shake the dust off their feet and get out of the Democratic Party. Patriotic Americans should see to it in the future that those Roman Catholics who are swayed and controlled by considerations of the "Roman Catholic hierarchy" do not hold the balance of power and cast the deciding vote and elect as President the man most friendly and favorable to the Roman Catholic program.

In part, that program is: Opposition to the American public-school system, opposition to the laws of the United States that restrict immigration, and opposition to the American doctrine of the separation of church and state. Let me read from Roman Catholic sources some of the doctrines, plans, and purposes of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. In the Boston News-Evening Transcript, September 10, 1924, in statement from Rome by Associated Press, the Pope said, with regard to politics, that it was not only his right but his duty to give directions and indications to be followed by Catholics.

Listen to these statements, Senators:

[From the Syllabus of Pius IX, issued December 8, 1864]

The state has no right to leave every man free to profess and embrace whatever religion he shall deem true.

It has not the right of the entire direction of the public schools.

The [Roman Catholic] Church has the right to require the state not to leave every man free to profess his own religion.

She has the right to deprive the civil authority of the entire government of the public schools.

She has the right of perpetuating the union of church and state.

She has the right to require that the [Roman] Catholic religion shall be the only religion of the state to the exclusion of all others.

The supreme duty of Catholics is to obey the Pope and seek in every way, and especially the ballot, to render the Catholic policy effective in this country. (Quoted from the Catholic World, New York, July, 1870.)

Dollinger, himself an ardent Roman Catholic and one of the greatest papal churchmen Germany has produced since the days of Martin Luther, tells us what such base superstition means. His message to Americans is well worth pondering: "I wonder if they understand in America what an infallible Pope means; that it means a hand stretched over into the United States and laid upon every Roman Catholic citizen, imposing upon him the obligation to set himself up in opposition to the ordinances of your Government whenever the Pope shall pronounce his judgment against those ordinances on moral or religious grounds." (Washington in the Lap of Rome, pp. 253-254.)

I admit the Pope can absolve Catholics from allegiance to the form of government under which they reside. (Priest McDermott, in a sermon in Philadelphia, April 15, 1894.)

The will of the Pope is the supreme law of all lands. (Archbishop John Ireland, St. Paul, Minn.)

In 1857 the Pope declared the laws of Mexico as not binding, and the citizens be absolved from all obedience to the ruler of the country. (Paris dispatch in the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald, March 28, 1915.)

Tell us we are Catholics first and Americans or Englishmen afterwards; of course we are. Tell us in the conflict between the church and the civil government we take the side of the church; of course we do. Why, if the Government of the United States were at war with the church, we would say to-morrow, To hell with the Government of the United States; and if the church and all the governments of the world were at war, we would say, To hell with all the governments of the world. * * * Why is it that in this country, where we have only 7 per cent of the population, the Catholic Church is so much feared? She is loved by all her children and feared by everybody. Why is it the Pope has such tremendous power? Why, the Pope is the ruler of the world. All the emperors, all the kings, all the princes, all the presidents of the world are as these altar boys of mine. The Pope is the ruler of the world. (Priest Phelan in Western Watchman, June 27, 1912.)

* * * If the American Republic is to be sustained and preserved at all, it must be by the rejection of the principle of the reformation (church and state separation) and the acceptance of the Catholic principle by the American people. (See The Papacy and the Civil Power, pp. 172, 173.)

All Catholics should exert their power to cause the constitutions of the States to be modeled to the principles of their church. (Pope Leo XIII, November 7, 1890.)

When a Catholic candidate is on the ticket and the opponent is a non-Catholic, let the Catholic candidate have the vote, no matter what he represents. (Catholic Review, July, 1894.)

A priest can not be forced to give testimony before a secular judge. (Taberna, a papal theologian, vol. 2, p. 288.)

The Roman Catholic citizens of the United States owe no allegiance to any principles of the Government which are condemned by the Pope. (The Tablet (R. C.))

Undoubtedly it is the intention of the Pope to possess this country. In this intention, he is aided by the Jesuits and all the Catholic prelates and priests. (Dr. O. A. Bronson (Catholic writer).)

Many non-Catholics fear us as a political organization and are afraid that the Catholic Church will dominate and rule; we are working quietly, seriously, and I may say effectively, to that end. (June number, 1909, of The Missionary (R. C.), p. 69.)

The Church of Rome is one monarchy over all the kingdoms, as the mind and soul of the body of a man, or as God in the world. Therefore, the Church of Rome must not only have the spiritual power, but also the supreme temporal power. (Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, 1879.)

We can have the United States in 10 years, and I want to give you three points for your consideration, * * * the Indians, the negroes, and the common schools. (Archbishop Ireland.)

There has never been a period in American history when the church's opportunity has been so close to her. To a great extent the ancient antagonisms have died. Protestantism is disintegrating before our eyes. The moment is ripe to build a Catholic America, and the strong men are now laying the foundations. (The World (Catholic).)

The boast of the Roman Catholic Church is that it never changes. It must not be forgotten that the present Pope and each of his predecessors have affirmed and reaffirmed the decrees, bulls, and edicts of every former Pope.

Cursed be those cunning and infamous societies which call themselves "Bible societies" and which give the Bible to the inexperienced youth. (Pope Pius IX.)

The New York World in November, 1895, published a news item of the burning of eight heretics at Texacapa, Mexico, two of the victims being women, one with a child in her arms, the offense being the reading of the Bible.

Let the public-school system go to where it came from, the devil. (Freeman's Journal, November 16, 1869.)

It will be a glorious day in this country when, under the laws, the school system will be shivered to pieces. (Catholic Telegraph.)

We would rather our children should grow up in ignorance of letters than be taught in a school that is not Catholic. (Catholic Review.)

I do not consider that we are doing our duty as American citizens, to ourselves, or to our children in permitting such a system of public schools to exist as we have to-day. (Professor Dunne, of the Jesuit College, Washington, D. C.)

It must have been hard on General Miles, when he stood in the stand for the unveiling of the Columbus statue in Washington, to see the Knights of Columbus pass by in parade. The swords of the fourth-degree men must have convinced him that the order is but waiting the opportunity to cut a path for the Pope into the White House. (From The Tablet, a Roman Catholic paper published in Washington City, June 15, 1912, and again November 11, 1916.)

When the church needed armed men to enlist as crusaders the young men of the church shouldered the musket and saber and obeyed the orders of the church. When the church wanted to get rid of the Saracens the faithful arose en masse and extinguished them. The church may have to call on you to defend her rights in this country, and I know the young men will obey the church and take up arms to exterminate the enemies of the Roman Catholic Church. (Priest Menard. See Detroit Journal, November 6, 1892.)

We call upon the clergy everywhere to organize the laity, male and female, old and young, into secret societies, and that the men and boys may have competent instructors to give them military training, that they may be prepared to aid and sustain our faith in an emergency. (Exhortation of Pope Leo XIII, quoted from the Christian, July, 1914.)

Now, Mr. President, I want to read an address delivered in this city a few nights ago by Bishop Cannon:

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN ROMANISM AND THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT
By Bishop James Cannon, jr.

Why should there be so much discussion of this question in the United States of America? First: Because the provisions of the Mexican constitution are quite unusual and in some respects very different from those of the United States on this question of the relation of church and state.

Second. Because the leaders of Roman Catholicism in this country and their obedient, not to say subservient and fanatical, followers, have not only bitterly denounced these provisions and the enforcement of them, and have not only appealed to our State Department to intervene with the Mexican Government, but have actually gone so far as to introduce through a loyal son of Romanism, and most aggressively to support a resolution in Congress asking for the withdrawal of recognition of the present Mexican Government and the entire severance of diplomatic relations with Mexico because the present government is enforcing these provisions of the Mexican constitution which apply to the property, priesthood, and activities of the Romish Church.

Third. Because many Protestant church bodies have been carrying on missionary work in Mexico for the past 50 years extending from the Rio Grande to Yucatan and these provisions of the Mexican constitution concerning the relation of church and state directly affect the form and scope of these missionary activities.

Separation of church and state, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, equality of all before the law are so recognized as essentials of free government by American citizens that present conditions in Mexico can not be properly appraised by the average American citizen without accurate knowledge of the historical facts behind the present situation. It must be agreed that if they are taken apart from the historical setting some of the constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, and administrative decrees concerning religious rights, privileges, and activities in Mexico are unusual, even drastic. But this very fact compels most careful examination for the reasons for these decrees, especially in view of the fact that probably over 90 per cent of the Mexican people are at least nominal Romanists. These reasons must be sought and found from the record of the activities of the Roman Catholic hierarchy as a body (not of the activities of a small proportion of genuinely consecrated missionary priests) in Mexico during the past 400 years, which record Pius XI declared in his apostolic letter of February 2, 1926, to have been a "praiseworthy record."

WHAT ARE THE FACTS

The provisions of the Mexican laws, which are the cause of the present religious agitation and discussion, refer to property rights, religious education, foreign priesthood, freedom of religion, freedom of press, and exemption of the priesthood from the control of the civil authorities including the courts.

For over 350 years the Mexican people lived under the practically unrestrained domination of Roman Catholicism supported by the

Spanish court. The Romish Church had it within its power to write the history of Mexico as it would, and in fact did write it. The church had the opportunity to show what it could do with a good native stock in a country with unlimited natural resources. It could have taught the Indians to read and write, to build comfortable, clean, sanitary houses. It could have preached the gospel of truth, honesty, chastity, and set an example of high moral character. What did it do? It did build great and beautiful cathedrals and lavished millions of dollars in the decoration of them and upon the shrines, images, altars, and vestments therein. It did multiply costly churches throughout the country, in some sections building one on each great estate (the money for all this work being extorted in devious ways from the poor, superstitious people who frequently spent their entire earnings for masses, baptisms, marriages, and other charges made by the priesthood, these extortions leaving the people hopelessly in debt). The church did develop over 1,000 parishes with over 20,000 ecclesiastics of various grades. It did develop over 200,000, and 50 convents and monasteries with over 8,000 inmates vowed to celibacy, over 150 missions, and 18 male and 20 female orders. It did collect multitudinous tithes; it did compel the superstitious people to pay large fees for baptisms, marriages, masses, absolution, etc. It did receive or exact large gifts and bequests from those eager to receive absolution from their sins in order to escape purgatory, and from miserable, terrified, superstitious, dying wretches who hope to purchase a chance for the eternal safety of their souls by making the church heir to their earthly treasures. It did secure for the Archbishop of Mexico \$65,000 annual income and for the other Bishops incomes from \$10,000 up to \$50,000 yearly. It did accumulate such a vast amount of property that in the official report of the government about 1850, it was conservatively estimated that the church owned either directly or controlled indirectly over one-third of the material assets of the country in lands, houses, mortgages, etc., so that in some cities it was held that the church either owned or controlled indirectly one-half of the houses.

Yet with all this great wealth of the church the masses of the people lived in poverty, miserably housed, half fed, and half clothed, and while there were some good schools for the favored few, not over 1 per cent of the people could read and write in 1810, the year in which the native-born Mexican priest Hidalgo raised the standard of independence for Mexico, of freedom from Spanish Roman Catholic rule.

THE CONFLICT FOR THE LAND

There can be no proper appraisal of conditions in Mexico without a full recognition of the grip which the church had on the land. The life of a country is in the land. Not only in Mexico but in every country sooner or later, as in England, France, Russia, etc., the conflict for the land is inevitable on the part of the people. The great struggle between the church and the State in Mexico for the past 100 years has been itself simply a part of the determined effort of the Liberal Progressive leaders of the nation to secure the land for the people, a large proportion of the very best of which was claimed by the church as its property. Therefore the constitution of 1857 decreed the nationalization of property of the church worth over \$200,000,000, the income of which was estimated at over \$20,000,000.

It can not be too strongly emphasized that there has never been and is not to-day any purpose on the part of the Mexican Government to prevent the church from using any buildings or any property which is really necessary for carrying on the legitimate work of the Christian work. But the constitution of 1857 and the later constitution of 1917 both declare that the church is not permitted to own property, but that the title to churches and to all other ecclesiastical property is vested in the nation, the authorities of which will designate such buildings as may be necessary for the proper conduct of religious worship and activities (under this provision there is no taxation by the government upon church property). It was truthfully declared that the property accumulated by the church had been accumulated improperly from the people and that as the church claims to exist only for the good of the people to minister to them in spiritual things, and to carry on works of charity, and certainly not for the purpose of accumulating property, all buildings and lands not needed for church purposes should be restored to the government to be applied to the needs of the people. This provision of the constitution of 1857 was most bitterly fought by the Romanist at that time and the conflict has continued down to the present day.

In order to prevent the church from accumulating more property in the guise of gifts or bequests to individual priests who would in reality hold property for the church, the Mexican law forbids the making of bequest to a priest by anyone except a relative within the fourth degree, for experience has shown, as stated above, that bequests will be made by superstitious men and women on their deathbeds in fear of purgatory and eternal damnation unless they shall receive absolution and extreme unction from the ministering priest. All these present restrictions of the Mexican laws upon the holding of property by the church are based upon the 350 years of bitter experience, during which time the Romanish Church in Mexico became enormously and disgracefully rich alongside of the extreme poverty of the people. • • •

THE CONFLICT FOR FREE EDUCATION

The constitutional provisions and legislative enactments furthermore forbid that religious instruction shall be given in any schools of primary grade, whether public or private. Here again it should be strongly emphasized that the purpose of the constitution and of the Mexican Government has not been and is not to-day to prevent the giving of religious instruction to children as has been falsely declared by the Romish authorities. But because in the private schools conducted by the Romish Church, the Government has found that the children are positively persistently taught that the national laws concerning the relations of church and state are declared by Pope Pius XI to be "wicked laws," not to be obeyed by Roman Catholics; especially, for this reason, the Government forbids the teaching of primary schools by any ministers of religion or members of religious orders, or any religious instruction in any primary schools. Note carefully that the religious instruction of children in the secondary grade are in the churches or in any buildings entirely separate from the school buildings has never been forbidden and is not forbidden to-day.

In our own country religious instructions is not permitted in public schools, but is permitted in private schools, and under ordinary conditions the prohibition of such instruction in private schools is unwarranted and improper. But if in the private schools in our own country children were taught that they should despise the Constitution of the United States and that the Pope had declared that our American laws were "wicked laws," as the Pope has declared concerning the laws of Mexico, it might be more easily understood by us why the Mexican Government refuses to permit religious instruction of young children in primary schools devoted primarily to secular education by those who openly declare that their paramount allegiance is to the authority of the Pope, who has denounced the laws of the country as wicked laws.

Furthermore, it is to be noted at this point that the constitution of Mexico has since 1857 positively forbidden the existence in Mexico of any religious order, the purpose being that no citizen can take any pledge such as is required by religious orders which limits his freedom as a citizen of the state to follow his own convictions and which binds him to obey the commands of his ecclesiastical superiors, whether those commands agree to the laws of the state or with his own convictions or otherwise. All nuns, sisters, monks, or brothers who have been giving religious instructions in primary schools in Mexico have been, therefore, guilty of a double violation of the Mexican law.

THE CONFLICT WITH FOREIGN PRIESTHOOD

The Mexican law furthermore forbids any one but a "Mexican by birth to exercise the ministry," which has been interpreted by President Calles to be the "performance of ritualistic acts." This restriction, apart from the historical background, can not, of course, be recognized for one moment as binding upon the conscience of any Christian who decides that it is part of his duty to carry out the command of Jesus Christ to preach the gospel to every creature. And there can be no possible compromise on the question of the right of every Christian to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation everywhere. So far as the question of principle is involved, no Christian can accept the sovereignty of any earthly ruler as superior to the rule of his Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, but there is not simply a question of principle involved in the handling of this Mexican problem, but an important question of expediency. For the reason for this restriction in the Mexican law is very evident to the student of history, even though it may be fully agreed that such a restriction can not be permanently accepted by the church of Jesus Christ. It is to be noted, however, that the proclamation of the gospel by Mexican ministers or by laymen of any nationality is not restricted.

The kernel of this whole question is found in the fact that the religious life of Mexico has been absolutely and arrogantly dominated by a foreign priesthood which has been largely Spanish but with some Italian and French priests. When the constitution of 1857 was adopted, it must be remembered that there was no church in Mexico except the Roman Catholic Church. Indeed all other churches were positively prohibited by the constitution. The church hierarchy was Spanish to the core until the independence of Mexico in 1820. The native priesthood with rare exceptions was given little consideration by the ranking church authorities. There was a constant drain of money from the poor natives of Mexico to the Vatican treasury. Millions upon millions of pesos which should have been spent by the church upon the poor Mexicans were sent yearly out of the country. These influential, dominating foreign priests were as President Calles has said "the traditional enemy of the Republic." When the cry for independence was raised by the Mexican-born priest Hidalgo, the hierarchy not only refused to take any part in the effort to free Mexico from Spain, but the priest Hidalgo was excommunicated and bereft of his church relationship by the ecclesiastical authorities before he was executed as a traitor. In every period during the struggle for independence of the past hundred years the Romish hierarchy controlled by the foreign priesthood has opposed the republican form of government. It supported the imperial pretensions of Iturbide. It favored the reactionary movement under Santa Anna and then openly and desperately fought Juarez—a native-born Indian, but trained in the church for the

priesthood—and all his reform laws. Finally, when Juárez realized that there could be no free government in Mexico until foreign-inspired clerical interference and domination were absolutely overthrown, and so deliberately incorporated in the constitution of 1857 the epoch-making provision stripping the church of its ill-gotten wealth for the benefit of all the people and abolishing the legal existence in Mexico of religious orders, convents, and monasteries, the Vatican itself, as to-day, joined openly in the conflict and was an active participant in the effort of the foreign-led Mexican hierarchy to overthrow the government of Juárez and to place the Austrian archduke, Maximilian, upon the throne of Mexico as emperor. Furthermore, this same hierarchy fought the return of Juárez to power after the execution of Maximilian, and was in open rebellion during the Presidency of Tejada, who succeeded Juárez.

During the rule of General Díaz, the Romish hierarchy, under the leadership of its foreign priesthood, under the patronage of Señor Díaz, gradually crept back into a position of privilege and power and increased its property holdings and the number and influence of foreign priests. The hierarchy bitterly and aggressively opposed the revolution stated by Madero and his followers in 1911, and after the assassination of Madero, which, it is currently believed in Mexico, had the tacit approval if not the active cooperation of the hierarchy, it decidedly supported the usurper Huerta until his overthrow by Carranza.

It is this continuous record—not "praiseworthy," as Pope Pius XI asserts but shameful—of the active hostility of the clergy (led especially by the foreign element) to the republican form of government for over a hundred years and the efforts of the clergy to use its tremendous power over the ignorant, superstitious people and to teach the children in the schools that the laws of the country are "wicked laws," are not approved by the Pope, and therefore must be opposed by all faithful Catholics—it is this record which impelled the framers of the present constitution to add to the provision of 1857 the more drastic provision of 1917, which provision forbids anyone except a Mexican by birth to exercise the ministry; that is, as President Calles says, "to perform ritualistic confessional acts."

TO PREVENT COMPLICATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

President Calles, in his letter in reply to the apostolic letter of the Pope, stated that it was "especially necessary, in view of the possibility of the new intrusion of the Mexican Catholic clergy in matters of a temporal character, to insure the exclusion of foreign elements not allowed as ministers of religion by the constitution, since these elements, precisely because of being foreigners, could import to the indicated problem only more serious and difficult characteristics." That is to say, the Mexican Government claims that the administration of the religious laws of the country is a purely domestic problem, and it does not desire to become involved in complications with the governments of other countries arising from the unlawful criminal acts of priests of other than Mexican nationality in opposing and trying to overthrow the constitution.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that President Calles makes a clear-cut distinction between "ritualistic acts" and "the strictly confessional work of their religion" on the one hand and merely "performing acts of religion" on the other, and this distinction is of vital importance from the religious as well as from the political viewpoint. The Mexican Government fully understands, as does every impartial student of history, that prayer, singing, exhorting are not the weapons used by Roman Catholicism in the accomplishment of its political purposes. Confession, absolution, penance, the mass, extreme unction, the power over purgatory and hell and heaven—these "ritualistic acts" have been the weapons of Romanism in controlling the activities of its followers and in securing large political power and great properties for the church in every country and in every age. The Mexican constitution does not forbid the performance of "ritualistic acts" by Mexicans, but only by foreign priests, holding that experience has demonstrated that this discrimination is justifiable; that while foreign priests will be dominated absolutely by the Vatican and think of Mexico simply as a province of the church as they have done in the past and will endeavor to send as much money as possible out of the country for the Vatican treasury, the Mexican priests will be greatly influenced by love of country, by the views of their friends and kindred, and will naturally prefer to cooperate with their Government as far as possible in its efforts to develop their own country and to advance the prosperity and the enlightenment of their own people.

THE CONFLICT FOR POLITICAL CONTROL

The additional provision prohibiting the participation by the priesthood in political activities of any kind is also based upon the teaching of experience. The constitution forbids priests to hold office, to vote, or to criticize in any way the acts of the Government. This is admittedly a drastic provision, but whoever reads the history of Mexico since the incoming of the Spaniards will recognize that the pernicious political activities of the priesthood are alone responsible for this drastic prohibition.

Other countries have been compelled to expel the Jesuits, and to restrict and to curtail the political activities of various church orders. It can not be too strongly emphasized that the Vatican distinctly claims

the right to a voice in the temporal affairs of nations. The Pope compelled the German Emperor in other days to stand for three days in the snow at Cannosa, and he claims exactly the same power to-day.

The policy of Rome can be summed up in a single sentence. The Roman Catholic Church demands tolerance in every country where it can not absolutely control the government of that country, but it has practiced intolerance in every country where it has ever had control, and it does so now, to-day, in this twentieth century. Up to the time of the constitution of 1857 the Catholic Church demanded that the constitution of Mexico should provide, "Article III: Constitution 1824—the religion of the Mexican nation is and will perpetually be the Roman Catholic apostolic. The nation will protect it by wise and just laws and prohibit the exercise of any other whatever." The constitution of 1842 provided, "Article II: The nation professes the Roman Catholic apostolic religion and will not tolerate public exercise of any other." "Article 31: There shall be no other legal privileges than those conceded to the ecclesiastics and the military." (Which means that the Roman Catholic clergy were entirely exempt from the administration of the civil law and were amenable only to the church courts.)

This constitutional provision of the Mexican law in 1824 and 1846, forbidding the exercise of any but the Roman Catholic religion, has been and is the fixed policy of Romanism in every age and in every country where it has power to enforce its policy. It was its policy in every country of South America, down into the nineteenth century, and in Peru until very recently, and the priests stir up the people to persecute Protestants in every country of Latin America. Even to-day in Austria the Methodist Church is not allowed recognition as a church by the Roman Catholic controlled government.

In Poland, notwithstanding the pact of the League of Nations providing for freedom of worship to all minorities, the Methodist Church has not yet been able to secure recognition as a church from the Roman Catholic controlled government. The Roman Catholic hierarchy, heading up in the Vatican, has opposed freedom of worship and greatly hampered the activities of Protestant bodies in Spain, Portugal, and Italy. It does not favor freedom of worship or freedom of the press in any country except in countries where it can not control the government. But the Pope now denounces as "wicked laws" the laws which Mexico has enacted to protect herself from Romish domination, although this same Pope and all other Popes demand far more drastic, even prohibitory, laws against Protestants whenever they have the power!

THE CONFLICT OF 1857

To sum up the great conflict in 1857, it was a conflict between two distinct platforms. The Roman Catholic Church demanded a constitution which would provide for the absolute inviolability of church property and revenue and the reestablishment of all former monetary exactions; the reestablishment of rights of the priesthood to exemption from civil law; the Roman Catholic religion to be the sole and exclusive religion of Mexico; church censorship of the press; immigrants to come only from Roman Catholic countries; and a central dictatorship subservient to the church only, or a monarchy to be established if possible. As opposed to this program of Roman Catholic intolerance, Juárez and his followers demanded that a constitutional federal government be established; freedom and protection to slaves; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; immigration from all countries encouraged; the military and the priesthood to be under the control of the civil powers; nationalization of all church property not necessary for purposes of worship (worth at the lowest estimate \$200,000,000, with an income of \$20,000,000, which was being paid into the coffers of the church in addition to all the other money which the church received).

The estimate published by the Government officials of the income of the church at that time amounted to \$9,000,000 income from real estate; \$22,000,000 from interest and revenues from all properties; contributions, so called, but in reality forced payment for baptisms, marriages, penances, gifts, etc., \$32,000,000; other contributions, \$1,500,000—total, \$64,500,000.

The conflict was bitter and bloody and lengthy, but the Romish hierarchy was defeated, the constitution of 1857 was adopted, and it remains to-day as the charter of Mexican liberty, wrung by Juárez and his followers from a rapacious and intolerant church. Is it not proper to ask at this point whether the demands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in 1857 for censorship of the press, for prohibition of freedom of religion, for freedom of exemption from civil law, for the continued holding of over one-third of the property of the nation, were not far more to be condemned than is the present constitution of Mexico which provides for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, liability of priesthood to civil law, distribution of the ill-gotten enormous wealth of the church for the benefit of the people, and free immigration from other than Roman Catholic nations? But did Romanists in the United States or anywhere else, in 1857 or since, denounce the Romish Church in Mexico for its violent opposition to religious freedom and a free press in Mexico in 1857? Verily, they did not, and they have never denounced Romish intolerance in any age or country. Then why this clamor against Mexican law to-day?

A quotation from the historian Bancroft is given here concerning the conditions which prevailed in 1857, and which would be perpetuated

to-day if the Romanish hierarchy had been allowed to control or should be allowed once again to control in Mexico.

"The clergy systematically opposed the Government; were hostile to religious toleration, to freedom of thought, and to a free expression of the press. They objected strenuously to equality before the law; they made war against civil marriages and registrations; they opposed foreign colonization and public or any other education unless it was wholly under ecclesiastical control. They demanded every aid and support from the laws and Government, and yet disallowed all subjection or responsibilities to them; they had large pecuniary resources which they used freely to accomplish their end, constantly availing themselves likewise of the low elements of ignorance and superstition.

"When the Federal Constitution was adopted in 1857 the church forbade the people to take oath to support it on the ground that it contained articles hostile to their religion and the church, such as the article establishing freedom of public instruction; the article proclaiming man's inalienable right of freedom, which was not to be curtailed by reason of labor, education, or monastic vows; the article on free speech and free press; the article declaring ecclesiastical corporations incompetent to hold or to administer real estate; and finally and particularly, because it omitted to designate the Roman Catholic Church as the church of the State."

Personally, the writer is of the opinion, which is shared by very many others, first, that when the provisions of the Mexican law concerning religious rights and activities are judged by the records of the activities of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Mexico during the past 400 years, it is evident that the Mexican people have been obliged to adopt these provisions to protect the Government from disintegration and overthrow as a result of the political activities of the Roman Catholic Church.

Second. That there has been no persecution of either Roman Catholics or Protestants by the present Mexican Government. The Government has simply required that both Roman Catholics and Protestants shall obey the constitutional and legislative provisions clearly laid down in the Mexican laws. Punishment for refusal to obey the law of the country is not persecution. When priests or nuns refuse to obey that law and are punished that is not persecution, but the maintenance of the law of the land.

Third. There is no purpose manifested by the Government to prohibit the religious instruction of children or to prohibit public worship. The Government does prohibit religious instructions by priests or ministers or members of any religious order, or in primary schools, as subversive of the idea of compulsory education of all the children entirely free from denunciation of the constitution and of the Government by Roman Catholic teachers.

The past record of the Roman Catholic Church on education of the masses amply justifies the attitude of the Government and its determination to establish and maintain a primary system of education absolutely free from Romish control. As noted above, in 1810, after 300 years of Roman Catholic domination, while there were some good schools for the favored few, yet less than 1 per cent of the population could read and write, and the result of the policy of the Romish Church in every country where it has had control has been to keep the masses of the people in comparative ignorance.

Comparing the standards which prevail in the United States of the entire separation of church and state, of freedom of worship, of freedom of the press, of freedom of religious education in private schools (all of which has been characteristic of our Government from the beginning)—comparing these conditions with the conditions which the liberal progressive element of the Mexican people have been obliged to face for nearly 400 years because of the intolerance of the Roman Catholic Church, it is not surprising that the Mexican people, who, again be it noted, are over 90 per cent nominal Roman Catholics, should demand the enforcement of the constitution and laws which they have adopted to remedy evils from which they have suffered for centuries at the hands of a largely foreign-controlled Roman Catholic hierarchy.

The cry that there is religious intolerance in Mexico is raised only by those who have always upheld and practiced religious intolerance throughout the world whenever able to enforce their will and who are fighting the Mexican Government to-day in order to regain control of the country, and who, should they secure control as before, would prohibit the recognition of any other religion except Romanism, just as is done in Austria and Poland to-day.

ROMANIST ACTIVITY IN UNITED STATES

As indicated in the beginning of this statement, the action of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States has intensified the discussion of this question. Hardly had the Mexican Romish hierarchy defied the Mexican Government to enforce the Mexican laws concerning church and state than the hierarchy in the United States entered the fray. Archbishop Curley, of Baltimore, impertinently and in the most arrogant Romish fashion denounced the President of the United States because he extended regular and suitable courtesies to high officials of the Mexican Government. The American Catholic press editorially shrieked denunciation and vilification of the Mexican Government and printed in its columns similar attacks from the Romish leaders. Dele-

gations of Romanists visited the Secretary of State to appeal for official condemnation by our State Department of the administration of the religious laws of Mexico.

At last, when it was thought that the time was ripe, on March 11, Representative BOYLAN, "a loyal son of the church" from Romish-Tammany-ruled New York City, introduced a resolution in Congress, as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President should forthwith withdraw diplomatic recognition of the Government of Mexico until such time as the policies and conduct of the said Government in relation to educational and religious institutions of all creeds and nationalities justify a resumption of relations."

One would imagine from reading this resolution that other creeds than Roman Catholicism were demanding this action. But they were not.

And when, on March 30 and 31, hearings were held by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, it was evident to all present that the resolution was proposed at the instigation of the Romanists of the United States, who were endeavoring to use the United States governmental agencies to overthrow the present Mexican Government because that Government was requiring the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Mexico to comply with the laws of Mexico.

A flood of telegrams, letters, and petitions, practically all from American Roman Catholics, were received demanding action by our Government; that is, the withdrawal of recognition, the severance of diplomatic relations, the lifting of the embargo on arms; all were demanded for the one purpose of overthrowing the present Mexican Government.

It is a remarkable fact that after the hearing had been held the committee decided, for reasons best known to itself, not to print the hearings, and the writer has not been able, therefore, to see the testimony printed in an official report, as is usually the case. But Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama, demanded to see the record of the testimony and had part of it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Also, at a recent public meeting in Washington, Dr. H. E. Woolever, the director of the Methodist Press Bureau in Washington, stated that he was present at the hearing, and he reported some of the testimony, part of which is quoted here.

Mr. C. W. Darr, a prominent lawyer of Washington, testified:

"I appear before you to-day representing his grace the Most Rev. Michael J. Curley, Archbishop of Baltimore" (the one who so boorishly and brazenly attacked the President of the United States for extending official courtesies to Mexican officials). "I might say without fear of contradiction that I also represent 8 cardinals and 10 archbishops in the United States, in addition to 25,000 American Catholic priests, and also more than 20,000,000 Catholic laymen in the United States."

Rev. Father M. J. Ripple, secretary of the Holy Name Society, testified:

"I am the national director of the Holy Name Society, which enjoys a membership of 6,500 organizations, with a total membership of about 2,000,000 men. The men of the Holy Name Society have instructed me to register their protest against the laws of Mexico; against recognition by this Government of Mexico."

Doctor Woolever stated that resolutions were introduced from many official groups of the Knights of Columbus, and he presented one showing their nature:

"Whereas the Government of the United States has admitted Mexico and its Government into the circle of international friendship and continues to recognize this Government in spite of its indecent acts toward priests and sisters of the Catholic Church and its efforts to destroy the Catholic Church in Mexico; and

"Whereas decent liberty-loving citizens of the United States can hope for no relief from this unjust and degrading spectacle from this or any other administration in Mexico, because the persecution of Catholics and the plan to destroy the Catholic Church in Mexico is provided for in provisions of the Mexican constitution of 1917, which Mexican officials say they are merely enforcing:

"Resolved by the Knights of Columbus of Maryland, That we, as citizens of the United States, do earnestly protest against continued recognition of this Government of Mexico."

Why have not the delicate sensibilities of these Knights of Columbus been outraged by the urgent and degrading spectacle of the effort to hamper or entirely to prevent the activities of the Y. M. C. A. or of the Methodist Church in Romish-controlled countries?

Hon. Alfred J. Talley presented the protest of the Roman Catholic clubs of New York City. Mother Semple, who was introduced as a star witness, stated, however, with some degree of pride, that she had not been expelled from Mexico, but that she was unwilling to comply with the law and therefore left the country; and she declared that, if the United States Government should withdraw recognition from any government in Mexico, as was proposed in the Boylan resolution, it would result in the overthrow of such government.

Congressman FISH, of New York State, but not of Romanized Tammany New York City, a member of the committee, introduced a reso-

lution toward the close of the hearing, asking the State Department as to the freedom accorded to American ministers, missionaries, and teachers attached to religious schools other than Romanist in Italy and Rumania, as well as in Mexico. But, strange as it may seem to impartial persons, Mr. BOYLAN, "the loyal son of the church" from Romanist-controlled New York City, could not become indignant at the restriction imposed by Romanists upon Protestants in Italy, Austria, Poland, and elsewhere. He and his witnesses could see only that Romanism could no longer defy, but was compelled to obey, the laws of Mexico and that for Romanists to be compelled to obey the law implied such persecution and cruelty as to justify the Government of the United States in taking action likely to result in the overthrow of the present Mexican Government.

The Boylan resolution and the appeal for drastic action by our Government, made by cardinals, archbishops, priests, etc., failed, but still the Romanists would not accept defeat of their fanatical effort to overthrow the Mexican Government.

At the annual convention of the Knights of Columbus in Philadelphia on August 5, 1926, a long declaration was adopted, from which the following are quotations:

"We hereby solemnly aver that we would be neglectful of our duty if we did not register an unqualified protest against the policy of President Calles upon his recent despotic use of the armed forces of his military régime in oppressing the vast majority of the people of Mexico, who are struggling for the right to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience."

"And all this system in Mexico has been created under American auspices, sustained by American executive authority, which, in the first place, while refusing to recognize Lenin and Trotsky, have by Executive order of recognition, accepted Calles and Obregon, who are the enthusiastic supporters of the Bolshevist concept of government."

"We further point to the significance of the patronage bestowed upon these military despots by the continuance of such recognition, and particularly by the discriminating favoritism shown to Calles by the continuance of the embargo, which makes the Calles ascendancy possible."

"We call upon the President and the State Department to put an end to this ignominious contempt which has been shown by Calles to American appeals and to resolutely demand protection for American citizens and that they be treated with the same consideration and respect which is shown to Mexican citizens in this country."

"The period of 'watchful waiting' or any other such procedure is over. We, as American citizens, demand of our Government that this action be taken forthwith. Although our Government has for years emphatically refused to recognize the Soviet régime of Russia, it has continued to countenance, aid, and comfort the Bolshevist forces of Carranza, Obregon, and Calles."

"Therefore, as a pledge of our concern for our fellow Knights of Columbus of Mexico and of our determination to pursue relentlessly our campaign for the eradication of these evils at our own doorsteps, fomented and approved by the official action of our State Department, we hereby authorize our supreme board of directors to assess our membership to the extent of \$1,000,000 for a campaign of education, to the end that the politics of Soviet Russia shall be eliminated from the philosophy of American life and the ideals of liberty of conscience and democratic freedom may extend to our afflicted fellow human beings beyond the Rio Grande."

By any fair interpretation of the English language, this declaration of the Knights of Columbus is a denunciation of our Government for its continued recognition of Mexico and a demand that it withdraw recognition. Furthermore, this resolution pledges an appropriation of a million dollars to carry on this campaign against the policy of our Government, "to the end that liberty of conscience and democratic freedom may extend to our afflicted fellow human beings beyond the Rio Grande."

And the document winds up with this flamboyant note of defiance: "To this end, we pledge the support and cooperation of 800,000 men who love God, who respect lawful authority, and who, in the discharge of their duty, fear not the force of evil, either on earth or in hell."

It has been authoritatively declared recently that this declaration of the Philadelphia convention of the Knights of Columbus did not urge war with Mexico. That is probably true as to exact language. But the declaration of that convention, if it was not simply "sound and fury," does quite implicitly demand withdrawal of recognition with the hoped-for resultant of a revolution against the present Mexican Government, in which event the Knights of Columbus in Mexico are assured that they can count on the support and cooperation of 800,000 men, "who fear not the forces of evil, either on earth or in hell." It sounds very much like Saul going from Jerusalem to Damascus, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter," but the supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus, Mr. James A. Flaherty, has recently solemnly asseverated that the resolution really does not mean what it was supposed to mean. However, no Knight of Columbus up to the present time has given any reasonable interpretation of that Delphic Philadelphia declaration.

The most recent effort to explain the attitude of the American Roman Catholic Church toward this Mexican situation is the "Pastoral letter of the Catholic episcopate of the United States on the religious situation in Mexico." This letter is a disappointment to anyone who thought that these bishops would write anything which would be of value in the solution of the present difficulties. It is the plea of blind, prejudiced, one is almost compelled to say, sophistical, advocates. There is no recognition of failures on the part of the Romish Church in the four centuries of Mexican history. A few high-minded priests and monks are set forth as a fair sample of all. A few specially trained Indians are called out from the masses of multiplied millions of half-starved illiterate peons. A sample of the recklessness of the writers is found in the following paragraph on "Man's Inalienable Rights":

"Among them is the right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience. Let it be further observed that the constant and unvarying interpretation of the Federal Constitution by the courts bears out our contention that the Government exists to protect the citizen in the exercise of his natural and inalienable rights, and that it may enact no law which destroys them."

Again:

"The state must safeguard the liberty of all, so that none shall encroach upon the rights of others. But it may not rightfully hinder the citizen in the discharge of his conscientious obligations, and much less in the performance of the duties he owes to God."

Now, both of the statements above are very sound doctrine, but it really seems like amazing, brazen effrontery to use such language in a statement defending Mexican Romanism. In the first part of this article two quotations are given from the Mexican constitution which positively forbid the exercise of any religion in Mexico except the Roman Catholic religion.

And yet these American Romanist bishops attempt to impose upon the credulity of their readers as defenders of the rights of citizens to worship God in accordance with their conscientious convictions. And surely also one is compelled to ask for an explanation of the prohibition of others than Romanist churches in South America until recently, and in Austria, Poland, and parts of Spain to-day.

This criticism is not captious. It is simply impossible for the writer to reconcile the statements in this pastoral letter with indisputable facts of history extending through centuries down to this present hour. He fully appreciates many fine Christian Roman Catholics for personal piety and consecration, but the political activities of Romanism are dark and devious.

As a proof of the real position of Romanism quotations are given from a very recent book entitled "The State and the Church," published by Dr. John A. Ryan, professor of moral theology at the Catholic University of America, and Father Millar, of the Jesuit Society, printed and copyrighted by the National Catholic Welfare Council in 1924. The writer has not been able to verify these quotations personally, but Doctor Woolver read them publicly, and holds himself responsible for their accuracy. On page 32 we read:

"Pope Leo XIII declares that the state must not only have care for religion but recognize the true religion. This means the form of religion professed by the Catholic Church. It is a thoroughly logical position. If the state is under moral compulsion to profess and promote religion, it is obviously obliged to profess and promote only the religion that is true, for no individual, no group of individuals, no society, no state, is justified in supporting error or in according to error the same recognition as to truth."

Again it is declared:

"But constitutions can be changed, and non-Catholic sects may decline to such a point that the political proscription of them may become feasible and expedient. What protection would they then have against a Catholic State? The latter could logically tolerate only such religious activities as were confined to the members of the dissenting group. It could not permit them to carry on general propaganda nor accord their organization certain privileges that had formerly been extended to all religious corporations."

Here is set forth openly and baldly the Romish doctrine of the right, even the duty, of the Romish Church wherever it has the numbers and the power to prohibit the carrying on of religious activities—"propaganda" by smaller bodies. In this language is found the seed of every form of Romish intolerance, including the un-Christian, cruel, devilish, inquisition. But how can it be reconciled with all the talk in the pastoral of the Romish bishops concerning "the right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience"? It can not be reconciled. But the pastoral was written for a special purpose and must not be judged by Jesuitical standards and by the standards of candor and actual facts. When such teaching is openly set forth in print by fully accredited, responsible Roman Catholic writers, without any rebuke or repudiation by the bishops, who have issued the pastoral on Mexico, how can any value be given to the statements of that pastoral?

Finally, it is evident that the Romish hierarchy in the United States has put forth most strenuous efforts to secure the overthrow of the present Mexican Government. The revelation of the attitude of the

Romish hierarchy in the United States toward the Mexican Government is a matter of importance, but the revelation of its willingness and its determination to force our own Government to ignore international law and to interfere influentially in the matter of the domestic affairs of another nation as evidence of what might be expected did the Romanists control our Government, of what might very easily happen if "a loyal son of the church" should by any chance be in the White House with the foreign policy of the Government under his control.

Would he yield to the demands of the Pope, the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, priests, Knights of Columbus, members of the Holy Name Society, nuns, and sisters, and withdraw recognition of a foreign government on the basis of such appeals as were presented at the Boylan hearing? Or would he tell the holy father and all his subservient children in the United States from cardinals down to the last one of the 20,000,000, which Mr. Darr claimed to represent as a solid block, that the President of the United States could not yield to their fanatical clamor and interfere in the settlement of a purely domestic problem of another nation? Which course would a "loyal son of the church," who obediently kneels and kisses the cardinal's ring, feel obliged to take? Would his paramount allegiance be to the Constitution of the United States or to the Pope of Rome, who has openly and aggressively relieved Romanists in many countries from their oaths of allegiance to kings and governments of which the Pope did not approve? Surely, even if it were safe, it would be an act of cruelty for the American people to elect a "loyal son of the church" to a position in which he would doubtless be faced with just such a dilemma whenever the Pope and his subservient followers thought that the interests of holy mother church demanded it.

Now, I will read an editorial from the Christian Work:

TO ROMAN CATHOLICS IN AMERICA

[A small group of Americans, distressed by the antagonisms developing on religious lines in American life, evidenced in the clashes between the Knights of Columbus and the Ku-Klux Klan, desire to avoid the brutal method of settling difference by force and hope to substitute intelligent discussion, thus lifting the whole matter to a higher plane. If there are serious differences between the two antagonistic elements, they should at least be clarified. This group believes that when each side understands the other fully a fair and just conclusion will ultimately come to the whole struggle. If Christians can not be just to each other in religious disputes, how can they hope to be so in political or international affairs? This group is made up of Protestants. They believe that Roman Catholics do not generally understand the Protestant point of view. They have accordingly addressed to Roman Catholics the following letter, expressing what Protestants very generally think.]

Roman Catholics in America, do you believe the Roman Catholic Church, so unlike the simple early Christian church of the apostles, was founded by Jesus Christ? Read your Bibles. You will find that Jesus Christ never mentioned a Pope, priest, monk, nun, nor cardinal. He never instituted the mass nor the confessional. (See lives of the apostles, Book of Acts in the Holy Bible.) This is where all Christian authority rests, in the life, words, and work of Jesus Christ Himself, and of his apostles, recorded in the Bible. Jesus said, St. John 5:39, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and these are they which testify of me." He did not tell his followers to go to a priest or a Pope to have them interpret the Scriptures for them. He said plainly, "Search the Scriptures. These are they which testify of me."

Jesus Christ washed his disciples' feet. (See St. John 13-5, in token of service.) Your Pope demands his subjects kiss his toe. The Roman Catholic Church claims that Peter was the first Pope. There is no historic proof that Peter ever was in Rome, but Paul was, as the Book of Acts and Paul's Epistles prove.

When Peter answered Jesus, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Jesus said, "On this rock," this spiritual understanding of my divinity, "will I build my church," a spiritual structure in the heart and understanding, with Christ the perpetual and living head.

Roman Catholics in America, do you really believe the Pope of Rome is Christ's vice regent on earth? Jesus never said he would appoint a representative. But he did say plainly, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end." True Christians believe this. They are aware of Christ's invisible presence and repudiate the claim that another can take His place and be head of His church. The Roman Catholic concept of Christ's church is material, whereas Jesus said plainly, "They that worship the Father (God) must worship Him in spirit and in truth," not through "graven images" before which many of you pray as to a living God.

Roman Catholics in America, do you believe a priest, often criminally sinful himself, can forgive you your sins? Jesus never taught confess to a priest. You will not find that in all the Bible. He taught, "When thou prayest enter into thy closet and pray to thy Father (God), which is in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly."

Roman Catholics in America, is it because the Roman Catholic Church with her ceremonies, her priestcraft, her saint worship, and her image

idolatry is wholly without Bible authority that she has tried to keep you from reading your Bibles, has burned the Holy Scriptures by the thousands and substituted her own prayer books instead? Does she fear lest once you become familiar with the Bible, containing the true record of the works and words of Jesus and the apostles, you will discover her deceiving claims and she will be no longer able to hold you faithful to medieval traditions which she has substituted for true Christianity?

Your Pope styles himself "Holy Father"; Jesus rebuked the rich young man who addressed him as "Good Master," and said, "Why callest thou me good; there is none good but one, that is God." Is your Pope better than Jesus Christ himself, that he should be called "Holy Father"?

Roman Catholics in America, why are you always taught to think of yourselves as "Roman Catholics," when the followers of Christ during the early church were always called Christians? The Roman Catholic Church falsely claims to be the oldest and true church. Unbiased history proves the falsity of this claim. Roman Catholics, read your histories.

The Pope has no right to ban any of them. Jesus Christ said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Is this just what your church fears—that the truth will make you free from her domination?

For the first few hundred years after Christ the term "Roman Catholic" was unknown. Gradually the dominating Roman nature appropriated to itself authority over all the other Christian churches that had been established by the apostles and arrogantly enforced its rule over them. This autocratic sway thus acquired has been extended by this self-styled Roman Catholic Church until she presumptuously claims lordship over all the earth. Jesus Christ said: "My kingdom is not of this world." The Pope of Rome says, "The world is my kingdom," and in trying to enforce this claim his armies have drenched the earth with blood.

Roman Catholics in America, do you know why Christian Americans are against the papal system? It is because they know it is deceiving, unscriptural, un-Christian, and pagan. Do you know why true American patriots are unalterably opposed to its encroachments upon our national life? Read the following statements: The Pope's admonition to his oath-bound cardinals, "To try in every way to assert, uphold, increase, and promote the rights, even temporal, the privileges, and authority of the Holy Roman Church of our Lord the Pope." Mind you, not the Holy Christian Church of our Lord, Jesus Christ, but the "Holy Roman Church of our Lord the Pope," and "to promote the increase of the state of the church, even to the shedding of blood."

The pages of Roman Church history show well this "admonition" has been obeyed.

Priest Phelan, dean of papal editors in this country, said in The Western Watchman of St. Louis, June 27, 1912, "Tell us we are Catholics first and Americans afterwards, of course we are. Tell us in the conflict between the church and the civil government we take the side of the church, of course we do. Because the Catholic Church is everything to all the Catholics of the world, they renounce all national ties when there is a question of loyalty to her."

On August 8, 1912, Priest Peter O'Callaghan, president of a Roman Catholic Union in Indiana, announced that he had a communication from the Pope that they should have nothing to do with the Prohibition Party. They have evidently obeyed his command.

Roman Catholics in America, we know that the Roman Church, because of her dangerous claim of overlordship, holds you as subjects of Rome, owing first allegiance to her.

Priest Phelan said, "Why, if the Government of the United States were at war with the church we would say, to ——— with the Government of the United States."

When Cardinal Patrick Hayes, wearing his new red robe, dyed by matching the color to human blood, was greeted by a New York regiment, he called the regiment his "very own." Where did he get his authority?

Was it from the Constitution of the United States or from the Pope of Rome?

Roman Catholics in America, we are opposed to the Church of Rome for its interference in our national affairs; for its treasonable opposition to our fixed principles of separation of church and state; and precedence of the civil authority of the state over any temporal claims of the church; for its antagonism to the American institution that is the bulwark of our national democracy and representative government, our free public schools. We are opposed to the church of Rome because we know it is its fixed and determined policy to eventually control our national life, and that it enjoins its subjects in America to aid in this accomplishment. To this end it seeks control of strategic positions in all walks of life and considers these leaders as captains in her papal army.

Finally, we are against the Roman Catholic Church because it seeks to infuse into the veins of our National and State Governments, through its "subjects" of the "reigning" Pope, its own principles of government, thus attempting to thwart what the Vatican condemns—"government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

To summarize, many Roman Catholics are unaware of the extreme claims of the Papacy, as illustrated by the following quotation, which make many Protestants fear to have a Roman Catholic as President:

[Extract from the constitution]

"Pastor Aeternus," Vatican Council, July 18, 1870, in the matter of jurisdiction:

"If anyone say that the Roman Pontiff has an office merely of inspection and direction and not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole church *not only* in matters of faith and morals but also as regards discipline and the government of the church scattered throughout the whole world; or that he has only the principal portion and not the plenitude of that supreme power; or that his power is not ordinary and immediate, as much over each and every church as over each and every pastor and believer; anathema sit."

The following main factors of discord between Roman Catholics and their fellow citizens emerge. (The Roman Catholic clergy insist upon them. How far are they necessary to true Christian faith?):

I. Refusal to recognize or cooperate with other forms of the Christian faith.

II. Claim to universal dominion and right to control the state in the interest of Roman Catholicism.

III. Refusal to recognize the American public school, and insistent upon a partisan religious form of lay education.

IV. Ignoring the fact that other Christians are just as attached to their form of Christianity, hence will be resentful of attempts to force Roman Catholicism upon them, while the position taken in American life in accordance with the previous statements inevitably produces discord.

V. An apparent desire to use the traditional American tolerance for the protection of certain marked intolences, such as nonrecognition of forms of Christian marriage except those solemnized by the Roman Catholic clergy, and insistence that all children of mixed marriages be brought up as Roman Catholic Christians.

Mr. President, in view of these principles and purposes announced by Pope and priest, does anybody doubt that it would be exceedingly dangerous to make Al Smith President now, with this Mexican situation as it is? Dangerous indeed! I would tremble for the safety of my country. It will not do.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] printed in the RECORD the other day an "inspired" article written by George Gordon Battle, formerly of North Carolina, but now a member of Tammany in New York City. The article was about Roman Catholics in the South in 1860, and how they were devoted to the South. He referred to Father Ryan's poem "The Conquered Banner."

He was a poet of marked ability.

I have not criticised the Roman Catholics of those days who lived in the South. But, Mr. President, it is a far cry from the Roman Catholic priest who sat in this gallery the other day and hissed a United States Senator from the South when he was daring to tell the truth about the efforts of the Knights of Columbus and the Roman Catholic clergy to drive this country into war with Mexico. I repeat, it is a far cry from that "outcropping" of modern Roman Catholicism to the Father Ryan of the sixties. It is a far cry from Belford, the thug priest of New York who wrote in a religious paper that I ought to be waylaid by a highwayman and attacked. Yes, Mr. President, it is a far cry from him to the Roman Catholic priest of the South 60 years ago, and a far, far cry from that Roman mob that yelled William Jennings Bryan down, and for a long time would not let him speak, in the National Democratic Convention in New York City in 1924.

The most intemperate and villainous articles, not only attacking me, but attacking Alabama, and attacking the South generally, have been written and printed by Roman Catholic correspondents and by the Roman Catholic press.

Here is a sample from one of Al Smith's friends, a Roman Catholic sheet published at Providence, R. I.:

Senator HEFLIN believes what he wants to believe, whether it is right or not. That is one of the reasons why his section of the country remains in the backwash of our civilization.

And this is the section insulted and slandered by the Roman Catholic press that is now appealed to in the Battle article printed in the RECORD by the Senator from Maryland for support for Al Smith for President.

Every southerner who takes pride in the loves, traditions, and patriotic incidents of the South will resent the Roman Catholic press's mean and slanderous attacks upon the South.

Here is another one from a Roman Catholic sheet up in New York, another one of Al Smith's friends, the Gaelic American. It says that the Democratic Party should "throw off the south-

ern yoke and appeal to the intelligence and patriotism of the North rather than to the prejudices of the South."

The Democratic Party in the South is an American party; it is the Gibraltar of the Democratic Party, and it is not for Al Smith. The Democratic Party is true to itself and its principles. The Democratic Party does not vote the ticket this year and bolt it next year, as the "party" in New York under Al Smith's leadership does.

The Nation, a magazine published here in Washington, said they could not get Al Smith to talk on the Mexican war question. Of course not. He is not going to do anything to interfere with "their" program. I read from the Nation:

Of Governor Smith's attitude in this crisis, which involves his church and his country, we have had no hint, despite Norman Thomas's effort to force him into the open. In Boston, while the usually regular Republican Herald has bravely questioned the Coolidge policy, the Democratic Post, commonly regarded as the mouthpiece of the hierarchy, has openly shrieked its support of military intervention. The position of the Knights of Columbus is well known.

The Nation has always insisted that membership in the Catholic Church should never be considered a bar to holding public office in this country. It would like to see more evidence to support its belief that [Roman] Catholic Americans put their country first. Where do the Roman Catholics of the United States stand?

Why has not Governor Smith, of the great State of New York, cried out against war with Mexico? Why is he silent upon this all-important question?

His brethren, the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus, have gone on record in favor of intervention in Mexico and a Roman Catholic Congressman from the State of New York, the State of which he is governor, introduced a resolution in the House to have intervention, to sever diplomatic relations with Mexico. Judge Talley, from his State, testified before the committee that he spoke for the lay members of the Catholic Church in New York City, and Priest Ripple, of this city, claiming to speak for 1,600,000 Roman Catholic members of the Holy Name Society, all of them were wanting intervention because of "the persecution of Roman Catholics" and the effort to destroy "the Roman Catholic Church" in Mexico.

Mr. President, ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have conscientiously advocated the things that I thought were right and opposed the things that I thought were wrong. And now, because I have been true to my oath as an American Senator and loyal to my country as an American citizen, I have been abused, villified, and slandered by Roman Catholic priests and Roman Catholic press—all because I dared to expose and denounce their concerted efforts to get us into war with Mexico. They have not, they can not disprove a thing that I have said. They are sensitive and sore because I have been American enough and bold enough to tell the Senate about their very strange conduct in regard to the Mexican situation.

Let me give you something else to think about in connection with the Roman Catholic program regarding Mexico. Bishop Curley, a Roman Catholic bishop of Baltimore, addressed the Knights of Columbus here in Washington night before last. He spoke on the Mexican situation and bitterly denounced the present Mexican Government which has been recognized by the Government of the United States. He was bitter in his denunciation of that Government and the British ambassador to the United States sat right under his nose and heard his speech.

Mr. Flaherty, head of the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus, was there. All this is, indeed, significant, Senators. Just the day before this Knights of Columbus gathering in Washington a press dispatch from Nicaragua said a British battleship had arrived, and that one of the British officers said—listen to this, Senators—"If necessary, Great Britain will recognize Diaz." They are working fast. Other influences are responding to the call of the Pope. Diaz is a Roman Catholic. He has usurped the power that he holds to-day. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has made that so plain that everybody can understand it.

The man who, under the constitution of Nicaragua, is entitled to be President has been driven from his office by force. This man Diaz is a usurper, he is a tyrant, and yet, strange to say, this Government has recognized him, and now comes Great Britain with a battleship to back up "certain people" in the United States, and saying she, too, may recognize Diaz. Listen, I repeat, he is a Roman Catholic. There in Nicaragua is where the entering wedge is to be driven to start a war with Mexico. The present British ambassador, Mr. Howard, is "a Roman Catholic." It is the first time that England, Protestant England, so far as I know, ever sent a Roman Catholic ambassador to represent her at the Capital of the

United States. Something strange, and something new under the sun. So Great Britain, broken and torn with dissensions of various kinds since the deflation policy which, with this country, she instituted in 1920 and 1921, has been driven to the extreme of having "one high in the esteem of the Pope" as an ambassador to the United States Government at Washington at this particular time. He was present the other night when Bishop Curley hurled his thunderbolts against the Mexican Government which this Government is trying to help.

The British ambassador, Mr. Howard, has been to the Pope's Vatican in Rome in the Diplomatic Service. He has been well trained for the work he is doing here. He has been ambassador to Spain, a Roman Catholic country, which was all right. So, having gone to Rome, Italy, and Spain, being well trained, he now comes here when the "Roman Catholic hierarchy" is most interested in Mexico. When did he come? He came in 1924, the same year Al Smith was "slated" for President. There were "big doings" in contemplation then. A big Roman Catholic program was scheduled—a Roman Catholic for President of the United States, a Roman Catholic ambassador here from Great Britain, and the restoration of the Roman Catholic Church to power in Mexico. Lord Cowdry, of Great Britain, had turned his oil interests in Mexico over to Secretary Mellon, member of President Coolidge's Cabinet. So Mellon, with Doheny, Doheny himself being a Roman Catholic, are in the same boat with the ambassador from Great Britain. Lord Reading, an English Jew, was a splendid ambassador from Great Britain during President Wilson's administration, and he won the admiration of President Wilson and the American people. They could not use him in their Mexican program. They are still working on their program, and the Roman Catholic hierarchy is solidly behind Al Smith for President. Wake up, Americans!

Alien hands are knocking at the door of civic control in the United States, and upon our action will depend the future well-being and safety of our free institutions.

Mr. President, I have only two or three more minutes left, but before I close I want to say that the things I have mentioned here to-day involve a deep-laid Roman Catholic plan and a far-reaching and dangerous Roman Catholic scheme. God grant that every faithful American Protestant and every loyal American Jew may reconsecrate themselves to the service of protecting and safeguarding our free institutions against all "enemies," both "foreign" and "domestic," and of holding the Government of the United States true to the purpose of its creation.

The public school, free speech, free press, civil above military authority, religious freedom, the separation of church and state, and the right to protect patriotic American citizens against an influx of undesirable foreigners—these are the seven fixed stars in the firmament of American freedom, and God forbid that we shall ever prove recreant in our obligations to protect and preserve them.

Mr. President, I shall have the newspaper articles and editorials referred to and the letters mentioned appear in the RECORD immediately following the close of my speech.

[From The Protestant, Washington, D. C., February, 1927]

SENATOR HEFLIN'S GREAT SPEECH

Not in 70 years has either House of Congress heard on its floor a declaration touching the vitals of the papal issue in domestic and international politics so clear and courageous as that delivered in the Senate January 14 by Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama.

This magazine has not always been able to approve the entire official record of Mr. HEFLIN as a Member of Congress nor as a Senator; but the great address delivered by him on the date mentioned demonstrates that, regardless of his past attitude, his eyes are now wide open, his vision clear, and his heart right on the papal issue in its relation to the United States and Mexico and Nicaragua.

That address makes him the logical man with whom to defeat the presidential ambition of the wet Roman Catholic Governor of New York. The Democracy of the Nation, especially of the South and West, should immediately mass its strength for his nomination. His speech is an immortal utterance and definitely commits him on the most vital and transcendent political issue before America and the world.

His nomination will instantly make that issue paramount in the next presidential election. It will force quick proposal and ratification of the antiforeign allegiance amendment to the Constitution of the United States. So will it settle the papal question in this country finally and forever. Read and preserve his address.

[From the Fellowship Forum]

SENATOR HEFLIN, PATRIOT AND HERO

Fair-minded and truth-loving people of America owe a debt of gratitude to Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama, the only Member of

the American Senate who has dared to speak the whole truth about our relations with Mexico and about the conspiracy to engage this country in war with the Republic south of the Rio Grande.

There have been other Senators, many of them, who have disagreed with our State Department's policy in dealing with Mexico and with Nicaragua, and have frankly said so. They have strongly and rightly criticized Mr. Kellogg and his policies, but they have not gone to the root of the trouble. They have not told of the Roman Catholic conspiracy to plunge us into war with Mexico. Only Senator HEFLIN has had the conscience and the courage, physical and political, to do that. Other Senators have denounced in a general way what has been going on, but they dodged or used weasel words when they came to discussing the real heart of the difficulty.

It was Senator HEFLIN alone who had the courage to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the damning resolution of the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus which demanded an end to our policy of "watchful waiting" with reference to Mexico—and an end to "watchful waiting," of course, meant resource to the only alternative, intervention. Because he had the political and the physical courage to put the country on notice about what has been going on, Senator HEFLIN has been denounced as no other Senator within the present generation. It had been a long time, if it ever occurred before, when an American Senator had the nerve to stand in the Senate Chamber and tell the truth about the papal conspiracy. Of course, the papists were beside themselves with anger. Of course, papal papers all over the country arose to the attack. Puppet Roman Catholic editors dipped their pens in venom and what they said about the Alabama Senator has almost scorched the paper on which it has been written. It was to be expected that such would happen. It has neither surprised nor stopped Senator HEFLIN, not only because he has shown himself unafraid, but also because there is a brighter side.

Through the mails and over the telegraph wires there have come to Senator HEFLIN literally thousands of messages and letters congratulating him for the service he is rendering and commending him for his fearless Americanism. Ninety per cent of the American people are Protestants and patriots. They would not approve a war with Mexico at the behest of a Protestant church. Certainly they aren't going to approve of war for a church that wishes to restore the rule of superstition and ruin it exerted for so long in that country. If Senator HEFLIN and a few other courageous Americans, in press, pulpit, and faculty didn't have the courage he is displaying and tell the truth, there isn't much doubt but that the Knights of Columbus and the other Roman Catholic conspirators would bring about intervention in Mexico, and that would mean war, an unjustified and an unholy war.

Senator HEFLIN and the others outside Congress who have dared to speak out have placed their country under eternal obligations to them. That service will be remembered when the last of the snarling pack now at his heels has forever ceased to yap.

[From People's Forum of Ohio State Journal]

Senator HEFLIN, of Alabama, should be voted a gold medal for giving American people the real cause for our present strained relations with the countries below the Rio Grande. Of course, the Senator's intolerance (?) has placed him in a very precarious situation, and anything may happen to him from ostracism to murder. But it is good to know that we have at least one Senator who has the courage to ignore the senseless and hypocritical cry of intolerance and openly denounce those who are scheming to force this country into war.

[From the Tribune, Turner, Oreg.]

United States Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN has been coming out strong in opposition to armed intervention in Mexico. He hews to the line and lets the chips fall where they may. He has not hesitated to place the blame where he thinks it ought to be placed. We admire him for speaking his convictions. We, the citizens, do not want armed intervention in Mexico. It is not necessary. It is our place to take a friendly interest in our sister Republic and help her solve her difficulties in a sane and friendly manner. The administration and the State Department seem bound to continue the policy of armed intervention in Mexico and Central America.

[From the Columbus Ledger, February 20, 1927]

ORATOR OF OLD SOUTH; FLAYS GREAT FOES AND SMALL

By Rodney Dutcher

WASHINGTON, February, 1927.—Meet J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of LaFayette, Ala.

As has every man in public life, HEFLIN has his friends and his foes. His friends regard him as a valiant crusader—one with a flaming sword. His enemies ridicule him as a purveyor of nonsensical bombast—sincere, maybe, but deluded.

Whichever valuation of HEFLIN as a statesman be correct, he without question is one of the Senate's hardest workers, wields a voice that is golden, and steps into any breach with a most explosive courage.

When he gets started, he isn't to be stopped until he runs down.

In appearance, HEFLIN is the typical Senator in every respect, as the typical Senator is pictured in the popular mind. Every first-time visitor, gazing down upon the Senate, wonders who's the big fellow with the expansive white vest, the black frock coat, the black bow tie that measures eight inches from bow to stern, and the long black eyeglass ribbon.

There is no other like him.

No other Senator bears him even the faintest resemblance. He is unique. When you see him with his big, black 2-gallon hat, you have the picture complete.

HEFLIN as an orator is a survival of the old southern stump-speaking art at its best. His flowery verbiage and eloquence always draw an audience and entertain it immensely, even if they do not always drive it into frenzy. His voice is hard to match.

Are Fall and Doheny acquitted? HEFLIN howls at the judge, and conjures up an awful plot whose ramifications even include the murder of Jess Smith by the "Ohio gang."

Do the Knights of Columbus offer a million dollars to help their brethren in Mexico? Then HEFLIN thunders of a diabolical Popish plot to drag us into war.

Does an editor register disgust at HEFLIN for his explosions? Then that editor is a tool of Doheny, and Doheny will be around at his back door with a bag of gold that very evening.

If you really want to make HEFLIN pipe down, stop writing to him. HEFLIN says he has received 2,000 letters since the first of the year congratulating him on his sensational speeches. I have seen the baskets of unopened mail in his office late of an afternoon and am not disposed to question his figures.

The sincerity of this self-styled only champion of the people has been questioned, on the theory that no one could act and talk like HEFLIN does and still be sincere. But those who know HEFLIN best, admitting that he sometimes is absurd, assert that he means every word he says.

One often hears in Washington the remark that HEFLIN is to be commended for being the only man who has the nerve to rip the lid off certain situations.

"There isn't money enough to buy him and there isn't force enough to shut him up," they summarize.

The doorman who lets him out at night says J. L. Thornton, HEFLIN's secretary, is the hardest working man on the hill. HEFLIN himself is less burdened only because of Thornton's efficiency.

Thornton, mighty proud of his boss, delights to tell of the time HEFLIN, who is the Senate's champion story teller, made BORAH sit down and keep still when BORAH was protesting the Senate's self-voted salary increase.

He is said to be a positive marvel in front of a crowd.

It is asserted and it is denied that HEFLIN has presidential ambitions. HEFLIN is about to become Alabama's senior Senator, and he must consider himself the logical heir to Alabama's "Twenty-four for Underwood," which became so famous in the last Democratic national convention.

But there is no need to end on a detractory note and one may well quote a pithy size up of the man attributed to Alice Longworth.

"Tom," said Alice, "you've got the tongue of a demagogue. But you've got the backbone of a statesman."

[From the New Age Magazine, February, 1927]

But a few days ago Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama, delivered from the floor of the Senate a most candid and logical treatment of the situation leading up to the crisis, as previously outlined in this article. Mr. HEFLIN disregarded the ominous threats of those who would see this Nation embroiled in a bitter war with Mexico. He dared to charge the political ambushes of those sons of the Roman Catholic Church who wear the senatorial toga. He dared political defeat for his fearless and outspoken tirades against the Knights of Columbus organization and its activities as directed at President Calles's administration.

• • • He delivered a scathing rebuke to those members of the newspaper profession who had purposely garbled and misquoted him.

Mr. HEFLIN had "no ax to grind." He spoke as an earnest American citizen and patriot. He deplored the factions that were endeavoring to force us into a ridiculous war with Mexico. He made no direct statement without furnishing conclusive proof as to the correctness of that statement.

The grave crisis seems to have passed, diplomatic negotiations are being considered between the respective Governments, and in most likelihood the various complex features of this international tangle will be amicably settled by arbitration.

SENATOR HEFLIN STIRS THE COUNTRY

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama, has made two or three speeches in the Senate that have stirred the blood of every true patriot in the country. He seems to be a man who is not afraid to speak the truth. Every Roman Catholic newspaper and magazine has vented its spleen on this fearless patriot. He has been accused of attempting to

stir up religious strife and of being intolerant and bigoted. As some writer said, "If it be intolerant to tell the truth, then he has been intolerant." The thing that stirs the Roman Catholics is the fact that he had moral courage enough to stand on the floor of the Senate and in a speech tell some of the things the Knights of Columbus and the Roman hierarchy had been doing, which speech, of course, appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Among other things he said that the Roman hierarchy brought tremendous pressure to bear on President Wilson in 1916, just preceding the presidential election, to get him to make war on Mexico. When he refused they did all that lay in their power to defeat him. Some claim that if those Catholic war propagandists had had 10 days more they would have defeated Wilson. (The Good Citizen, Zarephath, N. J., March, 1927.)

On January 22 the Catholic News, of New York City, featured under a streamer headline across its front page an effort to belittle the specific and definite allegations made by Senator HEFLIN that the Knights of Columbus took steps last summer at Philadelphia and publicly declared plans to raise a million dollars to foment strife between the United States and Mexico. This demonstrates how the Roman hierarchy and press winced under the charges made by the Alabama Senator and which have not been and can not be answered nor refuted. (The Protestant, Washington, D. C., March, 1927.)

Let me read from another newspaper article:

Senator HEFLIN, of Alabama, discovered and uncovered plot of Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus and Roman Catholic clergy to plunge the United States into war with Mexico. He read and discussed in the Senate the war-promoting resolution of the Knights of Columbus and showed that the resolution introduced in the House of Representatives preparing the way for war was introduced by a Roman Catholic Congressman from New York, Mr. BOYLAN. He showed that the unpublished testimony in the hearings on the Boylan resolution established the fact that nobody but Roman Catholics appeared to urge the passage of the resolution, and that the reason they gave for severing diplomatic relations with Mexico was "the persecution of Roman Catholics and efforts to destroy the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico." He charged that it was an attempt to use the United States Army to restore the Roman Catholic Church to power in Mexico.

AN INTERESTING STATEMENT

In July, 1898, I was invited as editor of the Roman Catholic paper, *Il Vessillo*, published in Cremona, Italy, to attend the congress of the Catholic press in Milan. After the public session I had a private audience with Cardinal Ferrari, of Milan. In his conversation concerning the attitude and plans of the church, he stressed the point that he was not voicing his personal views but the attitude of the Vatican in political matters. Among other things, Cardinal Ferrari said to me:

"What we fear most and consider as the greatest hindrance to our plan of world domination is Protestant England and Protestant America. These two great powers, combining their strength and their moral influence in the world, constitute an unsurpassable barrier to our onward march, but of the two we fear America more, for in that country, with the separation of church and state, the idea is predominant that the state is superior to and independent of the church. We must gradually undermine England and America with the invasion of monastic orders, which are the advance guard of Catholicism, and by establishing parochial schools, in which the supremacy of the church and Pope must constantly be taught.

"It is also the aim of the Vatican to create wherever possible misunderstandings and friction between England and America, so that their imperialistic interests may appear antagonistic.

"When we shall conquer America, we are sure to conquer the world. The time is not far distant when America will lead the world. The order is 'to make America Catholic.' To obtain this coveted result several things are already in operation, among which is the Catholic colonization of the United States. The hierarchy of Italy, Ireland, Spain, and France is doing its utmost to encourage emigration of Roman Catholics to the United States and to direct them to the big cities, so that gradually the metropolitan cities may become dominantly Catholic. They are.

"We are already able to see that New York, Chicago, and other centers of America are beginning to feel the Catholic power. I do not hesitate to prophesy that the day will come when no political aspirant to office will dare to disobey the bidding of the church. I repeat, America will be ours, and with America the entire world. Then the Papacy will be the universal empire, and kings, presidents, and peoples will bow before the Pope and move like puppets in his hand."

(The above statement of Rev. Aristide Malinverni, of Garfield, N. J., a cultured and scholarly man and a convert from Roman Catholicism, was printed in the Springfield (Mass.) Republican December 28, 1926.)

Senator HEFLIN:

Rome fears the light. Good work.

T. F. CUMMINGS,
541 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Greensboro, Ala., February 19, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HEFLIN: I notice you are telling them at headquarters about the Catholic menace in America. Go to it! The South is with you in this fight. Of course, they will try to belittle the revelations made and make it appear that you are crying "Wolf! Wolf! when there is no wolf." But many of us know the "wolf" is here already within our midst, and he is doing everything within his power to capture America and destroy American institutions. Go on; "tell it to them!" You may expect the subsidized Catholic press and a spineless representation who cares more for popularity than principle to fight you. But your cause is just, and the Lord God of Nations, the prompter of every champion for righteousness, and the defender of every just and holy cause is with you.

"Thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; and the sword come and take any person * * * away, his blood will I require at the watchman's hand. Then whosoever heareth the sound of the trumpet, and taketh not warning, if the sword come and take him away, his blood shall be upon his own head." Ezekiel xxxiii, 7, 8, 4.

Yours for America and American institutions, as against all foreign aggression.

Most cordially yours,

WM. F. PRICE, Pastor.

WILSON, OKLA., January 30, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I note in the daily papers where you are exposing the Knights of Columbus in their effort to embroil the United States in trouble with Mexico. In my opinion the Knights of Columbus organization has about as much place in our Government, so far as the real spirit on which our Government is founded, as an organization of "Reds" from Russia.

You have never heard of me, and may never do so again, yet I desired to let you know that my heart is with you in the fight you are making. We need more of such men as you and Representative UPSHAW, from Georgia.

In striking the Knights of Columbus for their nefarious work against the best interests of our country you are voicing the feelings of some 8,000,000 Baptists. * * *

Sincerely,

KARL H. MOORE,
Pastor First Baptist Church.

PASTOR'S STUDY FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
Ponca City, Okla., February 21, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Kindly accept my congratulations for the statesman-like way in which you handled the Catholic war propaganda which is being carried into our United States Senate. It proves you to be a man of courage, a patriot, and a statesman of foresight.

The writer read in the papers about the million-dollar slush fund to be raised by the Knights of Columbus and foresaw what was coming. To say the least, you have opened the eyes of the American public to the dangers threatening. May you not weary in well-doing! What if you do fall heir to aspersions of certain un-American groups? I believe I stand in position to know that the great majority of American citizens are squarely behind you and will revere you for your faithfulness as their servant.

Sincerely in the cause,

ARTHUR BROOKS, Pastor.

CUMBERLAND, MD., February 3, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have read your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where you told the Senate that threats are being made against your life. I am a law-abiding citizen and do not believe in violence, but if the Knights of Columbus should do you serious bodily harm, or take your life, I pledge you my word of honor that some of them and their priests will pay dearly for it. If they should do such a cowardly thing and get away with it no "American" Senator in the future would ever have the courage to lift his voice again against the Knights of Columbus no matter what they might do against this Government.

I have talked with a number of other men, real Americans, who feel as I do. You are right and you are doing what you ought to do to keep us out of war with Mexico, and if the Knights of Columbus, with their secret attachments to a foreign power, namely, the Pope of Rome, resort to foul means to put a real "American" Senator out of their way for doing his duty to his country, many a one of them and some of their "higher-ups" in politics will pay for it with their lives.

Senator, you are making a brave fight and a great fight, and every true American owes you a debt of gratitude. Keep up the good work. Be on your guard always against the enemy, "the insidious power." Continue your firm stand. You have done more than any other man to expose and break up the conspiracy of the Knights of Columbus to get us into war with Mexico. God bless you and guide you and protect you in the great work you are doing.

With all good wishes, I am, very truly

[Telegram]

CHICAGO, ILL., February 1, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.:

Theodore Roosevelt once said that the most glorious sport in the world is a fight for the right. You must have that viewpoint in the courageous and upstanding fight you are now making for our Protestant Nation.

To my mind, you have rendered a tremendous service for all of us. Keep up your good work. The people you are discussing have dropped their arrogant, aggressive attitude and are defending their position.

Congratulations, Senator, and may God bless you and watch over you.

GAIL S. CARTER.

GALENA, ILL., February 3, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I am writing to tell you how proud I was when I read your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 18th of January.

I had almost given up hope that we would ever again have a man to defend us so nobly as you did that day. I always watch the RECORD for anything Senator HEFLIN has to debate. I know it is something for the good of the American people.

I hope your fight for the Mexican people will be successful, and pray every day that God will take care of you.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. ELIZABETH KOPLBAUER.

419 WEST ONE HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH STREET,
New York City, January 28, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have read with great interest your splendid and worthy work in endeavoring to protect our country from being a cats-paw of the Roman Catholic organization in its effort to involve us in controversy with Mexico. Yours is not an easy task, but a glorious one, when one realizes that half of the populace of the United States are still asleep to the great menace in our midst. I believe, as you do, it is not a time to mince words; we have too long done just that, being mesmerized in the thought that the Roman organization was a thing too high and holy to be attacked.

I, as a Christian Scientist, know well the methods they are using to destroy, not only physically but mentally. We, as Scientists, are working constantly for your protection, as well as all others who have put on the armor of truth to combat the evil in our ranks, masquerading under the cloak of religion. Truth must prevail, and God will protect you in all your ways. The first verse of the ninety-first Psalm fulfills that promise. God will give you strength and courage to carry on this glorious warfare. We are in the battle and must fight for our freedom.

Yours very truly,

MARGARET R. SPEIDEL.

STONE ROAD,
Keansburg, N. J., January 29, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, M. C.,
Executive Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Believing through the divine wisdom of Almighty God you have been placed upon the floor of the United States Senate, may you always be as honorable, fearless, and straightforward in the future as you have been in the past. Your utterances have been wonderful. May God give you strength, wisdom, and courage to carry on.

Most respectfully yours, I. T. S. U. B.,

FLORENCE L. NEWMAN,
Member of County Executive Committee.

GREENSBORO, N. C., February 6, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HEFLIN: I address you thus because you are the embodiment of real Americanism—a friend and one beloved of the whole people. Your fearless stand for rights of the people put you at the head of the list as the outstanding American to-day.

The Republicans of yesterday, who hated your democracy, are to-day singing your praises. I hear it on every side, and I join in a big amen.
Yours truly,

T. A. LYON.

PERU, IND., *January 31, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are watching you with the greatest of interest out here in Indiana.

I am a Republican, in a Republican State, but would be pleased very much to have the "great pleasure" some time of casting my vote for you to head our Nation.

I have not heard one word of condemnation of your stand on the Knights of Columbus, but have heard much praise of your courage.

All we want is for you just to keep going; you will be quoted long after you are dead.

May God bless and keep you in my prayer.

Yours very truly,

T. J. EWER.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 12, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is indeed a great pleasure to read of your actions in the Senate of recent date, as I had about despaired of ever hearing a Senator who put his love of country and its composite citizenry ahead of everything else on earth. You are to be commended on your fearless action in not hesitating to censure from the floor all people singly or organized who are endeavoring to put any other program before your country than that of America first, last, and always.

It is indeed with sincere feeling that we again have in the United States Senate one man who inherits the patriotic zeal of Washington and Lincoln.

As this is one of the great patriot's birthday and the other following soon, I sincerely wish that we could have more men of your integrity and fearlessness to represent us in the United States Senate. * * *

I know you have started a fight in the right direction and know you have raised bitter foes who will not hesitate to drive you from public life if possible to do so. Take courage and fight, as all people who love their country above all else are behind you to a man. Press on and may you be strong and valiant in your fight and in your love for America. I am sure God will crown your efforts with success.

A reply to this will be very gratefully accepted.

Yours very truly,

Mr. C. E. BENNETT,
1506 1/2 Houghton Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

NEW HARTFORD, MO., *January 30, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you these few lines to compliment and commend you for your noble and heroic stand recently in the Senate of the United States condemnatory of being drawn into war with Mexico by the howling of the Catholics.

I would to God there were many more of your conviction and courage, to the end that America might free herself from the pernicious influence of Catholicism.

I don't know your politics, but your talk in defense of America has the right ring to me.

Yours sincerely,

J. H. MOTLEY.

28 JACKSON STREET,
Attleboro, Mass., February 11, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on the way you dare come out and speak the truth in the Senate. Your service to these United States of America is valuable and a necessity.

Some honest to God American had to make this stand or we would have soon become the United States of Rome.

Much credit is due you, and I urge you to keep up the good work against the Knights of Columbus and the yellow press. America for Americans.

Sincerely yours,

RUFUS C. WATERMAN.

DEER RIVER, MINN., *February 10, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your fearless and patriotic stand in the present Mexican trouble inspires me to express my unqualified approval of your latest exposure of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and their vicious and dirty

schemes, perpetrated in open daylight, trying thereby to force our country into war with Mexico.

I want to congratulate you, Mr. Senator, sincerely upon your patriotic stand for America. It must take great courage and wonderful manhood to get up on the floor of the United States Senate and attack so fearlessly, as you have done, the most sinister enemy of free institutions the world over. If it did not take courage to do so, you would not be left alone to fight the battle. But, remember, Mr. Senator, the people watch mighty carefully and adore and love champions of your caliber.

May God Almighty bless you greatly in my prayer.

I beg to remain, sir, respectfully yours,

EHARD SANDGREN.

BENTON HARBOR, MICH., *February 21, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let me congratulate you on your recent arguments in the Senate for 100 per cent American principles. * * *

I am thankful a few good fighters like yourself are left. * * * I feel the American people are fast being reduced to two classes, "The skinned and the skinned," the last in a great majority. * * *

Keep it up. The American people are with you on this Central American and Mexican issue.

Yours truly,

ROMAN I. JARVIS, SR.

ASSUMPTION, ILL., *February 7, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I with scores of others in this section of the country, as well as most other parts, rejoice in the noble and patriotic stand you have taken in the Mexican trouble which you stated was urged and propagated by the Knights of Columbus of America. Here's hoping you success and honor for your great struggle for the masses of American people.

Yours very respectfully,

WM. R. DEWOLF.

TOPEKA, KANS., *February 5, 1927.*

SENATOR J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am mighty glad that there is one Senator in Washington who has "nerve" enough to come out in the open and tell the truth about matters in Mexico and Central America. There are a good many more in Kansas who are for you. I heard an old gentleman say "TOM HEFLIN is a man."

Personally, I know you are right about Mexico. I worked Mexicans for the Santa Fe Railway for several years, and my father for about 15 years, and we both agree that it is the Catholic Church more than anything else. I've seen them work their graft among these ignorant people and God knows it is a shame. I say, "Let Mexico alone, and let her work out her own problems." Evidently they have a President with "nerve" and "backbone."

My hat is off to you, and my heart is with you.

An admirer,

LEWIS McCLELLAN.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *February 7, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please count me among the many millions of American citizens whom you can depend upon to back up your stand on the Mexican religious controversy.

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. BOWLES,
An American citizen.

24 BLEACHERY STREET,
Lowell, Mass., February 4, 1927.

SENATOR J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: This is to inform you that not only I but a large number of real American people in this section of the country admire men of your type, which is the type that Heaven would smile on and own.

Thanks for exposing the Knights of Columbus and Frederick William Willensky. The daily newspapers would not publish your speech, but the Fellowship Forum did.

The eyes of the country are on you at this moment, Senator HEFLIN, and thank God there are still some of the Nation's leaders who refuse to mix their Americanism with party allegiance.

Thousands of Massachusetts Americans (Republicans afterwards) admire you for casting your lot with your country first, last, and always. Our prayers are that the Master will preserve you so that you may serve in the Senate for years to come. Our country needs you.

Wishing you continued success, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

LESLIE L. DUKESHIRE.

DANVILLE, ILL., February 4, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We certainly appreciate the stand you have taken. We need a man like you for President. I know there are 3,000 men and women in Vermillion County that are with you heart and soul.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK J. STRAHL

SHIPMAN, ILL., February 8, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with real pleasure, appreciation, and pride that I have read of the patriotic stand you have taken in the Senate on questions of national importance, especially on the Mexican situation.

At this time, when America has so many enemies within, and even some in official capacities who have apparently failed to get the vision of the danger that threatens our beloved country, it takes courage to stand up as you have done and tell the world what they should know.

As a humble American citizen, I wish to commend you on the stand you are taking; and I know there are many others who feel as I do in this matter. I shall look forward with pleasure to reading your future speeches before the Senate, and trust that through your noble efforts other Senators will awaken and assist you in keeping America American.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. RANDLE.

DANIELSON, CONN., February 8, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend the attitude you have taken in your speeches to the Senate. It is lucky for America we have a Senator who has a mind of his own and the will power to express it. We have business men in my town who are so afraid of the Catholic Church that they do not dare to call their souls their own.

I assure you that there are about four thousand 100 per cent Americans in this county who indorse my sentiments. We are with you.

Very truly yours,

L. A. BRADFORD.

KEWANEE, ILL., February 8, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As I am very much interested in the different talks made by you in Senate of recent dates, I can not help but write you my sincere appreciation of the stand that you are taking against the Roman Catholic hierarchy, better known as the Knights of Columbus.

Do not think, dear Senator, that the people are not with you. Your name is being heralded all over the United States as one man who speaks the truth. * * *

Yours truly,

DAVID MILLIGAN.

DAVENPORT, IOWA, February 7, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to take this means of expressing my admiration for your fearless speech which took place in the Senate the 18th of last month. I wish we had a few more like you, so we would know the truth. I am sorry that I do not know you personally and am not able to shake your hand.

I am sending you the best gift that life can give from the State where the West begins and the tall corn grows.

Give them — when you have a chance.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. HUBER.

LINCOLN, ILL., February 8, 1927.

Hon. Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank God for such men as you, Senator HEFLIN. I am glad we have such brave and courageous men in the Senate, and only wish that we had more there like you.

I was just reading your speech you made about the Knights of Columbus and the truth of conditions as they exist, and I just want to drop you a line to thank you and to let you know I appreciate the stand that you take, and all I can say is, thank God; and I hope and pray that He will watch over and care for you.

Yours truly,

C. A. PHILLIPS.

4047 NORTH ASHLAND AVENUE,
Chicago, Ill., February 7, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HEFLIN: Alabama is my native State. If you are acquainted with the Brocks, of Barbour County and Dothan, I feel sure you will

agree that I speak as one who is entirely American, for they are my mother's family, a very old Alabama family.

I have always felt proud of Alabama, and now my pride rises to its highest possible pitch, for my home State has produced the first United States Senator who has the courage to face the issue of real Americanism without an apology to anyone.

You will be persecuted, my dear Senator, for your courageous stand. You have made enemies. But rest assured your enemies are the enemies of America, and the friends you have made are just the kind who will go the limit for you. Stick to the ship; be not discouraged. Truth will not down, and "the truth will make us free."

Very sincerely yours,

G. H. MOORE.

861 CORNELIA AVENUE,
Chicago, Ill., February 3, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HEFLIN: I want to take this opportunity to commend you most highly on your patriotic and thoroughly American stand in connection with the Mexican situation.

That the Knights of Columbus should embroil us in a war with Mexico for the purpose of aiding the Roman Catholic Church is atrocious. Thank God we have at least one Senator who is not afraid to call a spade a spade.

I am a Republican—you are a Democrat—but we are both Americans. I believe in voting for the best men always, and do not hesitate to vote for good Democrats.

Congratulations again, Senator HEFLIN, and be assured that thousands of Americans in Chicago indorse your stand.

Respectfully,

CLAYTON I. KANAGY.

SIDNEY, NEBR., February, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have been reading of your great effort to bring before the Senate and the people the truth about the Mexican situation as it really is. We, as American citizens, are putting every faith in you, and feel sure you will continue to keep things going on the right track.

We people of western Nebraska stand for every move you make, and say to you, "Keep the good work up, and don't quit until you've run them in the hole and smoked them to the finish."

Yours for continued Americanism,

Mr. and Mrs. C. L. WALTERS.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., January 29, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HEFLIN: In all probability you have never even heard of me. However, I know of and have both seen and heard of you. * * * I have watched your career with intense interest, and have especially appreciated your stand with reference to a clean life for those in authority as well as a clean government, and also your fearless, outspoken stand with reference to our country's late dealings with the Latin Republics to our south. The world may never know what debt it owes to you and Senator BORAH. * * *

I came to this State from the University of Alabama, where I completed my law course in 1917. My wife and four children were born in that State, and, of course, we feel like that is "home." That is probably one reason for my having watched your career with so much interest.

Very sincerely yours,

O. E. LITTLE.

CANTON, OHIO, January 22, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to commend you on your wonderful work in the Senate. It deserves the praise of every Protestant American. We are thankful for having at least one American in our Senate to take the side of real Americanism and to have backbone enough to tell the truth.

Wishing you the best of results in your most worthy work, I am,
Your friend and backer,

R. E. HOCKENBERRY,
616 Patterson Avenue SW.

SECOND METHODIST CHURCH,
Dubois, Pa., January 28, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COUNTRYMAN: With profound interest I have kept in touch with you through the medium of the press. * * * I take this lib-

erty to inform you that the consensus of opinion agree with you in this part of Pennsylvania. I am praying that you may be used of God to bring the truth before the people.

Sincerely,

H. A. SILVIS, *Pastor.*

ROSELLE PARK, N. J., *January 31, 1927.*

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN.

DEAR SIR: It is with pleasure that I am able to write to one man in the Senate who is not afraid to tell where he stands on questions of vital importance that come before the body of which you are a part. Keep up the good work, and may God give you courage to stand and battle the foe who are against American ideals and principles and help close the doors against those without and those within who are not willing to abide by the laws of this great Republic.

God bless and keep you to perform the task before you.

Yours in unflinching bond,

WARREN CRATER,

458 Colonial Road, Roselle Park, N. J.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 28, 1927.*

Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting held by William McKinley Council, No. 18, Junior Order United American Mechanics, on the 28th instant, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas we as American citizens and members of the greatest patriotic society in America, known as the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, do hereby indorse your noble and patriotic stand as regards the activities of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Mexico; and be it
"Resolved, That we believe you have awakened the slumbering Americans from their lethargy to a realization that they should at all times follow your example as a true-blue, patriotic American, fearless at all times in the performance of their duties as American citizens."

Keep up the good work. We are with you 400,000 strong.

Fraternally yours,

J. H. EICHOR, *Acting Councilor.*

ROBT. J. FRITZ, *Recording Secretary.*

148 WEST THIRD AVENUE,
Roselle, N. J., *January 30, 1927.*

United States Senator HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Accept my thanks and appreciation for the fight you are putting on for America and all the principles we stand for.

Thank God for your spirit in defying those who dare to tear down our ideals.

I am trying to follow closely all that is going on and all my friends are solidly behind you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EFFIE SIDAY.

JANUARY 29, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AND FRIEND: Some one has said "Appreciation unexpressed loses half its value." I am pausing a moment to write this "line" to say to you that I have followed you in your public career with interest since our boyhood days together in Alabama. As a general thing I've always approved all of your sayings and doings in the Senate. But at this particular time, when the Knights of Columbus are attempting to laugh you off the stage of action and the Catholic-controlled press is trying to silence you with ridicule, I just wanted you to know that at least one of your old friends of other days is with you "heart and soul," and I say, "More strength to you," and, if it is possible, but I rather doubt if it is, more sharpness and cutting power to your tongue. In my opinion you are hitting the keynote of the greatest menace to this country of ours to-day.

Best wishes for success of your efforts, and with kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

J. W. MANNING.

ARDMORE, PA., *February 11, 1927.*

Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have been reviewing very closely your attacks on the Roman hierarchy for its concealed attempts to throw this great country of ours into conflict with Mexico, a country which is fighting for greater freedom than ever our forefathers had to fight for, and that is the freedom of the soul, and I wish to commend you for your unflinching courage and patriotism which undoubtedly has made the

enemy of freedom of the soul sorely afraid. You have made many sleeping Americans awake.

I only wish that I lived in the State from which you have been sent so often, that I, too, might cast a vote for you.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BAKER.

EL DORADO, KANS., *February 1, 1927.*

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HEFLIN: Please bear with me for my second infringement upon your valuable time. I have just finished reading your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, and could not refrain from again sending you a word of encouragement to continue in the great fight you are making to keep our country out of war with Mexico.

I am sorry more Senators do not come to your rescue, for I am sure there are many of them that see the light as you see it. I suppose, though, they have not the courage to speak their minds as you have spoken.

The time is coming when we will have the opportunity of electing you to the highest office our country has to offer to one of its citizens.

Yours very truly,

J. D. MESICK, M. D.

NEOSHO, MO., *January 30, 1927.*

Senator HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We want to thank you very much for the stand you have taken in Congress on the Mexican question. The people are not ignorant as to who is to blame. I hope you will keep it up. There are a lot of people in this neck of the woods that are with you.

The administration is losing ground.

The majority of the people admire the man who has the courage of his convictions.

Very truly yours for the Old Flag and a clean Government,

A. F. POWELL,
Neosho, Mo., *Route 3.*

612 SECURITIES BUILDING,
Omaha, Nebr., *January 29, 1927.*

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: To show my heartfelt appreciation of the stand you have taken so fearlessly in the Mexican situation, I am thus writing you to commend you for your speech made recently in Congress. There are many of us who know, as you no doubt have reason to know, that think as you do. We are thankful that there are men such as yourself in Washington who are willing to fight for the right and who are opposed to involving our country in a war with Mexico or any other country, for that matter, when it is none of our affair.

Wishing you continued success and trusting that God will give you the strength and guidance to keep up the battle for real Americanism, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

L. N. BUNCE.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *January 29, 1927.*

Senator J. T. HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I have been reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and following your speeches and effort on behalf of the Mexican situation. Those that stand for the truth always have a cross to bear, but I am sure the majority of the people are back of you in this fight, regardless of how much certain Senators try to "laugh it off." If nothing more is accomplished than the publicity that this is getting, a great thing will have been done, as so many people are sound asleep on the situation.

Wishing you every success.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. LAMPE.

426 WEST FORTY-FIFTH STREET,
New York City, *January 31, 1927.*

Senator HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Allow me to cordially thank you for the stand you have taken on the Mexican question.

We need more men of your character who are not afraid to speak the truth. I feel proud to be one of the number from New York State to "back you up" in this Mexican affair.

The Roman Catholic Church is an immense business corporation, headed by the Pope.

May God bless you, give you strength and wisdom in your battle against this greedy pagan organization.

Fraternally yours,

EDWARD F. WARREN.

WATERVILLE, ME., January 29, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You have a good many friends here in this city who would like to shake your hand and congratulate you on the stand you have taken regarding Mexico and the Knights of Columbus. I have had a number speak to me characterizing you as a clean-cut American. So, Senator HEFLIN, be assured that you have a host of friends who are ready to show their patriotism as Americans.

Wishing you all the good things,
Truly yours,

J. A. STEWART.

VIRGINIA, MINN., January 29, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been watching with pleasure your stand on the Mexican question and hope that you do not weaken in your attitude, as you are expressing the feelings of 90,000,000 real Americans from coast to coast.

We wish to take this opportunity of congratulating you upon your stand, and may you never falter.
Respectfully yours,

JOHN E. WESTERLUND.
W. N. HASKING.

235 CENTRAL AVENUE,
East Providence, R. I., January 29, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is a great pleasure to read in the papers of the stand you took in the Senate the other day in regard to the Mexican question. No finer service could be contributed to our country and to the cause of peace and Christianity throughout the world.

Yours in V. L. & P.,

R. BURTON.

609 SHERIDAN STREET NW.,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having heard your wonderful speech of this afternoon I wish to commend you on your attitude on this momentous question and on your fine, fearless Americanism.

I only wish there were more real Americans like you in the high offices of this Nation.

May God bless you and protect you and give you strength to carry on the fight that this country may be ruled by its people and not by the Pope of Rome.

Keep up the good work; we're with you.

Yours sincerely,

JULIAN RENFRO.

145 WEST FIFTY-FIFTH STREET,
New York, January 30, 1927.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Hundreds of thousands of inarticulate Americans are heartened by your courageous stand against the attempted usurpation of power by the Roman Catholics of America.

Many of us are keenly alive to the menace and danger threatening our country, but greater numbers are in ignorance or will not believe the evidences that are everywhere about them.

I am of the family of Betsey Ross, who gave our beautiful flag to the country. Every fiber of my being is dedicated to loyalty and the protection of America.

To you, our defender, I send greetings, and know you will not be intimidated.

Most cordially yours,

Mrs. ELIZABETH M. DICKINSON.

[Telegram]

COLUMBIA, TENN., January 29, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN, of Alabama,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

On with the fight, Senator. The Southland is tired of toe-kissing politicians. Let Roman Catholics and Wall Street fight their own battles in Mexico.

J. W. DEMENT, Minister.

[Night letter]

LINCOLN, NEBR., January 29, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The people of this State are watching with much interest your splendid fight against those who would embroil the United States in war

with Mexico. Am glad to know that we have one United States Senator who has the courage to disclose the efforts of the Knights of Columbus. The speeches by your opponents as reported in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveal very plainly what they are trying to do, but I notice you have held them to the real issue in spite of all their maneuvers. A Knights of Columbus lecturer recently toured this State telling of the horrible crimes committed by Calles followers. Thousands of people in Nebraska are absolutely in sympathy with you in your commendable stand.

J. W. REED.

16 EXCHANGE PLACE,
New York, January 29, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am only one of the many who are listening to your patriotic efforts in the United States Senate along the line of American freedom. We need more of this. It requires real patriotism and a brave heart to tackle this particular subject. All the people need to know is the truth, what is going on, what is being done, and by whom.

In my opinion there is no question of doubt that the Knights of Columbus is purely a political organization inside the church working day and night to further the Roman Catholic political aims and efforts. This particular church has been in politics always, and apparently always will be. In the countries where they have operated and controlled the people for years and years the people are ignorant and medieval in many cases and progress of the kind we believe in is slow. We need a real, honest Christian attitude, and this particular organization has no such attitude toward others who are not of their kind.

Permit me to congratulate you and assure you that all good Americans are with you and behind you. I only wish that we were better organized to combat the organized effort on the other side.

With kind regards and admiration, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

GEO. E. BARSTOW, JR.

OWENSBORO, KY., January 28, 1927.
United States Senator HEFLIN, of Alabama,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: In the sincere belief that a United States Senator who has the courage to stand up and voice the sentiments expressed by you in the debate on the Mexican situation in the United States Senate is worthy of the support and commendation of every man and woman voter in the United States of America who has its interests in mind and who believe in the words and spirit of the Declaration of Independence, permit me to express my heartfelt appreciation of your manly and true American stand against the opponents of true liberty, toleration, and the administration of the internal affairs of the Mexican Republic.

For many years I have observed the concerted action of this foreign and un-American organization to force its will and its ways upon the American people. Its continued encroachment in the affairs of the Government of the States and of the United States surely is a menace to our institutions and it behooves all who love the peace and tranquillity of these United States to beware of its seductive teachings.

To read the demands and the resolutions of this organization and to see in the public press, the theater, and on the silver screen the subtle propaganda that is being put forth at its behest makes the blood boil in my veins.

Owing to the suppression of your remarks in the Senate of the United States by the Associated Press, I respectfully request that you favor me with copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contain your words on the Mexican question.

Again thanking you for your manly stand against the massed opposition and assuring you of my moral support, I remain,

Very truly yours,

THOS. C. MORGAN.

JACKSON, MISS., January 29, 1927.

Senator THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It really makes life more worth while to read in the press the report of the stand that you have taken on the floor of the United States Senate in regard to Knights of Columbus efforts to plunge our country into war with Mexico on account of something that is none of our business and about which we are not concerned.

It makes our blood boil to hear that those who have no sympathy with our American institutions threaten the life of such men as you, who have the temerity to defy the power at Rome. I glory in you and would to God that we had more men like you who had the manhood to speak out in high places.

I want you to know that thousands in Mississippi are with and squarely behind you and all such men. We are proud of you and want you and the people of Alabama to know it. I am writing our Senator from Mississippi along these lines. * * *

I have heard many prominent men of our city express themselves, and they have expressed their intentions to write you and offer their hearty approval of your actions.

I have never written a United States Senator before in my life about any matter, assuming that they were better fitted to take care of matters of state than we laymen, and I want you to take this in the spirit that it is written in. I wanted you to know that you have our hearty support, and we feel proud that some one has the nerve to place the mailed fist on them and check their unopposed march, as they have far more than they are entitled to in the elective and appointive offices.

With very best wishes, I am
Yours very truly,

J. H. FEWELL.

CANTON, OHIO, *January 29, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to commend you on your wonderful work in the Senate. It deserves the praises of every Protestant American. * * *

Wishing you the best of results in your most worthy work, I am,
Your friend and backer,

J. W. BLACKBURN.

MUNCIE, IND., *January 29, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just had the pleasure of reading in a copy of the *New Menace* an article regarding your battle over the Mexican situation. I am, indeed, glad that we have at least one Senator who is not afraid to tell the truth and to fight for the truth. * * *

You know that millions of Americans think the same way and would compliment you upon your manly stand if they only knew the facts in the case. My family consists of eight members, and we all thank God we still have men like you to lead us.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES MACFATRIDGE.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *January 28, 1927.*

HON. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

KIND SIR: I can not refrain from writing you, although a stranger to me, but I do like the way you tell it to them. You give them the truth in regard to the Mexican situation, the only man in the Senate to stand for the people. We need more men like you to stand for the truth and let the people know what is going on at the Capitol. Please give me a word as a friend, and oblige,

Yours for the truth,

JOE J. PYATT,
Route 4, Box 245, Springfield, Mo.

R. F. D. 1, FALLS CHURCH, VA., *January 29, 1927.*

SENATOR J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to add my congratulations to the thousands that you are receiving for your courageous stand against the designs of the Knights of Columbus and the Roman Catholic Church to dominate our Government.

I want to direct your attention to the following:

Eighteen per cent of the population (the Roman Catholics) hold 65 per cent of the Government positions.

Our Army officers are trained at West Point, our Navy officers at Annapolis, but our State Department consular officers are mostly trained at the Foreign Service School of the Jesuit Georgetown College.

I understand that of the President's Secret Service guard the most of them are Roman Catholics and Knights of Columbus. Would not that be fine protection for a real Protestant President?

Sincerely yours,

L. F. MOORE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONTGOMERY,
Wetumpka, Ala., February 28, 1927.

SENATOR J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you to let you know how well I indorse your stand you have taken in the Senate. It seems that you are the only Senator that has taken a stand for the American people's rights. I hope you have just got started with your fight for our rights. I say go to it with all your might. I am for you.

No man appreciates a man more than I do who has grit and backbone enough to stand up in the face of the enemy and tell them about it.

The great issue to-day is, Will the American people surrender to the dictation of a foreign crown—the Pope—without any resistance and

humbly bow to him who sits on his throne on the banks of the Tiber? I for one am not willing to surrender to them without a fight.

I am getting literature from the Knights of Columbus at New Haven in regard to their drive for money for their Mexican program.

I hope you will keep up your fight to the end.

I am, your very truly,

W. G. WELDEN,
Member, Alabama House of Representatives.

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *March 3, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN:

I just have to write you another letter, after reading your last speech in the Senate, to let you know how good it makes me feel to have a Senator who is not afraid to tell the truth. My only regret is that I am not able to shake hands with you and tell you just how I feel, which can not be expressed on paper.

Yours truly,

MARTIN SMITH.

PERRYVILLE, IND., *February 5, 1927.*

SENATOR J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you upon your stand for pure Americanism, as we of the Middle West understand it. Keep up the fight. Hundreds in eastern Illinois and western Indiana are backing you to a man.

Give the native-born American the truth and he will do the rest.

Yours for true Americanism,

D. EARL CLINGAN,
Perryville, Ind., Route No. 1.

BOWDON STATE COLLEGE,
Bowdon, Ga., February 1, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I have just read your speech of January 28 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Let me welcome this opportunity of expressing my warm appreciation for the information which you have disclosed and for the very able stand that you have taken.

I have a very kind feeling for all denominations, but I do not approve of any one particular denomination giving secret or open aid to any enemy of the United States nor in assisting a movement to overthrow a government which has been constitutionally established. I do not approve of the Knights of Columbus raising \$1,000,000 in America for the purpose of bringing this country in conflict with the affairs of Mexico. Such a move ought not to be tolerated in any country, and I think that the Government of the United States should forbid such an action.

I suppose that this matter has escaped the attention of many of the people of this country, and they should appreciate your courage and frankness in bringing the facts to light. I think that you have done your country a great service.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely your friend,

HENRY B. SLAUGHTER.

NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO, *February 7, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to voice our appreciation of your courageous and heroic stand for true Americanism. The American people have anxiously waited for a man who would have the backbone to get up in the Halls of Congress and tell the truth as to the cause of our present troubles and who is patriot enough to defy the big oil interests and the smoothest organization that ever cursed the world. Mere party fealty amounts to little; at this crucial time we need men. Yes; patriots who can see the black clouds of danger that are hanging over our country. Go on, brother; and may God watch over you is our prayer.

JOHN D. LONG,
ANNA L. LONG.

BLUEFIELD, VA., *February 7, 1927.*

SENATOR J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read the speech in the Fellowship Forum of February 5, which you made in Senate on the Mexican situation, and I want to say that I am truly glad to see we have one American who is fearless and patriotic enough to tell the Roman Catholics what you told them. I hope other Senators will join in and make the same open fight for Americanism that you are making.

Respectfully yours,

R. C. ANDERSON.

EDWARDSVILLE, ILL.,

Madison County, February 5, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: I have been reading with much interest your recent speech before Congress, and heartily commend your courageous stand against the attempt of the part of the Knights of Columbus to have this Nation declare war on Mexico; also bringing before the American people the truth regarding certain phases of our present relations with Mexico.

Very truly yours,

TITUS D. WILLIAMS,

823 Kinghighway.

MOULTRIE, GA., January 30, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Have just finished reading your exposure of the Knights of Columbus, etc. I am amazed at the contrast between your bold, manly, and patriotic stand as compared with that of a very prominent Senator whom I do not need to name—his chosen position as trimmer and papal apologist puts him into the open where real Americans will henceforth adjust whatever presidential aspirations he may have nursed in the past—his cake is all dough. Cowardice under these conditions makes his professed patriotism utterly contemptible.

Senator Watson, of this State, shortly before his death, published to the world that the Knights of Columbus was a traitorous organization. Millions of us have long recognized that the Knights of Columbus are the standing army of the Roman Church, maintained as a government inside our Government, to control our Government.

You will find, Senator, the firmer you stand your ground the stronger the people will support you. You have crossed the Rubicon, and there is no going back, and to prevent their threats against your life being carried out Protestants and all loyal Americans should get behind you in such force as will make them afraid. * * *

This is a case in which we should "Lay on Macduff!" Congress should at once investigate to the utmost this organization, and if the law and the penalty is not sufficient it should be made so in a day. This organization convicts itself wholesale by its own conduct.

Any such state of affairs is intolerable, and no loyal Americans will stand for it. The time has come now to put compromisers and traitors out of office. We all see now what we have in our midst, and if Congress does not act the people will.

If the knights do not believe they will start more hades than they know what to do with, let them carry out their threats.

Stand by your guns, Senator; they do not dare harm you. It is high time the people were waking up over the incredible rottenness and cowardice of the press. No paper I have seen gives more than a very meager report of this national shame and crime.

It is well known that the Jesuits have a representative on the editorial staff of most all the prominent papers of the country.

Courage to tell the truth in the face of strong opposition will make one greater than anything I know of.

Thank God for one man in the United States Senate!

Devotedly yours,

C. H. JOHNSON.

PALISADE, NEBR., February 17, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The signers of this article offer our congratulations and assure you that we are entirely in accord with you in your fight to keep our country out of the mess in Mexico. We are glad, in the first place, to know a man of the caliber of President Calles is living in our generation; we are proud of a man of your caliber in the Senate of these United States. We are writing our Nebraska Senators, the Honorable NORRIS and HOWELL, of our attitude in this affair, and urging that they get behind you and help you in your fight, and may every State where a few loyal citizens still remain do the same in urging their own Senators to get behind you and help show this thing up in its true light.

May you have the support of every American Senator at once, regardless of their politics.

Assuring you that we are heartily in accord with your views on this matter and proud of you in your courage and loyalty, we are

Humbly yours,

ROYAL W. LARSON and
TWENTY-TWO CITIZENS.210 WEST ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTH STREET,
New York, N. Y., January 29, 1927.

Hon. T. HEFLIN,

United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: You are to be congratulated for putting a quietus on the belligerent activities of the Knights of Columbus. * * *

It is a pleasure to read of your independence and courage in public life.

Cordially yours,

HERMAN NADLER.

KANSAS CITY, MO., January 28, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS J. HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am sure you have the backing of the right-thinking, true American people in your attitude regarding the Mexican situation. The purpose of the church is for the betterment of the people as a whole and not for the purpose of taking possession of our Government for sinister purposes.

Respectfully yours,

A. M. SILLS.

2207 WEST MADISON STREET,
Chicago, Ill., January 29, 1927.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: You are a patriot and are the only Senator that had the courage to tell the truth of the conspiracies that are carried on now by the Roman Catholics. I believe I am one of millions in this country who rejoice at your stand.

My prayer to God is that he may save you from any violence by the Pope's emissaries because of your patriotic position.

Very respectfully,

T. C. WENDELL.

UNION, NEBR., January 27, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have read several sketches of your speech to the Senate in regard to the trouble in Latin America.

Allow me to add my congratulations to the many that you probably already have.

We certainly need men who will dare to think enough of their oath of office to do the things that you have been doing.

I firmly believe that you have the support of the true, honest, thinking Americans of the United States when you will dare to say the things that you said and take the stand that you have taken, notwithstanding the press battery that you are apt to get.

Here is to you and your kind.

Yours truly,

CLIFTON B. SMITH.

NARBERTH, PA., February 16, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write to thank the Senator who has the courage to battle alone. Would to God there were more HEFLINS and less yellow streaks in our representatives of Protestantism, who carry on their shoulders the destiny of a nation.

Brother, it may be God's will to make of you a martyr for your spoken truths, but, like Luther, your name will be in marble on the pages of history and millions won't forget the faithful Senator from Alabama.

My earnest hope and prayer for you is that you may continue many years in the service of your country.

Yours in the propagation of the truth.

Sincerely,

LESTER E. PETERS.

[Telegram]

CHICAGO, ILL., February 16, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Allow me to congratulate you for your fine Americanism and for exposing the plot fostered by the Knights of Columbus to drive America into war against Mexico.

Only a man of real courage and an American at heart would do that.

As ever yours for America first, last, and always.

F. I. POLLARD.

DETROIT, MICH., February 14, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am glad that once again we have a public official who will stake all for the cause of liberty and justice, as Patrick Henry, John Hancock, and other great patriots did. I am glad that I can tell you with pride that you have the American people of this State back of you just as much as your own constituents.

Very respectfully yours,

AN ADMIRER.

LOGOOTEET, IND., February 14, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish I could express my great admiration for the rare form of courage which you possess and which is so necessary in high places at this time.

You are absolutely right, and, besides, you have the evidence to prove it to any man or woman with brains.

More than any other man you have caused the American people, and an administration which seems to have gotten into a sorry plight, to "stop, look, and listen." I hope to have the privilege some time to meet you personally. * * *

Sincerely, an admirer,

W. J. S. DAVIS.

LA GRANGE, ILL., February 12, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: At a recent meeting of our Women's Christian Temperance Union, mention was made by one of the leaders of the bold stand that you recently made in the Senate regarding the attitude of the Knights of Columbus in Mexican affairs.

According to her suggestion we are writing this letter to express to you our thanks and commendation for the stand that you have taken in this important issue.

We remain, very truly yours,

W. P. FOGG.
S. A. FOGG.

Box 482, ABILENE, TEX., January 29, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HEFLIN: I am a native Alabamian, of Tuscaloosa County.

I have always loved my native State, and with a host of loved ones of both my own and my wife, makes me take special note of many things transpiring there. And I am delighted to especially note your courage in showing your loyalty and patriotism for our country on the floor of the Senate, concerning the activities of Knights of Columbus and Roman Catholics generally in Mexico and Nicaragua. A large majority of the people are with you and Senator BORAH. You are both worth your weight a thousand times over in gold to this country. * * * I wish I was in Alabama to vote for you and work for you.

With best wishes and regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

A. M. ROBERTSON.

GREENOCK, PA., January 31, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate and thank you for the stand you are taking against * * * the Knights of Columbus. If they got their just dues they would all be deported to Rome. * * *

The world loves a man who is unafraid to express his opinion. I venture to say there are 80,000,000 Americans on your side, although many have not the backbone to say so.

Keep up the fight. Don't let the United States go to war with Mexico.

President Calles is doing in Mexico what we ought to be doing in this country right now, or will have it to do sooner or later.

Again many thanks.

Respectfully,

JOHN R. TWELVE.

ABERDEEN, MISS., February 2, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Care of Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I write to congratulate you most heartily for the brave and patriotic stand you have taken in regard to the Mexican situation, and I assure you that the true, patriotic, God-loving, God-serving Christian people who love their country and their flag applaud your patriotic stand and are behind you and will back you to the limit in your fight for the right against Romanism in all its hideousness. The press, too, as you so righteously state, is under the rule and control of this Roman hierarchy, as anybody who reads the daily subsidized press can tell.

I am glad to know that I live in an adjoining State to Alabama, who has the honor of having such a stalwart, patriotic, fearless representative in the Halls of Congress to represent them. I wish I could vote for you for the highest honor in the gift of the people.

Continue to wage your fearless fight for the right, notwithstanding REED, COPELAND, et al., and feel assured that the millions of true Americans are behind you to the man, and at your call they will answer. Never doubt and never fear; we are with you.

Praying God's richest blessings upon you, and that you may live to continue your great and much-needed work for your country and your God, I am,

Truly your friend and admirer,

CULLY C. MCKINNEY.

LANSING, MICH., February 4, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: I desire to extend to you my appreciation for your stand against the Knights of Columbus on the Senate floor in the

Mexican affair. Remember you shall have my prayers, as well as the prayers of my people in the church.

It looks as though we were living in the closing of time before the coming of Christ.

Trusting you will continue to take the right stand, I beg to remain,
Yours truly,

L. G. MOORE, Pastor, Evangelist.

FLINT, MICH., January 20, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: "Bully," as Teddy would say.

Stick to your feet.

Your courage and truth may upset the hierarchy plans to force our land to put Mexico again under the heel of Romanism, not Christianity.

Yours respectfully,

CLARENCE W. A. HOWLAND.

SPARROWS POINT, MD., February 16, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was reading your speech in press in the Fellowship Forum.

I only wish we had more Senators like you. You are a 100 per cent American. You know a great many people don't like to hear the truth about themselves. That's the way with the Knights of Columbus. They have started the trouble in Mexico and they may start here. * * *

I am a great believer in prayer and faith. I am praying every night for God to keep us out of war, and bless us as a Nation, and I pray that God's blessing and protection will be with you, Senator.

I am an American. I love my flag and believe in law and order.

I remain your faithful,

LEWIS A. REDFORD.

14373 PLAINVIEW AVENUE,
Detroit, Mich., February 13, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, as true Americans, wish to commend you on your recent speeches in the Senate exposing the Roman Catholic war propaganda.

* * * * *

Keep the good work up.

We are behind you and doing all we can.

Yours respectfully,

J. T. MORGAN,
ETHEL MORGAN,

FEBRUARY 10, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In your splendid speech before the United States Senate on January 14 you made the following statement in your first paragraph:

"Ours is the only Nation in all the earth whose highest judicial authority has declared it to be a Christian Nation."

Will you kindly indicate to me to what you there refer and, if possible, furnish me with a copy of the declaration in question?

My writing to you in this instance, rather than to our Maryland State Senator, is because of your undoubted familiarity with the document or declaration to which reference was had.

You are greatly to be complimented upon the speech to which I refer. It bespeaks soberly and masterfully the convictions of many earnest, cautious, and intensely patriotic people in this country. We, like you, take God to our conscience and allow no hierarchical domination in the seat of deepest convictions.

We are ready to support you heartily.

Very sincerely yours,

REV. A. BROWN CALDWELL,
Walbrook Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Cambridge, Md., March 1, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned organization, take this opportunity to congratulate you on your fearless and patriotic stand in respect to the Mexican situation and Nicaraguan question.

Even as Christ, our criterion of character, was criticized and denounced as a preacher of false doctrines, so is every one who advocates the high and lofty ideals of Christian living, as are inculcated in our American Constitution.

Thus, when Satan's darts at you are hurled, look ever to Jesus for renewed strength, and always feel that the great American organization,

the Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, are very ready to stand with you in the defense of the pure American principles you have championed.

Yours sincerely,

CHOPTANK KLAN, No. 5,
Realm of Maryland, Invisible Empire,
Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan.
W. C. POTTER, Kligrapp.

411 FERGUSON BUILDING,
Springfield, Ill., February 2, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I feel that I must take this method to commend you for the courageous stand you have taken in the United States Senate against the attempt on the part of certain individuals and organizations to have this Nation declare war on Mexico, and I want you to know that throughout the entire State of Illinois your truly American stand has made for you many scores of friends.

I am not one of that type who is opposed to any form of religion, but I am one of that type who feels if our Nation were guarded in its entirety by men such as you, who hold our Americanism as a sacred heritage, that we, who are at home, would experience a new sense of peace and tranquillity.

Please accept my thanks and commendations and believe me to be,
Yours very truly,

W. W. MOORE.

P. O. BOX 133,
Newburgh, N. Y., February 3, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Would you kindly send me your speeches of January 18 and 28? I go to the library each day and read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I wish my numerous friends also to know what is going on. The newspapers give nothing.

As to the few Senators that are against you in the Senate, I will say nothing about, as the voters will take care of them at the proper time.

The truth has been suppressed for some time. Thank God, you are a man who is an American clear through.

Keep up the good work, as the majority are with you.

Truly yours,

HAROLD SHERMAN.

"Honor is more than life."

TYRONE, PA., February 3, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania and one who believes in upholding the Constitution and laws of this our great country I am writing you to convey to you my sincere appreciation for your stand for things American.

Your stand against getting this country into war with Mexico, as reported recently in the Fellowship Forum, is cheering indeed. How much we wish that every man in the legislative halls of this Nation had the backbone and courage to stand up and call a spade a spade.

I assure you, Mr. HEFLIN, that you have the backing of most of the patriotic people of this country, and pray that your tribe will increase greatly until our legislative halls will be filled with none but those who have the good of America at heart.

I beg to remain,

Very sincerely yours,

REV. J. W. TYOCK.

PHENIX COUNCIL, No. 23,
JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS,
Phenix City, Ala., February 23, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Phenix Council, No. 23, Junior Order United American Mechanics, has noted with much pleasure your action in calling the Senate's attention to the hypocritical working of the Roman Catholic Church and the Knights of Columbus with their \$1,000,000 propaganda fund trying to involve this country into war with Mexico, and we want you to know that the crooked Romanized press with its false headings and colored stories does not fool the people any longer, thanks to our patriotic newspapers and magazine; therefore, Phenix Council, No. 23, Junior Order United American Mechanics, has gone on record as approving your great fight on the enemy of all free government, the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and we want to assure you at this time that we are with you 100 per cent in all you have said and done in exposing the rottenness and crookedness of the present administration's action toward Nicaragua and Mexico.

With best wishes for a long life that America may not be without a representative in her greatest of all law-making bodies, I am

Fraternally yours,

J. J. CANNACK,
Assistant Recording Secretary,
Phenix Council, No. 23, Jr. O. U. A. M.

GREAT BEND, PA., February 14, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, an order of 150 men, wish to use this means to show our appreciation of the stand you took on the Mexican situation.

Our only regret is we haven't got more men in the Senate, with backbone enough to stand up and fight when our country is facing danger.

This letter may be a little late, but it will show that all red-blooded Americans are back of you.

Cordially yours,

EARL LANE, Committee.

BALTIMORE, February 19, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN.

DEAR SIR: It was my pleasure to hear your wonderful speech in Congress yesterday, February 18, and write you that there are 2,000,000 Methodists in the United States who will back you up and thank you for the plain truth which you uttered.

Why is it that no other denomination have their meetings shown on the moving-picture screen but the Roman Catholics?

Every time the Catholics kiss the toe of the Pope there is a picture made of it, and it is shown on the silver screen.

The Baltimore Sun is run by the Catholics, no matter what Mr. BRUCE says to the contrary. The Abell family have run the Baltimore Sun ever since the paper was started, and the public knows they are Catholics.

The Lord help the United States if we ever have a Catholic President.

Very respectfully yours,

JAMES CARMICHAEL.

WACO, TEX., February 18, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: "He is a bold flea that can take his breakfast upon the lips of a lion." The Roman Catholic hierarchy, backed by their henchmen—the Knights of Columbus—in this country have emboldened themselves to the point of feeling themselves in power and strength like unto the king of the forest, and that all governments were vassals of the Pope of Rome and his canon law.

You have breakfasted upon the lips of that lion. Self-respect was the dynamite that blew the kings out of this country in 1776; your soul in this hour of America's call for men is radiant with the spirit of 1776; and not since the days of a Patrick Henry has a voice been heard so clear and true for justice and righteousness as what you have spoken. In America the Knights of Columbus have suffered a Waterloo by the courage of a HEFLIN. You have paralyzed the hand that would stab the temple of liberty. Back of you, dear sir, is an American organization of over 9,000,000 souls, and no coward souls are these.

Fear not. On with the battle! All honor to you.

Faithfully yours,

DR. WALTER LEE AUSTIN.

VALLEY LEE, MD., February 5, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The noble stand you have taken for truth and justice has won the approval of every intelligent, "square-shooting" American.

May God strengthen you in your glorious defense of American principles. Accept the gratitude and esteem of the undersigned and all other fair-minded Protestants of St. Marys County, Md.

E. ROSS ADAMS.

G. W. CHESSEY.

J. K. CROWDER.

MAURICE H. JONES.

Mrs. IDA ADAMS.

R. A. CHESSEY.

LOUISE ADAMS.

BESSIE JONES.

CLEVELAND CHESSEY.

JOHN L. CROWDER.

C. V. RICE.

DULCIE CROWDER.

JOHN R. MOORE.

P. S.: Kindly overlook the untidy appearance of our letter. It passed through many hands, and one signer, unfortunately, burned a corner while drying the ink over a lamp. It will at least serve to show you we are with you, even in this Roman Catholic county. We could secure many more signatures had we the time to cover more ground than this neighborhood. We are wearing out every issue of the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD passing it on for all to read what is actually occurring in the Senate. With best wishes to you, we are,
Your Protestant friends in southern Maryland.

Per P. W. WEBER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., February 22, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have blazed the way. Your vigorous exposure of the insidious enemies of struggling Mexico was timely and commendable. It is singularly appropriate, it seems to me, to devote a few minutes on this Washington's Birthday to extending sincerest congratulations. Perhaps other Senators may now take courage, since you have pointed out the path to patriotic duty.

"America for Americans—one flag, one country, one allegiance." Let us stick closely to these principles. If we do this, we will have little time, outside our own affairs, to undertake to force upon an unwilling people a program which has already kept them in ignorance, superstition, and poverty for several centuries.

On a separate sheet the writer is citing a few authorities which may be helpful to you in the future, provided, of course, that you have not had the time to look them up before now. These books, I am sure, may be found in the Congressional Library. If they are already familiar to you, beg pardon. No harm done, I hope.

Best wishes for your happiness, long life, and continued usefulness.

Sincerely,

EDGAR M. BALDWIN.

We, the Minute Men of America, Long Beach Regiment No. 1, Long Beach, Calif., in meeting assembled, this 15th day of February, 1927, do hereby present the following regarding our position toward the Mexican controversy:

"Whereas President Calles in Mexico understands his people and knows their needs and has in the past two years made more progress toward the establishment of a just, stable, and liberty-giving Government than his predecessors had in nearly 400 years. Imbued with a burning national patriotism and a desire that his benighted people may become more intelligent and prosperous, he is bending every energy and using every channel of intelligence at his command to establish a government free from the domination of ecclesiastical tyranny, which has prevailed most of the time for four centuries and has produced its natural results, fear, ignorance, and poverty. Calles, with a commendable spirit and wisdom, is insisting that the people obey the laws, especially that portion of the law relating to the separation of church and state and religious liberty.

"Our constitutional law is very similar to the Mexican law as relates to these two provisions, and we absolutely insist that they be observed; therefore, no just grounds for intervention on this point, notwithstanding the Knights of Columbus and ecclesiastical revolution promoters in this country are trying to embroil us in a war of intervention.

"Whereas Mexican intervention or the withdrawal of recognition on the part of the United States Government at the behest of the Knights of Columbus in this country would likely in the end react on our Government and, we fear, prove disastrous;

"Whereas in Omaha in 1925 President Coolidge declared that, 'Our country has definitely relinquished the old standards of dealing with other countries by terror and force and is definitely committed to the policy of discussion and understanding.' This being our policy as laid down by our President, and President Calles having offered to arbitrate the land and oil controversy in Mexico, there is no necessity for intervention on this point.

"Resolved, That we deem it only wisdom and justice on the part of the American people, holding firm to the policy that we will grant the same rights and privileges to the other party as we claim for ourselves. Therefore, on principle, we must grant to Mexico the right to settle her own internal affairs as a sovereign nation.

"We believe President Calles has shown the ability, courage, and intelligence to settle this question as best suits his people and all concerned.

"Resolved further, That we appreciate highly the loyal Americanism and sturdy patriotism of many of our United States Senators, who said on the Senate floor, in speeches delivered, that they consider intervention in either Nicaragua or Mexico inadvisable and unnecessary. We want to especially commend Senators HEFLIN, BORAH, and WHEELER for services rendered to this cause. God forbid that we might inadvertently touch the spark starting another world conflagration."

Col. B. C. BUB,
320 Pacific South West Bank Building,
Long Beach, Calif.

By GEORGE H. SHEARER,
Adjutant, Regiment No. 1,
286 Cherry Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Opelika, Ala., January 21, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan of Opelika, Ala., do most heartily indorse your stand on the Nicaraguan-Mexican situation. It is only those Protestants who have awakened that know that it is the Catholics and their political machine, the Knights of Columbus, who are the cause of the tenseness of our relations with our neighbors on the south.

Again assuring you of our wholehearted support, we are,
Your loyal supporters,

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
C. N. HATFIELD, Secretary.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Selma, Ala., January 29, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HEFLIN: We take this opportunity to congratulate you on the stand you have taken in the Senate in connection with Mexican situation. We are proud to know that we have a man who is capable of thinking on problems of this kind, and we are especially proud to know that we have a man who possesses the moral courage to state his convictions.

We wish to assure you that you have stated our sentiments exactly with reference to our relations with Mexico, and we believe that you have justly placed the responsibility for all the trouble that is now brewing regarding Mexico.

We hope you appreciate the confidence the people of Alabama, and especially those of south Alabama, have in you and in your ability as a statesman, and we are back of you 100 per cent.

We do not know whether you are a member of the klan or not, but if you are not you should be, because we believe that the time isn't far distant when we will need a man big enough to stand for klan ideals in preserving our American Constitution.

* * * Will thank you to see that we get a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your speech the date you caused so much excitement in the Senate.

Address all communications to post-office box 427.

Yours very truly,

THE KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN.

EAST FLORENCE, ALA.,
Post-office Box 1016, January 25, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is with the greatest respect and admiration that we extend to you our congratulations on your speech in the Senate relative to the Mexican situation and the Knights of Columbus intrigue to plunge our country into war with Mexico.

We feel that the true patriotic citizens of Alabama are proud of the fact that they have the only Senator that has the courage to stand up before the enemy and use plain English language in denouncing their schemes and plots to plunge two peaceful Nations into war, and not only the citizens of Alabama but the true citizens of the entire Nation are behind you in the stand you have taken in this matter. Keep up the good fight, remembering that we, too, are opposed to any religious denomination driving our country into war.

This organization goes on record indorsing every word of your speech on the Mexican and Nicaraguan situation, having full confidence that you will continue as you have started out, to serve and sacrifice for the right.

Respectfully,

FLORENCE KLAN, No. 73,
By THE KLIGRAPP OF THE KLAN.

JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS,
OLYMPIC COUNCIL, No. 4,
Seattle, Wash., February 21, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: We wish to call you friend.

The members of Olympic Council, No. 4, by unanimous vote in council session assembled wish to commend you and indorse your stand in the Senate in regard to the Knights of Columbus and the Mexican and Nicaraguan situation. You no doubt understand that we stand for the same principles that you advocated and spoke of in your historic speech, and it is, indeed, historic, since that you are the first man in almost 70 years who has had intestinal stamina enough to get up and tell the common enemy what you thought of them and their principles.

We wish you success, and only wish that there were more of the representatives of the people who would stand on both feet and fight for the principles of real Americanism.

Sincerely yours,

S. K. BEATTIE,
Recording Secretary, 6121 Arcade Building.

BRIDGEPORT, NEBR., February 25, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to take this means of extending to you our hearty congratulations on the stand you have taken in the Mexican and Nicaraguan situation, and of expressing to you our deep appreciation of the good work you have done.

We assure you that we are doing all in our power to spread the facts before the public in this community.

If there is any way in which we can be of further assistance to you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

OFFICERS AND KLANSMEN OF COURT HOUSE ROCK
KLAN, No. 32, REALM OF NEBRASKA.

MOUNTAIN CITY COUNCIL, No. 11, JR. O. U. A. M.,
Frostburg, Md., February 28, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been instructed by the above-named council, whose membership is 390, to write to you and tell you that they congratulate you on your stand on the Mexican situation.

Keep up the good work. We need more men like you in the life of our Nation.

Trust other Senators will join you in this fight for right.

If you have any copies of your speeches please mail us the same.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. TIMMONS, R. S.,
141 Maple Street.

NEW YORK CITY, February 10, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am instructed to inform you that Prince of Orange District, Loyal Orange Lodge, No. 1 (New York), of the Loyal Orange Institution of the United States, in meeting assembled January 31, 1927, on motion made and carried, passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this district lodge, through the secretary, send to Senator HEFLIN, of Alabama, an expression of appreciation for the able and consistent manner in which he has represented Protestant opinion in debate on the Mexican question before the United States Senate."

Yours respectfully,

T. L. BLACKMAN,
District Secretary Prince of Orange District,
Loyal Orange Lodge, No. 1.

WOMEN OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
MAYFLOWER KLAN, No. 115,
Jersey Shore, Pa., February 8, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Women of the Ku-Klux Klan, of Jersey Shore, Pa., wish to extend to you their congratulations on the noble stand you have taken in exposing this plot of the Catholic hierarchy.

God give us men like you, who are not afraid to voice their opinion. Keep up this good work and arouse our Protestant people, who are sleeping.

Yours sincerely,

Post Office Box 345, Jersey Shore, Pa.

WILMINGTON, DEL., January 31, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your speech to the United States Senate on Friday, January 14, 1927, on the Mexican and Mussolini question was read at our klan in conclave assembled, and I am directed by motion and unanimous vote to write to you and advise you that we are to a man heartily in accord with you.

We desire to say that if we had more men in the United States Senate like you, we would have no fear of any foreign power or any organization within our border interfering with the running of our Government. It surely is gratifying to know we have at least one man that is fearless, as by that speech we are satisfied that you are truly on guard.

We have learned from certain sources that you have received letters from this city criticizing you for your stand in this matter; but that man or men that wrote you are not American citizens, as you well know.

We trust that this letter, with thousands of men back of it, will offset any letters that you may receive from these so-called American citizens.

We trust, therefore, that you will be inspired to continue on your way for this noble cause and that you will be protected by the Almighty from the wrath of the attacking vampires.

Sincerely and truly yours for America,

WILMINGTON KLAN, No. 7, KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN.
HARRY J. SCHMIDT, Secretary.

MONROE, LA., February 5, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: At the regular meeting of Monroe Klan, No. 4, Realm of Louisiana, on last evening a resolution was unanimously passed naming me as a committee of one to express to you the sincere appreciation of this organization of your manly and truly American stand taken in the Senate of the United States a few days since relative to the relations of this Nation with the Republic of Mexico.

We, as individuals and as members of this organization, feel that only through the efforts of fearless men, statesmen, who love their country more than political position, can the true principles and purposes of this Nation as originally founded be preserved.

We commend you, my dear Senator, and assure you that Monroe Klan, No. 4, Realm of Louisiana, Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, appreciate your splendid service to this Nation of ours.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. BRYANT.

WENATCHEE, WASH., February 3, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: At our klonklave assembled February 1, Wenatchee District No. 2, of the realm of Washington, a motion was made and unanimously adopted that the membership express to you, through the secretary of the organization, its deep appreciation of your courageous stand in the United States Senate against interference in Nicaragua and Mexico by our Government and your exposure of the methods of the Knights of Columbus to stir up strife between this country and Mexico.

There are several millions of klansmen in the United States watching your good work in appreciation and will stand back of you to the last man.

"God, give us men."

With best wishes, we are,

THE KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
By M. W. HOYLE, Secretary.

KEOKUK, IOWA, January 18, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred members of the Community Service Club, of Keokuk, Iowa, wish to commend you on your views of the Mexican situation. For God's sake, keep up your good work.

G. C. BARBE, Secretary.

CUMBERLAND, MD., February 1, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The members of five Klaverns of the Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan of Allegany County, Md., numbering a membership of 2,000 extend to you our congratulations upon your stand in the Senate of the United States in reference to the Mexican situation.

Regardless of our attitude toward those of any religious sect, we feel that it is in the interest of all the people of our country that the truth should be told in regard to any matter which might tend to war, and we thoroughly understand that on some occasions it takes exceptional bravery for a public official to openly state the facts.

Recognizing the political aspect of the present situation, we appreciate the Americanism displayed by you regardless of consequences, and extend to you the hope that you and men like you will continue to hold office in high places.

Very respectfully yours,

WALTER W. WITTIG.
J. S. COLLINS.
CECIL SMITH.
JAMES J. MACDONALD.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
REALM OF MISSISSIPPI,
Jackson, Miss., January 25, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED SIR: I have anticipated writing you for several days to congratulate you upon your stand in the Senate, January 14 and 15, with reference to the propaganda that the Knights of Columbus are spreading in this country to precipitate a war between this country

and Mexico, or at least the breaking off of diplomatic relations and the raising of the embargo on arms.

It is a very singular occurrence, coincident with President Coolidge's message before Congress and Secretary of State Kellogg's statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the citizenry of the State of Mississippi was flooded with a certain 32-page pamphlet issued by the Knights of Columbus entitled "Red Mexico," hoping thereby to cinch and bolster up their previous utterances made at Philadelphia, and to inflame the minds of the people against the Mexican Government.

Now is the time for men, especially Senators, to stand foursquare for this Nation and its rights, and at the same time stay out of the internal affairs of another country.

Just wanted to congratulate you upon your stand.

Faithfully yours, in the sacred, unfailing bond,
FRED E. WANKAN, *Grand Dragon*.

RUSSELL, KANS., *February 14, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The members of Russell Klan, No. 251 (Kansas), Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, have directed me to express to you our hearty appreciation of your courage and of your loyalty to the best interests of our country. In the recent debates concerning the proposed intervention in Mexico you have done much to awaken dormant Protestantism.

It is very refreshing at this time, when public men and statesmen are trimming their sails to secure the support of factions that are alien in every way to our institutions and to our most cherished traditions, to know that we have in you a Senator who has the courage and manhood to stand and fight for the right rather than to seek the cover of political expediency.

We hope the single-handed fight that you have made will inspire some enthusiasm and patriotism in some of the weak-kneed lawmakers at Washington.

God give us men!

Accept our best wishes for the successful continuation of your unselfish service for America.

Cordially and sincerely,

A. Z. CARSON,
Exalted Cyclops, Russell Klan, No. 251, Russell, Kans.

KIT CARSON, COLO., *February 8, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been reading of your valiant fight in the Senate for America and the principles of Americanism. We wish to express to you our appreciation of the efforts you have put forth for this cause. We feel that with men like you in the Senate who are not afraid to tell the truth and make a fight for what is just and right the future of our country is safe. We wish again to assure you that we fully appreciate your efforts, and assure you that the West is with you. More power to you!

Yours sincerely,

CHAS. SCOTT
(And 16 others).

VERONA, PA., *February 14, 1927.*

To the Hon. Senator HEFLIN of Alabama,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a monster patriotic meeting held by American citizens in the K. of P. Hall, Verona, Pa., February 11, 1927, a unanimous vote of confidence was tendered you for your efficient service to your country and State in exposing the treachery of the hierarchy and K. of C. to involve the United States in war with Mexico.

We congratulate you for having the welfare of our country at heart.

Faithfully yours,

F. E. SMITH,
CYRUS SWEEAKER,
FRANK W. RUTTER,
F. G. SADDLER,
Committee.

ROCKBRIDGE, WIS., *February 14, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In behalf of the Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, and the W. K. K. K., I wish to extend praise to you and others, who have the courage to take such a noble stand in opposition to those who would like to entangle the United States into war with Mexico, in order to gratify the political desire of Rome.

Yours for good government.

J. S. LEATHERBERRY, *Secretary.*

SUNBURY, PA.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We the members of the Klavern of the Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan of Sunbury, Pa., wish to congratulate you on your action taken on the Mexican situation, and the wonderful stand you have taken for Protestant America and the upholding of the Constitution of the United States of America.

We wish you well in your achievement, and want you to feel that we are with you to the last man, and want you to keep up the wonderful work you are doing for Protestant America.

Sincerely yours, in the sacred and unending bond,
KLI GRAFF No. 9, KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., *February 11, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED SENATOR HEFLIN: Riverside Klan No. 34, Realm of California, in klonklave assembled, February 10, 1927, by a unanimous vote went on record as congratulating you for your 100 per cent American stand in the Mexican situation, and instructed the kligrapp to communicate with you advising you of this vote.

All the klansmen of this district have read your speeches in the Fellowship Forum, and know the truth. Of course, all they could get out of the subsidized press was that you "injected the religious question into the Senate," but thank God, we have a newspaper that will print the "truth."

I have heard hundreds of commendations on your brave stand, and I in turn am passing them on to you, to let you know that there are "powerful" groups in the United States of America besides the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Wishing you continued success, and hoping that you will keep up the good work, I am

Faithfully yours,

TRACY B. JACKSON,
Kligrapp Riverside Klan No. 34, Realm of California.

GREENE, PA., *February 9, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Fairfield Council No. 194, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, heartily indorse the stand you have taken in the Senate of the United States in regard to the Mexico situation.

They feel you have bit the nail on the head when you gave your explanation of the Knights of Columbus resolution adopted last summer in Philadelphia by that body. In stirring up this hornet's nest you have given to us who pass as 100 per cent Americans that there is a reality in the undertow which is undermining the principles upon which our American liberty was founded.

Accept this resolution as an indorsement of your work in regard to the Mexico situation.

"OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF FAIRFIELD COUNCIL No. 194,
"FRATERNAL PATRIOTIC AMERICANS.

"Resolved, That Robert Fulton Klavern No. 8, Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, goes on record as approving the stand that Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama, has taken in regard to giving to the American citizen the truth of the Mexico situation. This organization realizes that it is only through men of such character and backbone as Senator HEFLIN these truths are presented to Americans, and that, through the medium of his speeches being printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"The free American press is suppressed into publishing just what suits the Roman Catholic Church, and Protestants have been kept in the dark, but through the brave and stalwart son of the South we are given these truths; thus we, as an organization, extend to him our sincere appreciation of his great and noble work and pray that he may be favored to be crowned with the laurels of appreciation from a loyal American citizenry."

FAIRFIELD COUNCIL No. 194, FRATERNAL PATRIOTIC AMERICANS.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *February 9, 1927.*

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Congratulations, Senator, on the firm stand you have taken on the Mexican question. Your bold attempt to awaken in the hearts of your fellow Americans the peril that exists in that organization known as the Knights of Columbus is indeed commendable.

A man of such noble convictions, and with the dauntless courage to place the facts before the public, seldom reaches Congress. From your utterances we are satisfied you can not be silenced or bought off.

Oh, that we might have more men in the United States Senate like you. Men who stand for their country first, last, and all the time.

Keep up your good work, Senator HEFLIN, and may your endeavors awaken a slumbering Nation.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT KLAN,
C. W. REHNERT,
Exalted Cyclops.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Zanesville, Ohio, February 10, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: Muskingum County Klan, No. 11, Realm of Ohio, wish in this manner to congratulate you on your stand in the Senate and your excellent speech on the floor.

If our country had a few more fearless men like you in the Halls at Washington, men who are not afraid to voice their sentiments and who stand for American principles, this grand Nation of ours would be a better and a safer place in which to live.

You are in the right, Senator, and we hope that enough others will get behind you so that great good may be accomplished.

We are writing our Senators from Ohio, Senator F. B. WILLIS and Senator SIMEON D. FESS, to stand shoulder to shoulder with you and help you in the good work you have to perform, and we hope they will have the nerve to come out with you for what is best for our country.

Wishing you the best of success,

We are your friends for the cause of right,
G. H. RICHEY, *Secretary.*

WELLSVILLE, OHIO, February 5, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the representatives of an organization in the city of Wellsville, Ohio, composed of several hundred real Americans, offer our heartfelt thanks to you for the stand you have taken on the Mexican question.

We are certainly glad that there are some real Americans on guard at our Nation's Capital.

Men who have that thing within them that is called American backbone, and who have the courage of their convictions. Men who will stand out boldly for that which is right.

We as an organization are standing solidly behind you, as we stand back of every man who will stand for that which rightfully belongs to him. Our birthright is not to be sold for a mess of pottage.

Faithfully yours, the Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan.

I. J. STEWART, *President.*
T. F. CAMPBELL,
E. S. CLARK,
GEORGE C. GORSUCH,
Committee.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Greeneville, Tenn., February 8, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On Friday night, February 4, 1927, Greeneville Klan No. 11, Realm of Tennessee, in klonklave assembled, passed the following resolutions:

"Resolved first, That we praise you for your stand in the Mexican situation. We feel that what you are doing is for the best interest of all Americans.

"Resolved second, That we commend you for unearthing the vicious schemes of the Knights of Columbus in trying to get us in war with Mexico, so that they may keep control of the politics of Mexico; and we further

"Resolve, That we will give you our support in this matter and ask the good Lord to keep you from harm."

Faithfully yours,

GREENEVILLE KLAN, No. 11, REALM OF TENNESSEE.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Bellingham, Wash., February 9, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Allow us as members of the above society to tender you the resolution herein contained.

We glory in your patriotism and assure you that your exposure of the Knights of Columbus meets with highest regard in this part of the country. It is, indeed, refreshing to find a man in our legislative halls who has the stamina to tell the country the truth about things which millions of our population know nothing about. Hence it is that we wish you every success in your battle for Americanism and square dealing with all neighboring countries.

If it is possible, we would appreciate one or a dozen copies of your recent speeches upon the Mexican question. We feel that we may be able to educate some of our people by a judicious use of them.

Yours very respectfully,

W. W. KENOYER, *E. C.*
J. T. ADAMS, *Kligrapp.*

Whereas the Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, Senator from the State of Alabama, did recently in the Senate of the United States openly and fearlessly proclaim to the people of these United States and the world at large the true status of conditions existing in the United States with relation to the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas the members of Mount Baker Klan, No. 19, Realm of Washington, composed of native-born citizens of the United States of America, and representing directly and indirectly some 40,000 citizens of Whatcom County, Wash., in regular klonklave assembled, do unanimously indorse the fearless upholding of Americanism, liberty, and free institutions; and

Whereas we feel that the criticism of the actions of the Knights of Columbus in relation to the Republic of Mexico was and is justified in every particular: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Mount Baker Klan, No. 19, of Bellingham, Wash., do unanimously applaud and indorse the patriotic utterances of the Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, and assure him that he has the active moral support of a majority of the citizens of the Pacific Northwest; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senator from Alabama, the Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, at the earliest possible moment, and that a copy of the same be spread upon the minutes of Mount Baker Klan, No. 19, Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Titusville, Pa., February 10, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Realizing that perhaps circumstances may prevent our ever having the opportunity to personally commend you for the noble, self-sacrificing, all-American attitude you have displayed in your high calling as a Senator in this greatest of all Nations, the United States of America, we desire to take this opportunity to express to you our sincere gratitude for the fearless manner in which you bring to the attention of sleeping America the great need of the hour.

The prayer of this organization is God give us men, and we feel that in you we have found an answer to that prayer, and we wish to assure you that there are millions more in this good old United States of America who are willing and anxious to serve and sacrifice for the cause you so nobly espouse.

Sincerely yours,

KOLONEL DRAKE KLAN, No. 208,
Titusville, Pa.
WM. W. TUCKER, *Klg.*

KLAN NO. 48, VISALIA, CALIF.,
Realm of California, February 10, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The writer takes the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in volume 68, No. 38, there is to be found some very fine thoughts relative to our country. We observe that the K. of C. are very much opposed to your exposure of them in their efforts to try to get this country to go to war with Mexico.

At the request of the Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, No. 48, Realm of California, at Visalia, I write this letter to assure you that the klan is a group of loyal citizens of California and citizens of the United States. And each of them thank you, from the bottom of their hearts, for the stand you take against the inroads of Rome.

Their record of wrongdoing is an old one. "His infallibility, Pope Innocent III, finding the inefficiency of his gospel as preached by Dominic, proclaimed by his bulls a crusade against the Albigenses. Supported by his divine aid, His Holiness, in the name of the Lord of Hosts, granted all who should march against the Albigenses, pestilence, the pardon of sin, the glory of martyrdom, and the possession of heaven. The pontiff, by special favor and indulgence, gave the hero of the cross, if he fell in battle, an immediate passport to heaven, without even touching on purgatory. These rewards assembled half a million of holy warriors, composed of bishops, soldiers, canons, and people from Italy, France, and Germany, ready to riot in blood for the honor of God, the good of society, the defense of Romanism, and the extinction of heresy.

Lavaur was taken by storm in 1211. Americ, the governor, was hanged on a gibbet, and Girarda, his lady, was thrown into a well and overwhelmed with stones. Eighty gentlemen who had been made prisoners were slaughtered like sheep in cold blood. All the citizens were mangled without discrimination in promiscuous carnage. Four hundred were burned alive, to the extreme delight of the crusaders.

One shudders, says Velly in his history of these transactions, while he relates such horrors.

Languedoc, a country flourishing and cultivated, was wasted by these desolators. Its plains became a desert, while its cities were burned and its inhabitants swept away with fire and sword. A hundred thousand Albigenes fell, it is said, in one day, and their bodies were heaped together and burned. Detachments of soldiery were for three months dispatched in every direction to demolish houses, destroy vineyards, and ruin the hopes of the husbandman. The females were defiled. The march of the holy warriors was marked by the flame of the burning houses, the screams of violated women, and the groans of murdered men. The war, with all its sanguinary accompaniments, lasted 20 years. (See Variations of Popery by Samuel Edgar, D. D., pp. 256-257. Publishing house of M. E. Church South, Nashville, Tenn.)

Rome boasts that she never changes. What she did then she would do to-day, if she had the authority.

In the name of humanity and the name of our great Government, which we love and are loyal to, and in the name of the Ku-Klux Klan, No. 48, Realm of California, we heartily and sincerely thank you for the efforts you are putting forth in behalf of the citizens of the United States and against the rule of the Pope of Rome and his Romanism, and the cohorts of Rome, the Knights of Columbus.

We in konklave assembled thank you sincerely.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN, No. 48,
By J. C. THOMAS, Kligrapp.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Poughkeepsie, N. Y., February 14, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your recent stand on the Mexican situation in the Senate is to be commended and Poughkeepsie Klan No. 48, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., wish to take this opportunity of congratulating you highly. We also stand for America and a direct association with God.

It is needless for us to extol the ideals of the Klan, * * * but we must let you realize that we are behind the principles which you expound.

We are informed you expect to go on a lecture tour, and wish to know if you are booking any engagements in the Empire State. Poughkeepsie would be in a position to assure you a large audience. We desire information as to available dates.

I remain,

KLIGRAPP, Poughkeepsie No. 48.

TERRE HAUTE, IND., February 11, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: On behalf of several thousand Protestant American men and women, members of the Knights and Women of the Ku-Klux Klan of Terre Haute and Vigo County, and in accord with a resolution unanimously adopted at the last regular konklave of said order, I am writing you to convey the most hearty commendation of each and every man and woman allied with klan here for your brave stand in the United States Senate against the attempts of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to drag our country into war with Mexico. God give us more men like yourself; men not afraid to speak for their country and in defense of their country when danger threatens. As the late William Jennings Bryan once wrote me, so I write to you: "Strength to your arm."

We are preparing for a great Decoration Day gathering here, and I am wondering if you will come and be our speaker for that day. I can assure you that you will speak to one of the largest audiences that can be gathered anywhere in the country. You may name your remuneration figure. We will be able to draw from Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. With the keen interest now being manifested throughout the country, and especially in this section, I can assure you that it will be one of the greatest meetings this or any other section has ever witnessed.

Should you decide to come we shall cooperate in every way that your visit may be both pleasant and free from disturbance. We shall have 100 per cent cooperation from the city and county. * * *

When you have a leisure moment I shall be happy to hear from you, and I sincerely trust that you will find time to grant our request for the Memorial Day address.

With best wishes,

Respectfully and cordially yours,
ORVAL W. BAYLOR,
Manager Terre Haute Klan No. 7.

MARSHALL, TEX., February 8, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED FRIEND: We as a body of American citizens wish to congratulate you on the stand you have taken for Protestant Christian America and Americanism; therefore we are sending you these congratulations for the noble cause and brave fight that you are waging for your country, humanity, and Almighty God.

We believe that we are expressing the heartiest wishes and thanks of every patriotic American citizen, and we know that we are expressing the good will and best wishes of the thousands of the Ku-Klux Klan in Texas, and also those of all other States.

We wish to say that we feel like that Secretary Kellogg should, for the country's sake, tender his resignation at once, for it seems that his whole heart and soul is fixed on things beyond the sea and does not show the interest that one should, having the position that he now holds, and if he will not volunteer and tender his resignation we believe that our President ought to ask him to do so and make it effective at once.

We also believe that our President should come out openly and tell the people how and why this country has been dragged into meddling in Nicaragua affairs.

We also hope that our Texas Senators are with you in this great struggle and giving you first aid on the battle front.

We are sending congratulations to Senator WHEELER and Senator BORAH also, giving them our heartfelt thanks for their noble courage in standing up and out in the open for Protestant Christian America and American principles.

Again thanking you, and with best wishes, we are,

Faithfully yours in the sacred unailing bond,

MARSHALL KLAN, No. 168,
J. R. INGRAM, Kligrapp.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Lufkin, Tex., February 10, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: It is with great pleasure I inform you of the kind sentiments of praise unanimously expressed at a meeting of Angelina Klan, No. 16, at Lufkin, held on the night of February 17, in regard to the fearless stand you have taken against the Romanists and their henchmen in their propaganda to bring about war with Mexico.

We, as full-blooded Americans, are proud of you, and your native State never produced a better example of a 100 per cent American, one who when he knows he is right will defy the devil and all his angels to dispute it.

Keep up the fight, Brother HEFLIN, and God will protect you, because you are right. Don't stop until those mule-colored emissaries of the "Dago on the Tiber" "take to the woods."

Respectfully,

ANGELINA KLAN, No. 16, REALM OF TEXAS, AT LUFKIN,
SAM H. KERR, E. C.

P. S.: The writer is also a product of dear old Alabama, born in Athens nearly 69 years ago, and naturally feels proud of her son.

MATT. G. JOHNSON,
Kligrapp, Box 153, Lufkin, Tex.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Bozeman, Mont., February 11, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been reading in the public press about your speeches and the stand you have taken in the Senate on the Mexican situation, and we assure you of our hearty approval.

At our last meeting this question was discussed and a resolution passed commending you upon the firm stand you have taken and urging you and your colleagues to continue the fight in behalf of all 100 per cent Americans.

Faithfully,

COMMITTEE KLAN No. 10, REALM OF MONTANA,
Box 13, Bozeman, Mont.

KLAVERN OF TIPTON KLAN No. 50,
Realm of Indiana K. K. K.

Be it resolved by Tipton Klan No. 50, Realm of Indiana of the Invisible Empire Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, in regular konklave assembled, That we unqualifiedly indorse the stand taken by Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN on the Mexico and Nicaragua affairs, and pledge him our support in carrying out his program.

Exalted Cyclops, Tipton Klan No. 50, Realm of Indiana K. K. K.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Oxford, Ind., January 18, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to thank you for the statement you made in the Senate accusing the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic people of financing and stimulating the Mexican rebellion in Mexico.

We are proud to think that you are an American citizen and not afraid to voice your sentiments.

We are living in a Catholic community, and nothing would please them better than a war with Mexico over religion.

* * * We expect people coming to this country to abide by our laws. Let those in Mexico abide by the laws of that country. We know that money is being raised in this county to help in the rebellion there, as also in other Latin countries. Se we wish to say there are at least 2,000 real Americans in this county who are behind you, your views, and sentiments.

Faithfully yours,

BENTON COUNTY KLAN.

(Telegram)

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., January 19, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We congratulate you on your stand to keep America out of war.

We assure you that your patriotism and statesmanship will not be forgotten.

GOLDEN GATE KLAN, No. 58,
KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN.

WASHINGTON CAMP No. 41,
PATRIOTIC ORDER SONS OF AMERICA,
Frostburg, Md., February 25, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN:

Just a few lines of congratulations on your real Americanism.

The members of the above-named camp indorse your stand.

Just a paragraph from your speech in the RECORD of February 19:

"Is a Senator guilty of an un-American act when he tells the Senate about the effort of the Knights of Columbus to get our country in war?"

I don't think so. You are certainly right, and your remarks are just as much in place to-day as in the Dark Ages when dealing with a changeless system, who is just waiting her chance to undermine not only this Government but the governments of the world.

God bless and protect you.

Yours for Americanism,

THOS. G. JEFFIRES, Secretary, Camp 41.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Waterville, Wash., February 21, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We have followed closely your stand on the foreign relations of our country, especially with regard to Mexico and Nicaragua. At a recent meeting of some 150 American citizens your attitude was unanimously indorsed.

We believe that the only sane plan to follow is to let all other countries work out their domestic problems as they see fit and in their own way. * * *

More power to you in your stand for real American principles.

Yours very sincerely,

E. W. FAWLEY,
G. R. DICKSON,
M. W. MILLER,
Committee.

BOYCEVILLE, WIS., February 8, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HON. SENATOR HEFLIN: As American citizens we take pleasure in congratulating you for the patriotism you have shown and for the good judgment you have used in the Mexican situation. We take this step to show you that you are not alone in the fight for God and free America.

WM. SCHULTZ
(And 85 other signatures).

AUSTIN SWEDISH BAPTIST CHURCH,
Chicago, Ill., February 4, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.:

Because of the critical situation which at the present time exists in Mexico, where the Mexican Government, in its century-long struggle against the attempted domination of the State by the Roman Catholic Church, and inasmuch as our attention has been called to the fact that the Catholic clergy and Knights of Columbus are bending every effort to influence the United States Government to interfere with the efforts of the Mexican Government to throw off the Roman Catholic yoke: Be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Austin Swedish Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill., express to Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN of Alabama our sincere thanks for the fearless stand taken in the United States Senate in exposing the intrigues of the Church of Rome to cause war between the United States and Mexico, to the end that Roman Catholic interests shall be protected and helped.

As citizens of these United States, where our Constitution declares that church and state be separate, we pledge to Senator HEFLIN our united support in his every effort to protect the rights of this Government from Roman Catholic interference and power.

We will also enlist every citizen which our influence reaches to give whole-hearted support and loyalty to Senator HEFLIN in the manly and courageous stand that he and others like him may take to open the eyes of the American people to the insidious influence which the Church of Rome is exerting against our Government.

Done by order of Austin Swedish Baptist Church, February 31, 1927.

SWANEY NELSON, Pastor.
HERMAN LINDGREN, Clerk.

CLINTON, Mo., January 28, 1927.

Senator THOMAS J. HEFLIN,
State of Alabama, U. S. A.,

The Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I am authorized as president of the Clinton Christian Citizenship Club to write to you commending your recent speech before Congress in which you so ably and clearly voiced the sentiments of those who view with alarm the growing strength of the Knights of Columbus in American politics.

We hear so much of the sublime power of Senators to voice their feelings freely in their own chamber. This power is never so sublime as in such cases as your own when you invoked it in defense of Protestants and their right of condemning wrongdoing even though on the part of such an all-powerful organization as the Knights of Columbus.

We ask only that voices shall be raised against iniquity wherever it may be found, and we thank you for raising yours as few have been noble enough to do in the past.

Very respectfully,

MRS. W. B. BAILEY,
President The Clinton Christian Citizenship Club.

OAKLAND, CALIF., January 26, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: During a session of Custer Council, No. 22, Junior Order United American Mechanics, held January 25, 1927, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas the members of Custer Council have read with much pleasure the accounts in the press of the speech of Senator HEFLIN, of Alabama, regarding the efforts of the Knights of Columbus to stir up trouble between our country and Mexico: Be it therefore

Resolved, That Custer Council go on record as wholeheartedly approving the stand of Senator HEFLIN in this matter: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator HEFLIN and that the same be spread on the minutes of Custer Council.

CHAS. A. TAGGART,
Recording Secretary, 1007 Rose Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 15, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the North Shore Civic Association, held last evening, with 60 members present, a resolution was unanimously adopted commending you for your stand on the Mexican situation.

We only wish that there were another hundred men in the Senate that considered the interest of their country in the same light that you do.

Very truly yours,

NORTH SHORE CIVIC ASSOCIATION,
EDGAR A. ROSSITER, President.

PORTLAND, IND., February 14, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I feel that I owe you congratulations on your courageous attitude regarding your speech in Congress on the Mexican situation.

We as members of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics are in sympathy with any man who has the courage of his convictions regarding any effort on the part of any religious organization to dictate what shall be done regarding foreign conduct of our Government, especially when that organization is in the minority and we hope will be so in the next thousand years.

We are also opposed to foreign immigration. * * *

Let us be ever on the lookout for such moves by those who would give allegiance to other than the Government under which they live.

Thanking you again for your loyal stand. I am ever your loyal supporter when you take the stand you did.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN H. MCFARLAND.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., January 25, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being natural-born American citizens and deeply interested in our country's welfare, we have been watching with intense anxiety the course of events, especially relating to our Latin-American neighbors, Mexico in particular. We are wondering whether or not we would be embroiled in an unjust conflict with our neighboring country beyond the Rio Grande due to the direct influence of a very narrow and so-called religious clique—namely, the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

We, as loyal American citizens, believe that Mexico has a perfect and just right to shape her own destiny as we Americans have to shape ours. We wondered if the Senators would allow this great Nation to be drawn into this selfish conspiracy. But, thank God, we still have a few Senators who are showing their true American spirit by raising their voices in honest protest, and among those few the name of Senator HEFLIN shows most prominent.

Therefore, Senator HEFLIN, we desire to thank you for your unbiased stand for true American principles. If all our Senators in Washington were men of your type, our country would be in safe hands and we could live in close harmony with our neighbors.

The undersigned committee have taken it upon themselves to secure the appended signatures of native-born Americans who wish you and your colleagues to continue this fight for liberty and justice to and for these oppressed peoples.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY KOELZER, *Chairman,*
(And 107 others).

TAYLOR MEMORIAL, L. O. L., No. 541,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 8, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been instructed by the above lodge to write and state that we are very glad to know of the stand you took in the Senate in regard to the Mexican situation.

We are back of you 100 per cent.

Wishing you success, I remain,

Fraternally yours,

ROY A. TAYLOR, *Secretary.*

Mr. President, I want to read into the RECORD a deserved tribute to one of my neighbor Senators, Hon. WILLIAM J. HARRIS, of Georgia. This tribute to him is from Senator SIMMONS, of North Carolina, and is contained in a letter to Governor McLean of that State. This letter tells of Senator HARRIS's service to the cotton producers:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 13, 1927.

HON. A. W. MCLEAN,

Governor, Raleigh, N. C.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR MCLEAN: I have your letter of January 11, transmitting to me copy of the letter you received from the Governor of Georgia, asking support for H. R. 15206, introduced in the House of Representatives, providing for investigation and research by the Department of Commerce with a view to discovering additional commercial and scientific uses for cotton and its by-products.

I am rather surprised by this request from the Governor of Georgia, in view of the fact that Senator HARRIS, of Georgia, procured an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill, which has already passed both Houses, providing additional money in the sum of \$25,000, and providing investigation by the Department of Agriculture with a view of discovering additional commercial and scientific uses for cotton, etc. My information is, also, that Senator HARRIS has conferred with Secretary Hoover, of the Department of Commerce, and that further provision will be made along this line for investigation by the Department of Commerce in the appropriation bill for that department which will shortly come up for passage. Senator HARRIS has been of such great service to the South, and to the cotton growers in particular in this matter, and has been so diligent and successful that I am rather surprised that the governor of his State is not advised as to his accomplishments along this line. I assume that he is not familiar with what Senator HARRIS has accomplished, or otherwise he would not be seeking support for a bill introduced in the House by a Representative from another State which has for its object doing the work that Senator HARRIS has already provided for by one department and will shortly provide for additionally by the Department of Commerce. My information is that an amendment was proposed in the House to the agricultural appropriation bill similar to the one that Senator HARRIS had already provided, but the amendment so proposed did not prevail in the House. As above stated, however, Senator HARRIS succeeded in putting this amendment in in the Senate and held it in the bill in conference.

With assurances of my high esteem, I am,

Cordially yours,

F. M. SIMMONS.

Mr. EDGE obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, reference has been made to Sir Esme Howard, the British ambassador to the United States. He has been the representative of his country in this Republic for a number of years, and in the discharge of his duties has secured the esteem of the American people.

Sir Esme Howard has had a distinguished career. He has been in the diplomatic service of Great Britain for many years and has been its accredited representative to various countries. He is a man of high attainments and of unquestioned integrity. He has served his country with honor and has won the confidence and respect of the people of all countries in which he has served as a representative of Great Britain.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Sir Esme Howard since he came to the United States as Great Britain's ambassador, and I have no hesitancy in saying that it would be impossible for him, because of his intellectual and moral qualities, to engage in any intrigue against the United States.

Great Britain is a Protestant country, but it does not discriminate against its citizens, nor does it take into account their creed or race when naming persons for positions of trust. Many Catholics have held high positions in the British Empire. They have been loyal to their country and have contributed to the fame of the British Empire. Great Britain has selected for positions of responsibility at home as well as abroad persons of the Jewish race and faith. Quite recently Lord Reading, one of the ablest men in public life, filled an important mission for his country in this Republic, and Senators know that he but recently retired from the position of Viceroy of India.

Mr. President, knowing Sir Esme Howard as I do, I can not permit the charge to be made that he connived at any movement looking toward a war between the United States and Mexico or that he entered into any conspiracy affecting the interests of the United States or engaged in or approved of any measure derogatory to the United States or dishonorable to himself or to his own country.

Mr. President, the United States is at peace with Great Britain and all the world. It desires their friendship and good will as all nations and all peoples have the friendship and good will of this Republic. We welcome to our shores ambassadors and diplomatic representatives from other countries, and send to them our representatives who speak for this Nation. So long as Sir Esme Howard represents a nation with which we are at peace, and so long as he comports himself as a gentleman and acts in harmony with the standards which should govern the conduct of those who speak for and represent nations, I feel that he is entitled to the respect of this body as well as of those occupying official positions in our country; and his honor and motives and conduct should not be impugned, or his integrity questioned. We would resent any attack upon or criticism of our ambassadors or representatives in the parliamentary bodies of other countries, particularly when we knew that they were guilty of no improper or dishonorable act and were discharging with fidelity their duty to their country.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I indorse all the Senator from Utah has said, and am very glad to have it stated in my time.

I have no desire to discuss the family quarrels in the Democratic Party, whether they relate to differences of opinion on the question of prohibition or whether they relate to very acute differences of opinion as to who shall be the next Democratic nominee for President of the United States. Personally, approaching the thought from different angles, I join with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] in his expressed hope that Governor Smith shall not be the nominee on the Democratic ticket. I express that hope because I consider Governor Smith one of the strongest, if not the strongest, of Democrats in the country to-day—although he would not be elected. I might say, however, that I admire him greatly. His force, his determination, his comprehensive knowledge of his State responsibilities have made it possible for him to give the great people of the great State of New York a most satisfactory administration.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

S. 4316. An act to amend the act entitled, "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service," approved October 6, 1917;

S. 4474. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906, as amended:

S. 4840. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York;

S. 5385. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the county of Del Norte, State of California, to Whaler Island in Crescent City Bay, Del Norte County, Calif., for purposes of a public wharf; and

S. 5692. An act granting permission for the laying of pipes for the transmission of steam along the alley between lots Nos. 5 and 32 in square No. 225.

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

S. 2202. An act to provide that jurisdiction shall be conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statutes of limitation, to hear, examine, and adjudicate and render judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims arising under or growing out of any treaty or agreement between the United States and certain bands of Indians, and for other purposes; and

S. 2965. An act to prevent discrimination against farmers' cooperative associations by boards of trade and similar organizations, and for other purposes.

BUREAUS OF CUSTOMS AND PROHIBITION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10729) to create a bureau of customs and a bureau of prohibition in the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I am going to speak very briefly on the unfinished business. I recognize that to do that is rather the exception than the rule. There have elapsed about six or seven legislative hours since cloture was adopted. During those six or seven hours there have been five or six speeches made, one by an opponent to some features of the bill—the civil-service feature, I believe—the other five speeches by those who are supposed to be or who have previously expressed themselves in accord with the bill, and yet in each and every case they have discussed some other subject than the bill. That is one of the reasons, Mr. President, why I voted against cloture. Cloture does not seem to mean that even the friends of a measure, who should be enlisted upon the side of seeing it brought to a vote, will in any way help to bring about that result.

I voted against cloture for two or three other reasons. As a matter of fact, the bill had not been discussed for five minutes before cloture went into effect. The term "cloture," generally speaking, unquestionably means, if it means anything, that debate shall be stopped. In fact, that very expression is used in the cloture rule of the Senate. But in this case debate had never begun. I also voted against cloture, to be perfectly frank about it, being compelled to be away on the day that cloture was to have been voted on, because I feared that, perhaps, what I might consider objectionable amendments might have been offered just previously to the cloture vote, which, of course, is admissible under the rule. I voted against cloture likewise because, important as the bill may be—and I hope when it becomes a law, as it will, that it will demonstrate its usefulness and practicability—in my judgment it does not parallel in importance the so-called alien property bill, the public buildings bill, and other bills which will probably die with the close of this Congress at noon on Friday next.

I have already announced, I think, on two different occasions that I shall vote for the bill. Therefore, as a friend of the measure, a supporter of the measure, I repeat that I shall take only a very few minutes to discuss it. I shall not discuss economic problems; I shall not discuss utility problems; I shall not discuss war with Mexico, which is as far away as the most distant star in the heavens. Differing from other supporters of the bill, I shall discuss the bill itself, the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. President, as a member of the Finance Committee I first determined to support the bill when the bill, before the committee for consideration, was variously amended. The bill has been greatly changed since it came from the House. As it came from the House, I am not sure that it would have received my approval. I support it because now, with Senate amendments, it absolutely and completely divorces those two great bureaus of the Treasury Department, customs and prohibition. I have had letters and petitions from men engaged in the customs service, some of whom have been connected with it for a number

of years, praying that they might be divorced from the contaminating influences of attempted prohibition enforcement.

We must admit, my friends, whatever may be our position on this great question, that it has practically destroyed that once splendid service of which we were all so proud, the Coast Guard of the United States. Dozens of men of the Coast Guard have been compelled to resign or have been indicted for crime in connection with their responsibility to enforce the Volstead Act and the prohibition amendment, and have gone to jail or been detached from the service to such an extent that to-day that once splendid and proud organization, which guarded the shores of the Atlantic and Pacific and apprehended smugglers and performed such a wonderful service, is now relegated to a position that citizens are compelled to bow their heads in grief if not in shame. The customs service and the Bureau of Prohibition will be absolutely and completely divorced upon the passage of this bill. In fact, under the terms of the bill even the Secretary of the Treasury himself is powerless to transfer a man from the customs service to the prohibition service, and vice versa. It is clearly defined that each department shall be headed by a commissioner and its responsibilities alone confined to the law relating directly to those responsibilities.

I am very glad that is to be so, and I am very glad to assist in the interest of better law enforcement if it can be brought about. I believe by centralizing responsibility with a commissioner of prohibition in a department absolutely responsible to him, in no way related to the other departments of the Government, that we will have an opportunity at least to ascertain whether it is possible to get even a half satisfactory result in the way of enforcement of this law.

I hope I have made it quite clear, on the floor of the Senate and in the country, that I disagree with compulsory prohibition. I disagree with police regulations, as it were and as it is, as a part of the Constitution of the United States. I disagree with the social experiment which has failed. It is impossible, and it has been proven impossible in the past, to satisfactorily enforce the law; and I fear that the future will prove it is just as impossible as in the past. I do not say this in any spirit of exultation that such a condition exists. Far from it. I would be delighted if it were possible to design laws which were fair to the liberty of the people, giving due consideration to the guaranties of the Constitution, which would make for a better enforcement than we must admit exists to-day.

Therefore, I repeat, I support the bill with the hope that this separate department may in some way improve the enforcement of the law, and, goodness knows, there is room for improvement in every direction.

While supporting all sane efforts for law enforcement, I shall, however, do everything in my power on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere to bring about a resubmission of the eighteenth amendment, properly revised, in order to meet a condition which I think all of us must admit is intolerable to-day and in order to give the people of the country another opportunity, having full knowledge of the failure of the past eight years, to express, through their legislatures or otherwise, the policy for the future.

I want it to be done, however, in a direct, orderly, and proper manner. In the meantime I shall help, as I have done in the past, to secure proper appropriations and legislation which would seem to be fair and equitable, which might help in the enforcement of the law.

On the question of civil service, which seems, as far as I can analyze the views expressed by some of those who like myself oppose compulsory prohibition, to be the only section of the bill with which they are in disagreement, personally I am not in disagreement with that provision. Certainly, I repeat, enforcement under the present system has been most unsatisfactory to the friends of the law and others. If the invoking of civil service will improve the personnel, let us have civil service. Goodness knows, it could not be worse than it is now. I shall not attempt to repeat the figures, yet as I recall approximately 50 per cent of the men engaged as inspectors or agents or directors of prohibition in the various States of the Union since the law has been in effect, have fallen by the wayside. Many to-day are in prison; many were compelled to resign with the notation "for the good of the service"; many resigned voluntarily because they recognized what would happen otherwise.

We hear and read, of course, of the scandals in every section of the country. I do not believe that invoking civil service will correct that evil. I can not imagine how it can correct that evil; but, at least, it will place the applicants for positions on a basis of equality, and neither the Anti-Saloon League nor any other outside agency will have control of the appointment of these men. That, I believe, is a step in the right direction, and I hope it will result in better service and better enforcement.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say about the bill. I simply wanted my position to be entirely clear. There seems to be some effort to produce confusion because those of us who have clearly announced our opposition to the fundamental principle of compulsory prohibition that does not prohibit are supporting a bill that was in its inception, I believe, proposed by what are known as prominent dry leaders. So far as my position is concerned, I hope I do not need to repeat it, but I will. I do not care who proposes a measure, be he friend or foe, I reserve the right and always will, so far as my support or my opposition to the measure is concerned, to consult my own best judgment.

In my best judgment this is a fair bill. I hope it will become a law without any unnecessary delay or anything that could be termed a filibuster, and that it will be successfully administered and produce beneficial results.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] that there has been no debate of any account on this question that has had cloture applied to it.

I wish to outline as briefly as possible my views on the measure now the special order in this body, but before I do this I desire to pay my respects to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], who yesterday saw fit to ridicule and belittle me for making vigorous protest against the action of so-called "wets" of the Senate in joining the camp of the "drys" in forcing through the upper Chamber a measure which has never been adequately debated.

The Senator from New York sarcastically and insultingly quoted me as saying "that two incipient presidential booms caused cloture to be placed on the prohibition reorganization bill," and that "when professional Senatorial wets vote for dry measures, of course, it is useless to expect any encouragement from Senators who are neither wet nor dry. Cloture on this measure was decisively defeated until some presumably wet Senators cowed before the Wheeler lash and forsook wet leadership."

Mr. President, I did make this declaration, and I meant what I said, and I mean what I say now.

The only reference to the Senator from New York which can be questioned as to its truthfulness is that wherein I referred to him as a "wet." This is not true, and I beg the Senator's pardon.

The Senator from New York bombastically and with loud blowing of trumpet exclaims, "I am for law enforcement."

Mr. President, if the assurances of the Senator from New York as to his ardent desire for law enforcement are as counterfeited as was his promise that he would vote against cloture on the reorganization bill, God help law enforcement!

The Senator from New York has never been in sympathy with antiprohibition campaigns. He has straddled and wobbled on prohibition ever since he has been a Member of this body, and he is straddling and wabbling to-day, and this in the face of an overwhelming referendum of his own State against Volsteadism and all that it implies; and still he has the temerity to attack my motives when I speak the truth about the real friends and the bogus friends of the "wet" cause.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York further says, "I am for law enforcement." I should like to have the Senator from New York point out one Senator in this Chamber who is not for law enforcement. I am for law enforcement with a great deal more positiveness than is the Senator from New York, and he knows it. My fight against the reorganization bill has not been against law enforcement; it has been against the tactics and trickery of the dry forces in this body to railroad a bill through this Chamber without adequate debate simply because Wayne B. Wheeler cracks his lash. If that is the kind of law enforcement the Senator from New York is for, I am against him 100 per cent.

The trouble with the Senator from New York is that he is trying most unsuccessfully to play both ends against the middle, and thereby ensnare both wet and dry votes. He has never yet taken a positive and determined stand on the prohibition question, and I do not expect that he ever will as long as he is a Member of this body. His caustic comment and innuendoes cast at me have no more effect on my judgment or my determination to continue my fight against prohibition than have the wallings of Wayne B. Wheeler.

The Senator from New York further states, "We [meaning the people of New York] do not share the views of the New Jersey Senator." No; and the Senator from New York does not share the mature and intelligent views of anybody else.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York when and for how long he has been commissioned to

speak for Gov. Alfred E. Smith, of New York? I make this inquiry because I believe I am as familiar with New York State politics as is the Senator from Manhattan.

It was not so very long ago that the Senator from New York was working with the Hearst-Hyland faction of the Democratic Party in New York to ruin Governor Smith. In fact, the Senator from New York referred to the Governor of New York as "no Apollo," and did all in his power to thwart the governor's ride to power. With what credentials does he now presume to speak on the floor of the Senate for Governor Smith?

The New York Senator has seen fit to deride me for wishing to make this Nation "as wet as the Atlantic Ocean." Let me say to the Senator from New York that if I can make it as wet as New York City I shall be perfectly satisfied.

If the Senator from New York wishes to tie his fortunes up with the Anti-Saloon League crowd, let him go his way. God forbid that the antiprohibitionists will ever crave his help! If they do, they will never get it.

I sincerely trust that the junior Senator from the Empire State will broadcast his remarks to his home State, because when he announced to the world that he was in favor of cloture on the reorganization bill he declared himself in favor of gag rule in the Senate and against the right of free speech. If he thinks such flimsy and untenable argument as he has put forth will fool the people of the State of New York, I can assure him that he is mistaken. I know the people of New York quite as well as does he.

So much for the Senator from New York.

This reorganization measure on its face appears innocent enough, but when provisions of the bill are carefully digested and analyzed it will appear to many impartial and unbiased minds that if this measure becomes a law the Sixty-ninth Congress will have gone on record as favoring further centralization of government and the setting up of a bureaucracy which is bound to cause embarrassment to every legislator who votes to cause this bill to become statutory law.

This measure is known as H. R. 10729, and was introduced in the Senate April 19, 1926, and referred to the Committee on Finance May 17 of last year. On December 10 last, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] reported this bill to the Senate with certain amendments. It was recommitted to the Committee on Finance December 17, and now we are confronted with it on the floor of this Chamber.

It has already passed the lower House.

Mr. President, before I attempt to analyze this measure I want to assure my "dry" friends on both sides of this Chamber that it is with no thought of filibustering or delaying a final vote on the Smoot bill that I now address the Senate at some length. I want to say right here that if the Senate would take up either of the two most important bills, in my estimation, before the Senate—the public lands and buildings bill or the alien property bill—I would relinquish all right even to make my own position known in the Senate. My only purpose is to bring before the country the real and underlying reasons which prompted the sponsors and advocates of this measure to insist at this late day of the session that it be "railroaded through the upper House without allowing fair and just debate.

This measure has been pending on the Senate calendar since last year.

Why have no serious attempts been made to call it up?

Day after day and night after night when the Congress has been in session, and bills on the calendar have been in order, the Smoot bill has been passed over without the slightest efforts being made by my "dry" friends to ask for its consideration, except in the last week or so.

For the past two or three weeks the reception room of this Chamber has been alive with paid lobbyists of the Anti-Saloon League and the Methodist Board of Public Morals organization, buttonholing both wet and dry Senators to jam this reorganization bill through "when Edwards and Bruce are not looking."

The Anti-Saloon League has not approached me, because its members know that I would not listen for a fraction of a second to their un-American, entirely selfish, bigoted, and intolerant appeals.

I try to represent in this body, first, America, and secondly the intelligent and fair-minded thought of the State of New Jersey.

Let me inquire again:

What is the real purpose behind this measure? The purpose is not to stiffen prohibition enforcement; not to combat more urgently prohibition corruption and fraud; not to make America free of poison liquors; not to strengthen Volsteadism.

The real purpose is to create some 10 or 12 new jobs for Wayne B. Wheeler, who is now engaged in rounding up dry delegates for Mr. Coolidge in the 1928 convention.

Wheeler needs this additional patronage to maintain his fast-weakening hold on "dry" America.

This is all there is to the bill, my friends.

If it were not for the new jobs, Wheeler would not walk to the Capitol in the interest of this measure.

I know what I am talking about.

There is a gentleman in the Prohibition Unit now, a Mr. Roy Haynes, a protégé of the old, discredited Daugherty crowd, who wants one of these jobs. He, too, has been active in the prohibition lobby which has infested the Capitol Building day after day.

Although Haynes is now drawing a nice, fat salary from Uncle Sam for doing little but haunt Washington bucket shops and gambling exchanges and peddling lies about the progress being "made by me in enforcing prohibition," he expects the fattest job to be made available if this bill becomes a law.

How much longer is this administration going to be permitted by the Congress to allow officials on its pay roll to earn their salaries by lobbying at the Capitol day after day in the interest of the Anti-Saloon League?

The American Government is actually paying handsome salaries to officials who do nothing but wait on Wayne B. Wheeler and the Methodist Board of Public Morals, and lobby through this Congress legislation which is the rankest sort of class legislation.

The Smoot measure is a political trick to ensnare dry Republican delegates to the next national convention.

Not even its sponsors entertain the slightest hope that it will strengthen enforcement. On the contrary, they know it will not.

The only thing on God's green earth that will strengthen prohibition and bring about a true temperance is no prohibition. This may sound paradoxical, but it is just as true as the fact that I stand upon the floor of this Senate.

Prohibition and temperance are as contrary and opposed as are black and white.

If we insist upon prohibition we can not have temperance, because the one is a coercive instrument of government, while the other is an intelligent and voluntary instrument of moral suasion.

Prohibition to-day has reached heights of open and flagrant law violation far more menacing, far more dangerous to the domestic security and safety of this Nation than the old corner saloon; and no one wishes to see this institution revived.

Bootleggers are operating openly and defiantly; and I defy any legislator on Capitol Hill to assert that bootlegging operations can be halted as long as Volsteadism remains the law of this land.

It is not the so-called "whisky ring" who are supporting, aiding, and abetting the criminal bootlegger, but the dry fanatics themselves are the truest and staunchest friends the bootlegger has in America.

Is there a Senator on this floor who believes that there is a bootlegger in the State of New Jersey who will vote for me in the 1928 election? Not at all. The bootlegger will learn what candidate is indorsed by the Anti-Saloon League, and every criminal dispenser of liquors in the State will support the league candidate.

These bootleggers are annual contributors to the Anti-Saloon League campaign funds. They will spend thousands of dollars of their ill-gotten gains to defeat me. Now, why will they do this? Simply because prohibition, which was passed to hasten the millennium, affords them a rich market for their goods, and a haven of protection if they are caught.

My "wringing-wet" campaign, as Doctor Wheeler loves to call it, means the absolute ruination of the bootlegger's business; and yet Senators will vote "dry" year after year; and every time they do it they are upholding the hand of lawlessness.

Why has not this body of representative men of the Nation the courage to face the prohibition problem with backbone and stamina, and not stoop to the advocacy of the Smoot measure, which is the meanest sort of political trickery—a pork barrel for the Wheelers, the McBrides, and the Wilsons, who, except for bootleggers and dive keepers, are the only ones who are reaping a prohibition harvest?

Mr. President, I can see no urgency whatsoever in passing this bill at the present session of the Congress. There are measures now before us which are of the most vital importance to the international and domestic welfare of this Nation; and for the Senate of the United States at this late date to hold up important legislation in order to cram through a job finding bill is unthinkable.

There is no one in this Chamber who is more desirous of seeing prohibition function as it should function under the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act than am I. I should like to see the prohibition department an absolutely

independent agency of the Government; but the Smoot measure does not do this. At present we have somewhere around six heads of prohibition. We have the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, General Andrews, Mr. Roy Haynes, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the head of the Customs Division, as well as the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice, all trying to enforce prohibition, and all working at cross-purposes.

If Senator SMOOT or any other Member of this body will bring in a measure providing for one absolute and independent head of prohibition, I will gladly support it. If the bill now before us does not become a law, we will still have all the agencies already named trying their hand at enforcement.

Let me repeat, the Smoot measure is plainly and clearly a device to intensify centralization and bureaucracy in Washington by creating some half-dozen or more political jobs for faithful Republicans, who will be expected to do their part in rounding up delegates for the 1928 Republican National Convention.

If any Member of this body can show me any other merit in the measure, I will withdraw my opposition to it and refuse to obstruct early action. By the way, I have never said that I would not vote for the measure. I have never asked a Senator on this side of the Chamber not to vote for it. I do not know one Senator on this side of the Chamber who is going to vote against it, except myself.

Prohibition has already ruined the Coast Guard Service, which was originally instituted to protect human life, which it is now taking in countless numbers. It has ruined the customs service, and if this bill is passed it will continue to hamper and further degrade both of these governmental agencies. Police officers have been corrupted and customs officials have been debauched and prohibition officers and men have been bribed and ruined for life, and if this Smoot measure becomes a law, all of these agencies will continue to feel the blight of prohibition corruption.

At present prospective applicants for the position of prohibition enforcement agent must possess two main qualifications. First, they must have been convicted of crime, and, second, they must not bring convictions against anybody else for breaking the law.

Under civil service it is all but impossible to force out of the prohibition service men who are protected under the rules and regulations of civil service. They must be tried and convicted before they can be severed from the service. Of course, they can be suspended pending hearing. I presume this is the kind of law enforcement the Senator from New York is in favor of.

The adding of more deadly poisons to industrial alcohol by the United States Government when it is a known fact that millions of gallons of this alcohol are being annually diverted into so-called bootleg channels is too atrocious for even a barbaric nationality to contemplate.

The poisoning of alcohol that is being drunk by citizens of a free Nation—and drunk in violation of the spirit of both constitutional and statute law, if you please—is too ignoble and dastardly a process for a free people to countenance, even when the process is resorted to for the purpose of law enforcement.

Law enforcement can only become a reality when the consent of the governed has been obtained, and who ever heard of a nationality consenting to their own murder?

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just a moment?

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. I want to ask the Senator whether his attention has been called to the latest bulletin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., which, as he knows, has 17,000,000 policyholders. The latest bulletin states that last year there were more deaths from alcoholism among the policyholders of that company than there have been since 1917.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have heard of that, but I think the Senator from Maryland put most of those figures into the RECORD, and I do not care to repeat them at this time. I know he is right in his statement.

Even the citizen who is charged with the most heinous of crimes is given a respectful hearing by the accuser.

It is not a crime to drink intoxicating liquor, nor is it a crime to purchase intoxicating liquor, and yet we have the lamentable situation in this country of citizens being murdered by the very agency to which they look for protection, when no crime whatever has been committed.

It may be extremely harmful, not to say downright foolhardy, for one to drink denatured alcohol, but, I repeat, no

crime has been committed. What possible ground of justification can there be for the present activities of the Treasury Department in connection with its "poisoned rum" campaign?

The Treasury Department says, in effect, that "The prohibition law is being violated, denatured alcohol is being diverted into illicit channels, and the United States Government can not prevent it without poisoning those who drink this diverted liquor." To what impossible extremes has this Government of ours come when it admits that the most powerful Nation on the globe must take the lives of its citizens for the commission of an act which is not in and of itself a crime or even a misdemeanor?

There is a certain fanatical and bigoted element in this country which believes conscientiously or unconscientiously that a straight-jacket morality can be thrust down the throats of a people in the name of the Constitution and statutory enactment. Friends of this element have jubilantly exclaimed that it is all right for those not in sympathy to commit suicide because of an overt act on the part of the Government. What sort of political philosophy is this to be applied to a people who fought a bloody war to free themselves from another form of tyranny—taxation without representation? This Nation became an independent sovereignty because of its insistence upon certain inalienable rights, the bulwarks of which are personal liberty and the right to adjust one's individual habits as he desires, as long as they do not interfere with the rights of others.

The poisoning of denatured alcohol by this Government should be met with a most decisive step by every freedom-loving citizen of the Nation. Whatever one's views may be in regard to the wet and dry issue, to my mind the question as to whether or not intoxicating liquor should be prohibited in this Nation has nothing whatsoever to do with the poisoning of that which may be used as an intoxicating beverage, and I believe that both the moral and political sense of the American electorate will show the proper resentment to this most recent atrocity committed in the name of prohibition.

By the way, they are advocating now the use of 4 per cent of wood alcohol, instead of 2 per cent. If wood alcohol is poison—and it has been admitted that it is—and 2 per cent is put in, why are they advocating that 4 per cent be put in? I will tell Senators. It is because the people who make wood alcohol are being protected by the Government, in order that they might double the output of wood alcohol. Seventy-eight per cent of the wood alcohol is made in the State of Pennsylvania and in the State of Michigan. They want a further outlet for wood alcohol to poison the people. Why do they not put wood alcohol in the alcohol used by the United States Navy? They do not dare. They use what they call a croton oil, so as to be sure that none of the members of the Navy will be poisoned at sea. They say they can offset the effect of such denatured alcohol with fresh rye bread. I am told so. I have never tried it, but I think that is true.

After some 776 deaths were reported in the city of New York alone because of the drinking of poisonous liquor, I introduced a bill in the Senate making it a misdemeanor to knowingly and willfully poison a beverage alcohol which the dispenser or the seller knew, or had reason to believe, would be drunk by poor unfortunates whose craving for intoxicating liquors has not been and never will be dissipated by either the eighteenth amendment, the Volstead Act, or any other coercive measure.

That bill was referred to the Manufactures Committee some two weeks ago, and ever since that date I have been endeavoring to persuade the committee to either take action on the bill or ask that it be discharged so the measure might be brought to the floor of this body for consideration and action. But to this date I have been unable to even get a reply to a letter which I addressed to the chairman of the committee, asking that early hearings be held. This is only a sample of the disinterestedness of the Senate of the United States in real, worth-while legislation aimed at the protection of our citizens.

But although we are willing to turn a deaf ear to advocates of sanity in law enforcement, we welcome with open arms and bated breath the pronouncements of the head of the Anti-Saloon League who at present is the real and active administrator of prohibition in this country.

When cloture was voted on the reorganization bill yesterday Wayne B. Wheeler was in the galleries and in the reception room of this Chamber lobbying for cloture and wielding the lash of Anti-Saloon League reprisals on all Senators who defied his mandate. And I am sorry to say that a number of Senators bowed before his threats. But be that as it may, cloture has been forced on this measure, and I presume it will pass.

Dr. Wayne B. Wheeler has had the temerity and audacity to tell Secretary of the Treasury Mellon that "poison must be retained in alcohol."

Who is this man Wheeler? I hold in my hand the editorial page of the San Francisco Examiner of February 1. Let me read this editorial concerning Wheeler and his advocacy of law enforcement by means of the death penalty:

We know who Andrew W. Mellon is—the Secretary of the Treasury, appointed by President Coolidge, and in charge of the prohibition enforcement division, which renders industrial alcohol deadly to drink by mixing it with poisonous wood alcohol.

We know who Calvin Coolidge is—duly elected President of the United States, Chief Executive of this Nation.

We know who the Members of Congress are—duly elected by the people—and what the function of Congress is—to make the laws that govern the people of the United States, according to the Constitution.

We know who the 776 victims of 1926 were—citizens of New York City who turned to bootleg whisky, unhappy men and women not yet victors in the struggle to conquer the age-long curse of hard liquor, or perhaps just foolish boys and girls taking their first drink "for fun."

Yes; but who is Wayne B. Wheeler?

What has he got to do with it, rushing into the general procession to cackle, "It served them right," laying down the law to the Secretary of the Treasury, and telling him the good work of poisoning must go on?

Is Wheeler a public official, elected or appointed, a censor charged with the duty of criticizing and directing prohibition enforcement?

No; if he were an elected or appointed official, he would be hooted or booted out of office for his public exhibition of inhuman and ghoulish rejoicing over the agonized death of fellow citizens whose personal habits do not suit him.

Wheeler belongs not to the Government of the United States, accountable to the people. He heads a higher, sanctimonious super-government, accountable only to itself.

He is general counsel for the Anti-Saloon League in Washington.

He is the paid superlobbyist of the most powerful organization of the goody-goodies, busy-bodies, snoopers, and holler-than-thous who are coming to dominate the Government of the United States, and who are by no means averse to poisoning those who do not agree with them.

He gets his living by wheedling, threatening, cajoling, bulldozing, promising, and brow-beating Congressmen to vote for any measure Wheeler dictates, to carry out the ideas of the fanatics who pay him.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I would like to call his attention to the fact that the "slush" inquiry showed that between 1920 and 1925 the national Anti-Saloon League and 37 State leagues collected some \$13,116,433.64 and expended \$13,065,313.72. So it is perfectly obvious that the Anti-Saloon League's activities are not confined simply to the bulldozing and bullying of which the Senator from New Jersey has spoken, but extend to the collection and use of money on a very large scale.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am very glad the Senator from Maryland brought that to my attention. It just proves that Lincoln was right when he said that you can fool all of the people some of the time.

I read further:

The bigot does not change through the ages. We see him in the Roman Empire feeding Christians to the wild beasts. We see him breaking "heretics" on the wheel in medieval Seville and Lisbon. We see him among our own forefathers in Salem, Mass., burning helpless old women to death or drowning them in mill ponds.

So there is nothing new in the practice of preparing death for those who do not agree with you. The new thing is that the United States Government is in the business—and apparently must be kept in the business—of poisoning Americans who do not live up to the standards set by Wayne B. Wheeler, general counsel of the Anti-Saloon League.

History records the long crusade of the newspapers to abolish the saloon as the den of vice, crime, human degeneracy, and political corruption. Those who fought the saloon did not foresee Wheelerism. "After the lions who slay, the jackals who scavenge."

There lies before us all now the new task of freeing the people from the curse and the political domination of the organized army of self-righteous meddlers and bigoted fanatics, whose arch type is the lobbyist, Wayne B. Wheeler, the modern Borgia determined to make the country safe for Wheelerism by poison.

Mr. President, let me read an article appearing in the New York World of December 31, 1926, entitled "The resort to poison":

THE RESORT TO POISON

Mr. Mellon has told the Prohibition Unit to exclude "certain poisonous substances" from its new formula. But the 4 per cent of wood alcohol will remain, as he does not think that percentage injurious. The Associated Press states Mr. Mellon's position as follows:

"The Secretary's attitude, made known to-day at the Treasury, is that he does not conceive it as a duty of the Government to permit poisoning of citizens in order to enforce the law. He expects Government chemists soon will be able to denature alcohol so that it will be too distasteful to drink rather than too poisonous."

General Andrews, Mr. Mellon's chief aid, has long advocated a substitute for poison. On August 11 General Andrews said: "They [the Prohibition Unit's chemists] are seeking something which the ultimate consumer of the beverage will readily recognize from its odor and taste." On August 16 General Andrews said: "I am confident that Doctor Doran [chief prohibition chemist] will develop a formula which will enable us to get away from the use of wood alcohol as a denaturant." On September 9 General Andrews said: "Our constant aim is to get some ingredients to put in this alcohol which by the odor and taste will warn drinkers that the alcohol is not genuine, but which at the same time will not prove poisonous to the drinkers."

Mr. Mellon as a civilized man naturally abhors the fact that the Government is now poisoning drinkers. And it is easy to see why General Andrews has protested against poison ever since he took his office. To General Andrews the use of poison is a terrible personal humiliation. General Andrews is a soldier, trained in the code of civilized warfare. If he were in the field and at war, if he had to evacuate a piece of land which was to be occupied by the enemy, what would he say to a proposal to poison the water supply against the enemy's use of it? He would say that such a proposal was an insult to his honor as a man and to the uniform he was wearing. Yet here he is to-day, an officer of the United States, charged with the civil enforcement of a civil statute, resorting to a method against his own people that in time of war and against an enemy no civilized soldier would employ.

It is the Anti-Saloon League, speaking in the name of the evangelical churches, which is demanding enforcement by resort to poison. How horrified these good men were when the Germans first used poison gas! How they cried out when, after due warning against travel on the high seas, the Germans sank passenger ships! How we all shouted about the German frightfulness! And here we are to-day complacently and even with a somewhat sardonic joy using a weapon which by the common consent of civilized men is fit only for savages.

What has happened to the conscience of the Christian churches of America that they permit such things to be done in their name? They say they are enforcing the moral law. Let them pause a moment and consider what they are doing. There was a time, not so many centuries ago, when men believed that heresy was a stupendous crime, for it endangered the immortal soul. To root out heresy the churches, Catholic and Protestant alike, called upon the civil authority, exactly as the Anti-Saloon League is calling upon President Coolidge to-day, to extirpate the infamy by any violence it could command. The civil authority yielded, and history was stained with hideous cruelty. The world outgrew that view of things. The churches outgrew it. They intrusted the punishment of heresy to God, to men's consciences, and to the spiritual arm. But to enforce the Volstead Act, to enforce a mere human regulation made by fallible men, to enforce a law without divine sanction of any kind, to prevent the use of the very beverage which is employed in the central mystery of the Christian faith, these churches under the false leadership of heathens like Wayne Wheeler demand and apparently approve the use of the death penalty for those who knowingly or unknowingly stand in their way. Is there no residue of sanity and of saving common sense among the leaders of the churches sufficient to arouse them to a realization that they can not, that they dare not, that they must not sell the faith of which they are temporary trustees by agreeing to the use of poison against their fellowmen?

They can not escape the full moral implications of this policy by the flippant retort that nobody needs to drink the poisoned liquor if he does not wish to. There are some millions of American citizens to-day, at least as upright as Mr. Wheeler, whose consciences are in rebellion against the Volstead Act; and they do not propose to obey it. They are not the first and they are not the only Americans who have proclaimed their disobedience to a man-made law. Many of them are the descendants of men who with a perfect conscience refused to obey the fugitive slave law. They are all of them the fellow-citizens of those who in the Southern States refuse to obey the fifteenth amendment. They may be right or they may be wrong. But in the effort to impose upon them a law against which their consciences rebel they have a right to ask of the Government of the United States that it confine its efforts against them to lawful means, and above all that it refrain from practices which are intolerable even in time of war.

Mr. President, how can any red-blooded American read such statements as these and still support any measure advocated by

the Anti-Saloon League, especially when such a measure seeks only to strengthen the arm of a despised minority.

On January 19 the Treasury Department announced that legitimate consumption of intoxicating beverages in the United States last year amounted to 1,588,954 gallons. That represented about 1 per cent of the total consumption of "pre-war stuff," industrial alcohol, home brew, and moonshine that trickled onto the market via the bootleggers, according to estimates of Government experts.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Missouri. How many millions of gallons did he say had been legitimately used?

Mr. EDWARDS. I said 1,588,954 gallons.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Who can say how much of that contains poisoned alcohol which the Government itself poisoned?

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not think it is possible for that question to be answered. I presume a large portion of it was made of poisoned alcohol because, in order to get permits to sell, the alcohol must be poisoned.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the point I want to make is that poisoned alcohol does not go alone into the stomachs of the people who buy it from bootleggers and buy it in an illicit way, but that it is bound to find its way into certain drug stores, there to be put out upon prescription and drunk by sick people who are drinking under the direction of a doctor. When we put this poison in the alcohol, and the alcohol gets out, as it does in immense quantities, some of it will be drunk inevitably by people who are perfectly innocent and who are trying to take medicine instead of taking grog. That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am sure the Senator from Missouri is right. I believe, as I think he believes, that the worst offenders against the prohibition law to-day are some of the doctors and the druggists. Whether knowingly or not knowingly, the result is the same.

Eighty-eight thousand physicians were authorized to write liquor prescriptions at the beginning of 1927. In 1926 they wrote 12,000,000 prescriptions.

Officials asserted that during the year a number of "fly-by-night" drug stores and physicians, whose chief business was liquor selling, have been eliminated. A general cleanup of the illegitimate drug stores and doctors took place during the year, and liquor diverted to bootleg channels through these sources was cut materially, it was stated.

Another editorial reads as follows:

BOOTLEG DRUGGIST'S PROFITS

The bootleg druggist is making huge profits. The "agent" need not be a graduated pharmacist, and can procure from the Government whisky at \$35 a case. The liquor is delivered at the drug store. It is then transferred to the bootlegger who pays \$90 for the case and in addition delivers a case of cut whisky which the bootlegging druggist sells, on prescription, at \$3 a pint or \$72 for the case, which enables the druggist to keep his record straight with the Government. Perhaps the Government some day will test the whisky of suspected druggists.

I think that answers very completely the question which the Senator from Missouri asked me a moment ago.

Mr. President, I am opposed to this piece of legislation not so much because I am opposed to prohibition as because I do not feel that a further centralization of powers in the administration of Volsteadism can possibly have a beneficial aspect on law enforcement.

Conditions with respect to prohibition enforcement are growing steadily worse. They are 1,000 per cent worse to-day than a year ago. With every day showing a tremendous growth of illegal operations, it is a matter of mere conjecture as to what the conditions will be next year.

Conditions are the same in practically every State in the Union. From every quarter comes the same story. The prohibition laws are violated by every class of citizenship.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. In a recent statement laid on the desks of Senators in this Chamber, General Andrews and Mr. Blair both stated that violations of the Volstead Act are nation-wide and, to all practical purposes, innumerable.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am sure the Senator is correct.

The appalling extent of the failure of prohibition to accomplish what its advocates proclaimed it would do can be appreciated only by those who come in contact with actual conditions throughout the United States.

The newspapers of the Nation reveal this state of facts:

First. That "moonshining," "bootlegging," and the home manufacture of intoxicants have grown into big, remunerative business, apparently far beyond control of law officers.

Second. That disrespect for the prohibition law is rapidly breeding disrespect for all law and threatens to undermine the very foundations of orderly government.

Third. That there has been little appreciable decrease in the number of saloons, but in many instances a tenfold increase in the number of places where intoxicants are sold more or less openly and publicly.

Fourth. That many of the evils in their worst form have been driven into the family fireside, and that great numbers of people—particularly boys and girls—who were abstainers before prohibition are now consuming large quantities of ardent spirits.

Fifth. That instead of promoting temperance, as its advocates claimed it would, prohibition is increasing intemperance, because the pure, mild, practically nonintoxicating beverages have been driven from the market, and impure, poisonous concoctions have taken their place and are being heavily consumed.

Sixth. That some physicians—we believe the number to be large—are peddling their allotments of Government prescription blanks for cash in advance, and that druggists are filling in these prescriptions with the names of the unseen patients of the physicians and selling the prescriptions with the whisky. These practices, indulged in by even reputable physicians and druggists, are having a demoralizing effect upon professional and commercial agencies directly concerned with the health of the people.

Seventh. That there are widespread reports of official crookedness or laxity—and favoritism to an enormous extent—in the enforcement of the prohibition laws.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield again, I remind him that General Andrews has also stated that the great obstacle to the enforcement of prohibition is the official corruption which it generates.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the Senator.

Eighth. That the manufacturers of moonshine seem to be operating in the security of a special dispensation from Washington, or from the prohibition directors of their own States.

Ninth. That the general trend of public sentiment is that the prohibition enforcement act is too severe and is incapable of being enforced, and that real temperance and respect for law and order would be promoted by the amendment of the law to permit the manufacture and sale of beer—by some new method of retail distribution to be determined by Congress.

Tenth. That law-abiding manufacturers and distributors of lawful beverages are being penalized to the extent of many millions of dollars by law obedience, and are being driven out of business, while the bootleggers are being rewarded with huge profits, practically unmolested by the law-enforcing authorities.

Eleventh. That Federal and State Governments are expending large sums of money for law enforcement without accomplishing any definite results, and that the Government is being deprived of many millions of dollars that it might be receiving in revenues from the legal sale of mild stimulants.

Mr. President, the conditions are most serious. Independent investigations indicate a much more demoralizing state of facts. The nonenforcement of the prohibition laws—whether through inefficiency, official corruption, neglect of duty, political interferences or influence, or inability to control the illegal manufacture, sale, importation, and transportation of moonshine renders it impossible for those former manufacturers to do business.

I have been told that in the face of these intolerable conditions we should remain silent; that our protest or our petition would be discounted.

And that the truth itself would lose its weight and influence if we presented it to the officials of the Government. Again may we inquire whether this country has been so propagandized that the voice of truth can not rise over the clamor of prejudice.

My excuse for speaking is that I wish to present a truthful picture of existing conditions to our public officials. I still have faith that the truth is none the less the truth by whomsoever spoken—and that falsehood is falsehood still, though presented under a cloak of righteousness concealing "something on the hip."

The deplorable conditions brought upon the country by the operation of the prohibition law are attributable to the law itself. We think it axiomatic that laws to be enforceable must represent practically the unanimous sentiment of the people. The laws against murder and other forms of vicious crime express the crystallized sentiment of the race. They are written into

the statute books to punish or restrain the thousandth or ten-thousandth man.

It is not surprising that law, such as the prohibition enactment, which does not represent the will of the majority, and in the violation of which the people feel no moral wrong, is non-enforceable.

There were about 140 breweries in Pennsylvania before prohibition. With but few exceptions the brewers have obeyed the prohibition law. But we now have not less than 500,000 home brewers—probably a great many more. We doubt that there was a moonshine still anywhere in the State before January 16, 1920. Now, there are stills by the thousands scattered through the State. They are found in barns, in basements, on islands of the rivers, in caves—in a thousand secret places. A continuous stream of moonshine liquor is flowing from these stills into channels of trade, and charges of official corruption and official neglect of duty are flying thick and fast.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, had the attention of the Senator been called this morning to the fact that a garage belonging to a church in New York had just been padlocked?

Mr. EDWARDS. No; it had not; but I am not surprised. There are plenty of churches which perhaps should be padlocked instead of their garages.

Our Federal district courts, once models of judicial dignity and poise, which formerly commanded the respect of every class of citizens, have been reduced to the level of police courts. Their dockets are congested with cases of petty violations of the laws.

For the first time, I believe, in the history of the American Government, the administration has been forced to go about the country preaching respect for law. And that to a nation of people in which respect for law is inborn!

We heard quite recently of a distinguished Federal judge who commented bitterly and almost pathetically upon the fact that an elder of his own church considered it no moral wrong to violate the prohibition laws. This same jurist felt it his duty to remonstrate with the members of the bar association of his State because they were bountifully supplied with stimulants for their annual convention. He felt quite aggrieved when these lawyers—officers of the court, charged with the duty of upholding the Constitution and the laws of the land—laughed at his suggestion that it was wrong legally or morally to violate the prohibition laws.

While the judge on the bench who sees the dignity of his court slipping away and respect for all law being undermined by universal disrespect for the prohibition laws—even by the more intelligent men of the Nation—may feel deeply humiliated, yet he is but one in a thousand who has any serious respect for laws which apparently fail to represent the popular will.

We do not criticize those who are violating the laws. We do not criticize the law officers for not enforcing the laws—because we know that is impossible. We are informed that there are powerful rings operating throughout the United States, and that in many instances the arm of the enforcement departments is paralyzed by the influence of politics.

But we do disagree with the policy of those officers of the law who give out public statements that the laws are being enforced when they know that they are not and can not be enforced.

May I suggest to the administrative and legislative officials that they call in the prohibition enforcement officers from the field—the men who are doing their best to enforce the laws—and ask them what they know? They may tell you that they know that the laws are impossible of enforcement and that everywhere they go they find a sea of booze flowing uninterceptedly along channels as well defined as the Gulf Stream and as impossible to control in its course. They will tell you more than that, perhaps. You may find out from them, if you try, that as soon as the private detectives of the law violators by whom they are pursued report back that they have left a certain section the floodgates are opened again. They might even tell you something about how they are hampered by political influences and threatened with discharge because they interfered with some law violator who has powerful political friends in Washington or elsewhere.

Mr. President, I feel that we have a right to complain, not particularly against the law enforcement departments because of their failures, but against the law itself.

I have been conservative in presenting this statement. I could have made it much stronger and still have been well within the limits of truth.

I put these facts to you seriously, gentlemen. We have prohibition in theory, but what have we in fact? Is it not time to quit theorizing and get down to facts—to a sensible program that can be carried out with justice to all?

I believe that the train of evils resulting from the prohibition laws and their nonenforcement would be effectively remedied by liberalization of the present Volstead Act to legalize the manufacture and sale of beer. We think an investigation of those countries which have adopted a beer program will convince the most skeptical that this is the practical and effective road to true temperance, the reduction to a minimum of law violations, and of intemperance to practically nothing.

It will be noted from this analysis of present-day prohibition enforcement that what this country needs is not reorganization but a revision of the prohibition law, so that each State may have something to say about how best to attain to a sane and healthy temperance.

People are drinking liquor to-day and this Congress knows it as well as every citizen of the Nation.

In my opinion less than 1 per cent of the liquor in this country to-day is real or genuine and my views in this respect have been verified by Federal prohibition officials themselves.

Not so very long ago Mr. Robert Woods Bliss, United States minister to Sweden, said in conference with President Coolidge that there was less bootlegging, drinking, and contraband whisky in Sweden where the government licenses the business than in the United States where prohibition is the law.

Poisonous liquor has caused the death of more than 20,000 persons since the prohibition act became effective, a study of daily press files reveals. Other thousands have been blinded and crazed by home brew concoctions, hundreds of bootleggers and smugglers have been shot by revenue agents and countless persons have been injured and maimed in raids and by the explosion of illicit stills.

And, by the way, we have one example of that in the Senate. I am surprised that some one has not spoken about it. I spoke about it once a year or two ago soon after the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] was shot in a bootlegging feud. It was a terrible thing, a terrible example of these men who are defying the dry fanatics in that way.

Mr. Bliss continued:

Suicides traceable directly or indirectly to this cause are increasing scandals which had their origin in illicit drinking have caused thousands of other fatalities unaccounted for.

This woeful condition in a free and civilized world is laid directly at the doors of Volsteadism, enacted by hypocritical law-making politicians, who have stooped so low as to make the Christian churches their dupes for mercenary purposes by rallying the forces of the churches and other conventionally dry and well-meaning citizens with the bootlegger and politician who are interested in the dry law from the standpoint of profits and graft. Illicit manufacturers and dealers now pay tremendous sums for protection into the private purses of these same law-making politicians, which far exceeds the amount formerly collected by the Government from a business it supervised and regulated.

The funds collected by the churches to propagandize prohibitory laws are used by these same designing politicians to further their grafting political aims disregarding the continued flow of insanity, blindness, and death which they indirectly are responsible for.

At this point I should like to insert in the RECORD a printed report relating to the arrests by the police department in connection with this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Department announces a summary of the expenditures for police departments in the 247 cities having a population of over 30,000 for the fiscal year 1925. The total population of these cities represents 35.3 per cent of the entire population of Continental United States.

The large increases in the cost for police service, criminal courts, correctional institutions, and probation boards, as well as other financial data, are presented in comparable detail in the annual reports on financial statistics of the principal cities. The judicial cost is only partly represented in such costs of the city government, as criminal costs in superior courts are generally a charge upon the State or county governments, the exceptions being largely in the cities having a population of more than 300,000, where such cities exercise the ordinary functions of county governments, or where a per cent of the expenditures of the counties are included with those for the cities. There are a few States in which superior court costs are carried by the city government, but, in general, the payments are for municipal courts having supervision over violation of municipal ordinances only.

The costs for maintaining and operating the police departments, criminal courts, and correctional institutions, as nearly as they could be identified, amounted to \$220,241,752, or a per capita of \$5.41 for 247 cities in 1925 as compared with \$94,869,986, or a per capita of \$3.04 for 204 cities in 1915. These costs do not include the payments

for outlays for improvements, nor the interest on bonds issued for construction and equipment of these departments.

	1925 (247 cities)		1915 (204 cities)	
	Operation and maintenance	Per capita operation and maintenance	Operation and maintenance	Per capita operation and maintenance
Police departments.....	\$157,194,635	\$3.86	\$64,892,291	\$2.08
Police pensions.....	11,185,952	.27	4,712,921	.15
Probation boards.....	1,836,870	.05	498,731	.02
Judicial:				
General courts.....	10,779,739	.27	5,344,947	.17
Coroner.....	711,715	.02	494,843	.02
Superior courts ¹	19,729,901	.48	10,156,291	.33
Marshal and sheriff ¹	4,454,148	.11	1,956,069	.06
Correctional institutions:				
Adults.....	10,245,768	.25	5,420,285	.17
Minors.....	4,103,084	.10	1,393,608	.04
Total.....	220,241,752	5.41	94,869,986	3.04

¹ Includes criminal and civil costs.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Payments for the operation and maintenance of the police service for 1925 amounted to \$157,194,635, the cost per person in the 247 principal cities being \$3.86. The expenditures for this department alone represented 10.3 per cent of the expenditures for maintenance and operation of all general departments of the cities, being next in importance to that for schools which constituted 37.5 per cent of such expenditures. The general departments, as the term is here used, do not include public-service enterprises, such as water works, electric light plants, or similar public-service utilities. For the year 1915 the payments for operation and maintenance of police departments for the 204 cities having a population of over 30,000 amounted to \$64,892,291, or a per capita of \$2.08. The increase in the per capita payments from 1915 to 1925 is due not only to increased compensation of policemen, but also to the increase in the number of those assigned to direction of traffic. The above amounts do not include payments of interest on bonds issued for financing permanent improvements or equipment of police department properties. Neither do they include payments for the maintenance of the police-electrical equipment for those cities, 77 in number, which report such expenses as undistributed, under the heading, "Police and fire alarm system." The aggregate of such undistributed figures for 1925 was \$2,080,303.

The cities, showing, respectively, the highest and lowest per capita for maintenance and operation of police departments in 1925 were: For Group I—Boston, Mass., \$5.96 and Cleveland, Ohio, \$3.41; for Group II—Jersey City, N. J., \$3.44 and Cincinnati, Ohio, \$2.41; for Group III—Yonkers, N. Y., \$5.93 and Canton, Ohio, \$1.48; for Group IV—Atlantic City, N. J., \$10.76 and Springfield, Ohio, \$1.08; for Group V—New Rochelle, N. Y., \$6.24 and Hazleton, Pa., \$0.92.

The per capita figures for Atlantic City are based on the estimated population which represents only the number of permanent resident of the municipality. The city must, however, make provision for a population greatly augmented by visitors and temporary residents. The municipality in Group IV ranking next to Atlantic City in police department expenses was Hoboken, N. J. with a per capita of \$6.97.

PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS OF POLICE DEPARTMENT

For 1925 there was expended in outlays for permanent improvements for police departments \$6,136,654. This represented only 0.8 per cent of the total outlays for permanent improvements in all general departments. As shown by the following table, in all classes of cities the outlays for police departments formed a very small percentage of the total outlays; the percentage for 1925, however, was double that for 1915. Buildings for police headquarters are often a part of the city hall, and outlay payments for such buildings are reported as for general government.

Comparative cost of police departments for 247 cities in 1925 and 204 cities in 1915

Year	Operation and maintenance			Outlay for permanent improvements	
	Total (000 omitted)	Per capita	Per cent of total payments for expenses of general departments	Total (000 omitted)	Per cent of total payments for outlays of general departments
GRAND TOTAL					
1925 (247 cities).....	\$157,195	\$3.86	10.3	\$6,136	0.8
1915 (204 cities).....	64,892	2.08	11.2	1,091	0.4

Comparative cost of police departments for 247 cities in 1925 and 204 cities in 1915—Continued

Year	Operation and maintenance			Outlay for permanent improvements	
	Total (000 omitted)	Per capita	Per cent of total payments for expenses of general departments	Total (000 omitted)	Per cent of total payments for outlays of general departments
GROUP I.—CITIES HAVING A POPULATION OF 500,000 AND OVER					
1925	\$91,471	\$5.13	11.4	\$4,466	1.1
1915	36,760	2.79	12.4	409	0.4
GROUP II.—CITIES HAVING A POPULATION OF 300,000 TO 500,000					
1925	\$17,424	\$3.95	\$9.5	\$459	0.6
1915	8,330	2.11	9.6	119	0.2
GROUP III.—CITIES HAVING A POPULATION OF 100,000 TO 300,000					
1925	\$26,510	\$2.81	\$9.5	\$569	0.4
1915	10,766	1.60	10.6	254	0.4
GROUP IV.—CITIES HAVING A POPULATION OF 50,000 TO 100,000					
1925	\$14,477	\$2.54	\$8.7	\$391	0.4
1915	5,411	1.30	10.0	126	0.5
GROUP V.—CITIES HAVING A POPULATION OF 30,000 TO 50,000					
1925	\$7,313	\$2.15	\$7.8	\$251	0.5
1915	3,625	1.15	9.0	183	0.8

VALUE OF POLICE DEPARTMENT PROPERTY

For the 247 cities having over 30,000 population in 1925, the total value of land, buildings, and equipment of all general departments amounted to \$4,973,436,227. Of this total, \$53,495,184, or 1.1 per cent, was for the police departments. In 1915 for the 204 cities in this class the value of land, buildings, and equipment of general departments amounted to \$2,576,491,410, of which \$31,451,500, or 1.2 per cent, was for police departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. KING. Let the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Maryland proposes to strike out, on page 5, lines 1 to 11, inclusive, which read as follows:

(b) The commissioner of prohibition, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to appoint such employees in the field service as he may deem necessary, but all appointments of such employees shall be made subject to the provisions of the civil service laws, notwithstanding the provisions of section 38 of the national prohibition act, as amended. The term of office of any person who is transferred under this section to the bureau of prohibition, and who was not appointed subject to the provisions of the civil service laws, shall expire upon the expiration of six months from the effective date of this act.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I am sorry to have to say anything in opposition to the amendment proposed by my friend from Maryland, but I think we are in honest disagreement as to the benefits that will accrue to the enforcement of prohibition by the inclusion of the civil service law as applied to the employees of the Prohibition Unit.

The public generally understand that the Anti-Saloon League and some politicians interfere very much with the selection of employees for the Prohibition Unit. To both of these I am averse; and it is my conception that if these employees are put under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission not only may we secure better employees—and I emphasize the word "may"—but we will at least exclude the Anti-Saloon League and the politicians from picking out these law-enforcing officers.

The objection raised by the Senator from Maryland that they will contaminate other civil-service employees may be correct. I am not here to discuss that feature of the matter; but it is my hope that other civil-service employees may not be so contaminated, and that it may be, through the civil-

service examination, that we will get employees in that department who would not become so readily contaminated as some of the Anti-Saloon League employees.

There is much misunderstanding as to the application of civil service laws and regulations as to the removal of employees who are once in the Government service. There is an impression among Members of Congress and the public generally that when an employee once gets on the Government pay roll through a civil-service examination he may not be readily removed. There is also an impression that he may be removed only under charges, which charges have to be sustained.

That is an entirely erroneous conclusion. Any head of a department, any bureau chief, may remove an employee appointed through the Civil Service Commission at his will and discretion. The employee so removed has absolutely no recourse; and I am going to ask the Senate to indulge me for a moment while I point out some of the statutes and some of the rules and regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission with respect to civil-service employees.

Section 2, under "Procedure in removals and reductions," says:

Section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, 37 Statutes, page 555, provides, "That no person in the classified civil service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof; but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the office making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearing, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Civil Service Commission also shall, upon request, be furnished copies of the same."

Then, under "Reduction of force" it says:

In enacting and promulgating them—

The laws and rules relating to removals—

it was not intended that there should be no discharge except for incapacity or misconduct, or that employment should continue whether or not there was work to be done. There is nothing in the law or rules to compel the retention of an employee whose services are not needed, and it is the implied intent and understanding when the service begins that in such event the employee will be discharged.

Section 10 says:

The civil service law and the rules promulgated thereunder recognize that the power of removal and its exercise for just reasons are essential to the discipline and the efficiency of the service.

Section 11 says:

Decision of removing officer on the merits not reviewable: The power of removal for unfitness remains in the appointing officer, unimpaired by the restrictions of the civil service law and rules. He is the judge of the qualifications of his subordinates, and the question whether such cause exists as requires a removal in the interests of the efficiency of the service is for him to determine. The judgment of the appointing officer as to whether or not the causes for removal are sufficient is not reviewable by the courts or by the Civil Service Commission, but the civil-service rules provide that the commission shall have authority to investigate any alleged failure to follow the procedure required by statute or rule. Courts will not restrain or review the exercise discretion by the appointing power except to enforce statutory restrictions, and will not interfere in or review cases of alleged violation of executive rules and regulations relating to removals. An employee's fitness, capacity, and attention to his duties are questions of discretion and judgment to be determined by his superior officers.

So I repeat that there is nothing in the rules or regulations or the statute which prevents any officer of the Government from keeping his staff as efficient and as capable and as competent as he himself desires. Whenever a department fails to enforce a law, whenever a department fails to perform its functions, it may be ascribed to the head of the department, pure and simple. There is nothing in the way to prevent him from having the most competent and efficient force that it is possible to secure. Further, he is at entire liberty to remove any one for any cause other than political or religious causes.

In the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] he made the statement that by the segregation of the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Prohibition the employees of the Bureau of Customs may not enforce the prohibition laws.

In that connection I should like to ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who assures me that that is not the case, whether or not his understanding of the bill is that all officers charged with the enforcement of law are not required to enforce all criminal laws under the Federal statutes?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the Customs Service has charge of all violations of law in regard to goods coming into the United States. They have the power under this bill to deal with that matter. It will be handled in just the same way as the violation of any law in regard to the importation of goods into the country.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator will remember that I asked him if this bill repealed any of the prior acts which place the responsibility for enforcement of law upon all Federal officers.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it does not, further than this: It gives to the commissioner created here the power to handle directly the questions of violations of the law affecting the importation of goods.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. COUZENS. Yes.

Mr. EDGE. I do not think there is any great difference in our viewpoint, if I understand the Senator from Utah correctly. Of course, subsection (c) of section 2 of the bill now under consideration plainly stipulates, as plainly as the English language can be written, that—

The personnel of the Bureau of Prohibition shall perform such duties—

Then the Senate amendment—

In the administration of the national prohibition act and the laws relating to narcotic drugs as the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Prohibition may prescribe.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not repeal any of the laws existing to-day.

Mr. EDGE. No; not in the slightest degree.

Mr. COUZENS. That is the point I am making. I think the Senator from New Jersey is in error in saying that that repeals any of the laws which require a customs officer or any other Federal officer to enforce all criminal laws.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator from New Jersey is not in error, because he never made such a statement, and never intended to imply by any remark he made that any previous laws were repealed so far as the customs officers were concerned, as explained by the Senator from Utah. For instance, in apprehending a smuggler who may have liquor or who may have dutiable jewelry or furs or anything of the kind. Of course, the customs officer is there to apprehend smuggling of any article; but I make the assertion, and adhere to it, that under the terms of this bill that he can not be used as an inspector under the Prohibition Commissioner in the Prohibition Department.

Mr. COUZENS. I entirely disagree with the Senator from New Jersey that that can not be done, because in section 28 of the national prohibition act, among other things that are provided, it says that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his assistants and agents and "all other officers of the United States whose duty it is to enforce criminal laws" shall have power and protection in the enforcement of that act conferred by law for the enforcement of existing laws relating to the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors under the law of the United States.

In other words, I want to point out to the Senator from New Jersey that this bill does not accomplish what he and others may think it accomplishes. It does not separate, to the extent that he stated, the enforcement of prohibition from the Bureau of Customs.

Mr. EDGE. I entirely differ with the Senator from Michigan. He has a perfect right to his viewpoint. If I felt that it did not divorce the departments, I would not vote for the bill. I have been assured that it does. I have been assured by the representatives of the Department of Prohibition that it does, and by the clear language as I read it myself I believe that it does, and I am perfectly ready to accept that judgment.

Mr. COUZENS. That language does not repeal the act which I have just read, which states that they are empowered and instructed to enforce all criminal laws.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, that has not the slightest thing to do with transferring a customs officer over to the Prohibition Department. I think the Senator is talking about a distinctly different proposition.

Mr. COUZENS. Oh, no, no.

Mr. EDGE. I beg to differ with the Senator.

Mr. COUZENS. I raised the question because I want to point out that this bill is not going to accomplish what the sincere adherents of prohibition think it is going to accomplish. I want to point out that the only possible advantage of this reorganization bill to the enforcement of prohibition is the inclusion of section 5, providing for the selection of the employees under the civil service law. The rest of it, in my judgment, is simply a farce. I think it accomplishes no purpose whatever and is a mere gesture to create a commissioner of prohibition and a commissioner of customs without any idea that it is going to improve the enforcement of the prohibition law.

Mr. EDGE. Well, I guess we will have to wait; time will tell.

Mr. COUZENS. I just want to make that a matter of record, so we will see whether it does improve the enforcement of prohibition.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, before the Senator sits down will he permit me to ask him a question? I think he is in accord with me on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. COUZENS. I do.

Mr. HEFLIN. A few days ago we asked for a list of the names of those who had been in the service and had been discharged. The Senator knows what I am talking about.

Mr. COUZENS. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. It has been received, and I have gotten a good many requests from people in the department that they may have a list of them. I want to ask unanimous consent to have that list printed as a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will hold that in abeyance until we get through. I will say to the Senator that I have refused several requests for unanimous consent, and I do not want to make any exception in this case. I have not any objection to the matter referred to being printed, but I have refused others, and I shall have to refuse the Senator in this case.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am simply afraid there will be an adjournment without its having been done.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any objection, but I know the Senator will agree with me that I ought to be consistent.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I should like to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Civil Service Commission, relating to the question of removal of employees under the commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1927.

HON. JAMES COUZENS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR COUZENS: In response to your telephone inquiry as to the provisions and operation of the statute concerning removals of employees in the classified service, there is nothing in any law, rule, or regulation that stands in the way of a dismissal by the head of the establishment of an inefficient or unfit employee in the Federal civil service.

Section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), provides:

"That no person in the classified civil service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof; but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearing, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Civil Service Commission also shall, upon request, be furnished copies of the same. * * *"

Having complied with the provision of the law that the accused shall have a statement in writing of the reasons for the proposed removal, and having received the answer of the accused, the officer who seeks to make the removal of an inefficient or unfit employee may end the matter then and there. He is not called upon to prove his case to anyone. In practical results he is accuser, judge, and jury.

For this reason, employees sometimes complain that their rights are not sufficiently protected under the removal rule.

The only cases in which the action of the officer making a removal may be authoritatively questioned are those in which it is charged, with offer of proof, that the removal is for religious or political reasons

or that the procedure prescribed by the above-quoted statute was not followed. In either of such cases this commission is authorized by section 4 of Civil Service Rule XII to make an investigation, a report, and a recommendation, but it has no authority to do more.

Very sincerely,

W. C. DEMING, *President.*

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the senior Senator from Utah, in charge of the bill. I wish to ask him if he intends to make this law retroactive?

Mr. SMOOT. In what way?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I observe that section 7 of the bill reads:

This act shall take effect on July 1, 1926.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that an amendment to that language was agreed to, so that section 7 would read as follows:

This act shall take effect on April 1, 1927.

Mr. BROUSSARD. That amendment has been agreed to?

Mr. SMOOT. That amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, the main purpose of this bill is to create the office of commissioner of prohibition, and then it was proposed, and it is proposed in the bill, that the employees be put under the civil service law.

This is an old question. In 1923 the Senate considered for a long time what was called the Cramton bill. That bill proposed to create the office of director of industrial alcohol. At that time the prohibition laws were being enforced by men who were professional prohibitionists, who had been placed at the head of this very responsible bureau, and as they were lacking in temperament and training, lacking in information, we heard from all the industrial people in the United States of the hardships to which they were being subjected because of the restrictions placed on the use of legitimate industrial denatured alcohol.

The pressure was so great that the department yielded and proposed a bill, which was intended, supposedly, merely to create the office of commissioner, but there was really behind it a proposal to impose legal restrictions upon the use of industrial alcohol. We discussed that measure here for a long time. We exposed the fallacies of imposing restrictions upon the industrial people of this country, and finally it was agreed on the part of those who had charge of the Cramton bill and those who were opposed to it, that section 29 of the bill, I believe it was, which provided for civil service, should be enacted. That was agreed to, and under that bill the employees of the prohibition department were supposed to be placed under the civil service law.

The conferees managed to kill the measure because they had lost in that compromise the objective they were driving at, and they were not sincere in proposing to impose civil service.

We have seen such a lack of sincerity on the part of those who advocate this bill, again, duplicated, when the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] very readily the other night agreed with my friend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] to accept his amendment, to strike out section 5, which applied to the field force of the enforcement employees of the prohibition department.

I think the senior Senator from Utah gave the best reason I have heard for insisting upon keeping section 5 in the law. The senior Senator from Utah stated that the best enforcement officers in Utah could not pass a civil-service examination, and for that reason, inasmuch as he considered them the best two men in the State for those positions, he was willing to accept that amendment.

I leave it to anyone who is familiar with the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission and who has had any experience with the examinations conducted by that commission to say whether or not a man who could not pass such an examination as is submitted should occupy any position under the Government.

I quite agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS]. I would like to see the people in charge of the enforcement given an opportunity of trying the civil service. This bill was proposed with their approval, and it contained a provision putting the employees under the civil service. The committee in the House retained that provision, and the House adopted it and passed the bill. Then the committee of the Senate considering this bill reported section 5 without amendment. For that reason, if it is continued, and those who are charged with the enforcement desire the civil service—and it is already, as we have seen, the sense of the House that that opportunity be given—I think we should place them under civil service.

I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland, and at the last session, when such a measure was pending, I delivered a few remarks indorsing placing

these employees under the civil service. I am very glad of the opportunity of making the change to see if there will be some improvement.

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

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not find fault with the Senator, or any other Member of the Senate, if he does not agree with my views; but would the Senator vote for cloture to prevent me from expressing my views about any amendment?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I did not vote for cloture.

Mr. BRUCE. Of course the Senator did not. He was too faithful to his cause and the flag.

Mr. BROUSSARD. An illustration of how recklessly we go into cloture was demonstrated by the fact that the Members of the Senate voted cloture when this bill was proposed to be retroactive, and before the amendment was considered. There had been so little discussion of the bill that the Members who voted for cloture did not know that under the terms of the bill they were voting for a bill which, if enacted, would make the law retroactive. I agree with the Senator from Maryland, and have always voted that way.

I have referred to the main purpose of this bill, namely, to create the office of commissioner of prohibition. If I recall correctly the debate on the Cramton bill, it was proposed by that measure to create a director of industrial alcohol, and the committee appointed had expressed the opinion that it was not necessary to amend the law for that purpose. I really believe that what is behind this measure is merely an attempt to find an excuse to give to the country for the lack of enforcement in the past, and failures are being sought to be covered under the pretext of inadequacy of laws. I do not think there will be better enforcement under the proposed law than we have been having, except that it is plain that there will be removed from the enforcement employees that influence which is not considered good, and as is contended, is reflected in the employees of the customs department.

So far as that is concerned, I myself believe that most of the laws under which this department operates consist of regulations issued by the department itself, but if the customs division desires not to take any part in the enforcement, that may be accomplished now, without amending the law at all. I think all that would be necessary would be for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who is the head of that bureau, to issue orders to his director of prohibition that he may not use the customs officials in the enforcement of law, except incidentally, in the collection of customs or the administration and enforcement of the custom laws of the country. I do not think this measure is necessary at all. These employees may be segregated and separated effectively now without any new law.

Mr. President, I shall vote against this measure. I do not believe it will accomplish what the advocates of it claim, but I do not care to use any more time. I wished merely to express my own views with respect to the bill.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Louisiana takes his seat, I would like to call his attention to a matter upon which possibly he may choose to make some observations.

The clipping I hold in my hand shows that not only does Wayne B. Wheeler bludgeon the Members of this body into cloture when it suits him to do so, not only does the Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Morals sit across the Capitol Plaza, watching the Senate and the House of Representatives like a 'coon dog treeing a 'coon, but this board now undertakes to say who shall be the next presidential candidate of the Democratic Party. This clipping, taken from the New York Times, reads:

Bars Smith, Ritchie, and Reed for 1928. Methodist board asserts that all are unacceptable to the drys.

Mr. BROUSSARD. At any rate, Mr. President, in my opinion they selected for denunciation three of the most available candidates of the party.

Mr. BRUCE. The only ones who have any chance of election.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I have expressed my views in connection with this bill, and I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Maryland and vote against the bill.

Mr. RANSELL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me to present a unanimous-consent request to introduce a bill?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. RANSELL. Just to introduce a bill. I do not want to do anything but introduce it.

Mr. NEELY. I demand the regular order.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not want any business to take place.

Mr. RANSELL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, we are called upon to consider two measures which are yoked together but which are not related; indeed, they are rather incongruous. One relates to the customs branch of the Government—the agency which collects taxes upon imports. The other, ostensibly, is devoted to law enforcement, but in reality seeks only to place under the civil-service rule some of the employees of the Government who are not now subject to the civil service law. There is some question as to whether the customs provisions of the bill before us are wise, and it is quite certain that the benefits claimed for these provisions of the bill are purely speculative and will not be realized. There is no reason why these two subjects so unrelated, so disconnected, should be incorporated into one bill. It is apparent that the reason for so doing was that it was believed that more votes could be obtained for the bill so joined than could be secured for either of the subjects if dealt with in separate measures. Much could be said in criticism of legislation obtained in this manner. Omnibus bills which gather together matters wholly unrelated should be subjected to the severest scrutiny when presented.

Mr. President, I regret that we are not to have the opportunity of voting upon a measure that will more effectively contribute to the enforcement of the laws of Congress, especially those relating to prohibition. I assume that every Senator desires to see the laws of Congress enforced. No matter what differences may exist as to the wisdom of statutes, there can be no question as to the duty of Congress to provide all necessary and proper means for their enforcement.

There are many people in the United States who were opposed to the eighteenth amendment and to the Volstead Act, but who believe that they should be enforced. There were those in our country who believed that it was unwise and improper to deprive the States of a portion of their sovereign power to deal with their internal and domestic affairs, as was done by the eighteenth amendment. The States under our form of government possessed plenary power to deal with the liquor question. More than 20 States prior to the adoption of the eighteenth amendment had enacted prohibitory statutes. Some of this number had amended their State constitutions and provided therein for state-wide prohibition, either by constitutional provisions or by statute or both. There is no doubt that the prohibition movement was gaining strength, and there was every indication that within a comparatively short time most, if not all, of the States of the Union would adopt prohibition. But some of those who were advocates of prohibition were not satisfied with the progress which the movement was making, and although the progress was extraordinary they demanded an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. They were successful in their efforts, and the eighteenth amendment resulted. I was among the number who believed that it was the part of wisdom to bring about prohibition through State prohibitory statutes. It seemed to me that sooner or later all States would adopt prohibitory statutes, and that by education the movement for prohibition would increase in strength, and when it had encompassed the Nation the people would be prepared for prohibition, and the enforcement of prohibitory statutes would be comparatively easy.

I believe that legislation such as that involved in prohibitory statutes, legislation which many people regard as sumptuary and an interference with personal rights, should be pressed with caution and with forbearance and with proper regard for human nature and human psychology. I predicted that if the Federal Constitution was amended and Congress assumed plenary power over the liquor traffic and passed penal prohibitory statutes and provided for their enforcement much resentment would be aroused and law enforcement would be attended not only with difficulties but with obstacles almost, if not quite, insurmountable. In my opinion, the adoption of the eighteenth amendment at the time it was incorporated into the Federal Constitution was unwise. I predicted that the opposition to the amendment and to the acts of Congress for its enforcement would meet with serious opposition; that infractions of Federal statutes enacted to enforce the constitutional amendment would be frequent and general; and that there would be developed a spirit of resentment and unrest and disrespect for law, which would be followed by a train of unfortunate and evil consequences.

Mr. President, history is replete with examples of good men and women, engaged in worthy causes, failing to understand human nature and relying too much upon drastic penal statutes. However, Mr. President, the eighteenth amendment is a part of the fundamental law of the land. The duty rests upon Congress to enact all proper measures for its enforcement, and when laws

are passed for that purpose the obligation rests upon Congress to provide necessary and adequate means and agencies to enforce the same. While I believed that the eighteenth amendment was unwise, after it was adopted I regarded it as my duty to support all proper measures for its enforcement. Following its adoption a bill was introduced in the House by Congressman Volstead and a similar measure in the Senate by Senator Nelson containing provisions regarded as necessary to enforce the amendment. The Senate bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I was then and still am a member.

That committee appointed a subcommittee to consider the measure. Hearings were had, and after several weeks of consideration the subcommittee reported to the full committee, which in turn reported to the Senate a bill which is known as the Volstead Act.

When the bill was under consideration by the subcommittee, as well as the full committee, I offered an amendment which provided that the enforcement provisions of the bill should be administered by the Department of Justice. Senators know that one of the first executive departments created in the early days of Washington's administration was that of the Department of Justice. Obviously a law-enforcing agency or department of the Federal Government is necessary.

Statutes are not self-executing. Courts must be organized to interpret the law and administrative machinery must be created for the purpose of executing the law. So a great department of the Government was created charged with the duty and responsibility of enforcing the laws of Congress. At the head of that department is the Attorney General of the United States. He is presumed to be a lawyer of wide experience and of executive ability. He is given assistants and deputies and a large personnel in order that the laws of Congress may be enforced. The various States are divided into districts and within the districts executive and administrative machinery is set up to aid the courts in enforcing the law. As a part of the law-enforcing machinery there are marshals, deputy marshals, and a great army of agents and representatives of the Department of Justice.

These agencies, with their personnel, are coordinated and so integrated as to more effectively carry into execution Federal statutes. I repeat, when the so-called Volstead bill was before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, I attempted to have it so amended as to place within the Department of Justice the enforcement of the provisions of the bill. I believed that these law-enforcing agencies, in contact as they were throughout the United States, operating under one head, would more successfully and effectively enforce the provisions of the Volstead Act than could the Treasury Department. It seemed to me incongruous that the Treasury Department of the United States should have the responsibility of enforcing prohibitory statutes. The Treasury Department deals with the revenue of our country. It collects tariff duties, and the various taxes provided by the revenue laws of our country. To convert a tax-gathering agency of the Government into a law-enforcing body, I regarded as unwise.

I stated to the committee that in my opinion the Prohibition Unit, which is created in the Treasury Department, would fail to function properly and that the Treasury Department would pass through humiliating experiences and prove a weak, incompetent, and wholly inefficient organization to carry out the criminal provisions of the Volstead law. I predicted that there would be corruption and bribery and inefficiency and scandals, bringing the Treasury Department into disrepute and subjecting the Government itself to serious criticism.

I think that time has vindicated the position which I took, certainly the Treasury Department and its agencies have been unable to enforce the law. Charges of corruption and graft have been made against the Prohibition Unit, and proven time without number. Investigations have been ordered, and many have been conducted, with a view of ascertaining the reason of the corruption and demoralization and nonenforcement of the provisions of the Volstead Act.

Some of these investigations reveal such a shocking and revolting situation as to call for changes in the administration, if not in the agencies, adopted for its enforcement. But certain forces outside of the Government—forces which sometimes were controlled by fanatical individuals—would permit no important changes in the provisions dealing with administration and enforcement, and the result has been an increasing number of violations of the law, numerous and continuing scandals, and corruption nation-wide. However, there have been some changes in administration not fundamental, not important, and none of them have improved the situation. No one is satisfied with the manner in which the law has been enforced or with the results which have been obtained. It is apparent that some

radical and fundamental changes are necessary in order that the Volstead Act may be enforced.

And at this point may I say, Mr. President, that in my opinion the great majority of the American people are opposed to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and they are unwilling to modify the Volstead Act in so far as it deals with the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. I believe the eighteenth amendment, in common parlance, "has come to stay," and all efforts to repeal or modify the Volstead Act, except in administrative features, will be futile. I feel, therefore, that it is the duty of Congress to provide sound, rational, and effective legislation to enforce the law. Accordingly, I have urged that the Department of Justice be charged with the duty of its enforcement. In my opinion we should amend the bill before us and devolve upon the Department of Justice the duty and the responsibility of enforcing the Volstead Act. If it is the duty of the department of the Government to enforce other statutes, there is no sufficient reason to relieve it of the responsibility of enforcing the Volstead Act. However, I realize that all efforts to accomplish this reform will be unavailing. The Anti-Saloon League is opposed to that policy, and its views, I think, are shared by a majority of the Members of this body.

Mr. President, the measure before us seeks to place some of the employees of the Prohibition Unit under the civil service law. In my opinion, no beneficial results will accrue from such a course. This recommendation is merely one of expediency. It is experimental, as various other measures which have been recommended have proven to be. When one plan has failed, another has been recommended, and during the entire period since the creation of the Prohibition Unit, we have been conducting experiments which have ended in failure. There is nothing to justify the belief that the law will be better enforced; that there will be less corruption and fraud if some of the employees are given a civil-service status. Indeed, Mr. President, the bill before us transfers to a civil-service status a large number of those who are now in the Prohibition Unit. Will it be contended that by giving them a civil-service status they will be better or less inefficient or, if corrupt, will be purged of their corruption? Certainly, if there is corruption, it can not be said that the "corruption will put on incorruption."

Mr. President, the most effective way to enforce criminal statutes is to centralize the authority and the responsibility in one person, and require him to see that the laws are enforced. If he is to be hampered by civil-service regulations, it will be difficult to secure efficient administration. Law-enforcing agencies are much like an army. The responsibility for its movements is placed in the hands of the commander in chief. He is held to strict accountability. Failure of a subordinate is his failure, and the mistakes of those under him fall heavily upon his shoulders.

To recur to what I have indicated, the Attorney General of the United States is the head of the law-enforcing department of the Government. With the great powers given him and the large appropriations made from year to year to secure the enforcement of all criminal statutes, with the network of agencies extending throughout the Nation, it is obvious that the results in the direction of law enforcement will be infinitely better.

In my opinion, if the commissioner charged with execution of the prohibition statutes is to be held to a strict accountability for failure to enforce the law, he must have a voice in the selection of his aids and assistants. I think it may be said that public business, even under civil-service rules and regulations, is not as efficiently or economically conducted as is private business. A fair comparison will establish that a higher standard of proficiency is obtained and a larger volume of work performed by employees in private business than is performed by those in public service, though civil service prevails in the latter.

In my opinion, the Federal civil service act has not entirely justified itself.

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

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sorry to hear that the Senator from Utah does not share my views entirely with regard to the merits of the Federal civil service system. In that connection I am bound to admit myself—and I say what I do because it may prove suggestive to the Senator, tending to some extent, anyhow, to bear out his own personal convictions on the subject—that if there is a branch of the subordinate Federal

service to which the principle of competitive examination is not properly applicable, it would seem to be the Federal prohibition field service. The qualifications required for a position of this kind are not, except to a very limited extent, I should say, scholastic or academic. When we secure a Federal prohibition agent, first of all we want a man whose integrity of character, whose incorruptibility as far as possible can be relied upon, and then a man who is resolute and courageous in his nature. In other words, who have the moral qualities of one sort and another which a position such as the position of Federal prohibition agent calls for. It does seem to me, and I am bound to state it, that the position of a Federal prohibition agent is one which requires perhaps less, than almost any other position I can think of at the moment, of mere scholastic or academic qualifications.

Mr. KING. If I understand the Senator, I think he has stated the situation quite accurately. I do not want Senators to misunderstand my position. I repeat, I am in favor of enforcing the Volstead Act, and am desirous of supporting any measure that will enforce that act as well as all other criminal statutes. To that end I have supported the appropriations asked for by the Treasury Department and the Prohibition Unit, including appropriations for the purchase of revenue cutters to be operated by the Coast Guard. I am not satisfied with the present administration or policies of the Prohibition Unit. I know that under the present system there has been, as I have stated, fraud, graft, and corruption; and that base characters have found their way into various positions in the Prohibition Unit. But unsatisfactory as the present system of law enforcement is, I do not believe the plan proposed in this bill will be an improvement. Upon the contrary, I think it will prove a great disappointment and be less efficient and more unsatisfactory than the present imperfect plan.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Let me say that I hope the attention of the Senator has also been equally called to the futility of the efforts to enforce the law. Recently there was a survey made by the Moderation League, a league composed of men of very high standing in the United States, of some 564 cities and towns of the United States, with reference to arrests for drunkenness. A written statement which I have before me discloses this fact:

According to the tables of the Moderation League, drunkenness increased almost twice as fast in 1925 as in 1924. To be more specific, in the 564 cities and towns tabulated by the league arrests for drunkenness were, in 1924, 21,000 in excess of the arrests for that offense in 1923; and in 1925, 36,241 in excess of the arrests for that offense in 1924. In 509 of the 564 cities and towns arrests for drunkenness in 1925 were 129 per cent in excess of the arrests for drunkenness in the same cities and towns in 1920, the first year of national prohibition; and in 384 of the 564 cities and towns such arrests in 1925 were even more numerous than in 1914, when some States were licensing the old saloon and others were under State prohibition or local option. Most significantly, too, the tables of the Moderation League bring out the fact that conditions in the former so-called "dry" States are worse to-day, as compared with 1914, than are conditions in the so-called "wet" States.

Mr. KING. I have seen statistics corroborative of those just submitted by the Senator from Maryland. It is unfortunate, but nevertheless it is true, that there is almost universal disregard of the prohibitory statutes. There is no sufficient public sentiment behind these statutes, to secure the results to be desired; but, in my opinion, if a wise and prudent course is taken by the Government and the administration of the law is placed in the hands of the proper department of the Government, there will be a marked improvement, and within a few years public sentiment will greatly change, and the enforcement of the law will be less difficult.

Mr. BRUCE. Will the Senator yield to my question?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Some days ago the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], who is now in the chair, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by one J. P. Penny, in which it was said that a transformation, a marvelous transformation, I might almost say a pharisaical transformation, had been worked in the habits of the people of Salt Lake City by prohibition. Of course, that statement was at once challenged, as it might well be, because I myself had obtained from the chief of police of Salt Lake City previously a statement going to show that in Salt Lake City, as in every other city of the country—North and South, East and West—there had been a steady increase in the number of arrests for drunkenness between 1920 and 1925. These suggestions have been very in-

terestingly corroborated by an article which has just been placed in my hands, written by A. L. Watson, city prosecuting attorney of Salt Lake City. Perhaps the Senator knows him?

Mr. KING. I hope my friend will not now take the time to discuss my home city, because my time is limited. However, I shall be glad of the opportunity to say that Salt Lake City, if not a perfect city, is free from some of the evils that exist in other cities.

Mr. BRUCE. In other words, it is in the same class with Baltimore. The city prosecuting attorney of Salt Lake City, speaking of the general conditions of law enforcement, and so on, in Salt Lake City, said:

The matter of law enforcement and law violation is one which is receiving the attention of all thoughtful people. It is one of the serious questions before the public at the present time, and it is surprising, especially in regard to the prohibition law, the number and the classes of people who are daily violating this law. I feel that it is safe to say that it is the experience of all those working in the enforcement of law that this law is violated by every class of people and almost as frequently by the rich and the substantial people of the community as by others. One of the outstanding serious results of the prohibition law is the use of denatured alcohol and among those unable to buy whisky at its present high cost. The old-time drinkers find that they are able to get on a real drunk by the use of denatured alcohol at very little expense—the results are frightful.

The statistics show that in Salt Lake City, Utah, the arrests for drunkenness were in 1920, 659; in 1921, 658; in 1922, 758; in 1923, 868; in 1924, 919; and in 1925, 1,086. I do not want to be too hard on Salt Lake City, but—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to be courteous to the Senator, but hope he will not take me from the floor. The rule will be strictly invoked, and if I yield I may lose the floor. If the Senator regards the statement which he is reading as important, I suggest that he can offer it for the Record as a part of his own remarks.

Mr. BRUCE. Very well.

Mr. KING. I will not be diverted by the remarks of the Senator and enter into a discussion of the causes of crime and whether there has been more or less drunkenness under the Volstead Act than there was prior to its enactment. However, in view of the reference made by the Senator to the State of Utah, I wish to remark that the people of that State have always been for temperance, and have been noted from the very foundation of the Commonwealth for their frugality, sobriety, and devotion to law and order. They are a religious people and have supported all movements in behalf of temperance. The dominant church of that State is opposed to the use of alcoholic liquors and is a consistent and earnest advocate of prohibition. The members of that church have been taught that the use of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes is not only a social evil but is not in consonance with the policies and doctrines of the church.

So it may be said that prohibition, or the nonuse of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, is a part of their religious faith. And the people of Utah, whether members of the dominant church or of other churches, are for temperance and are in favor of the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. President, the provisions of the measure before us, in so far as they relate to the administration of the Volstead Act, are wholly unnecessary and without merit. They will not prove efficacious—they are not even palliatives. They will not cure the evils which exist. They will not provide better agencies of law enforcement. Those who sincerely believe in prohibition and desire that prohibition statutes shall be enforced, will be disappointed with the results following the passage of this bill, as they have been disappointed with the various expedients and experiments which have been adopted by Congress and the Prohibition Unit in order to bring about law enforcement of the provisions of the Volstead Act. If I believed that this bill possessed any virtues or would improve the present situation, I should vote for it. But in my opinion it is a mere idle gesture, offered to meet the indignant demands of the people for some effective legislation, and with the hope that, perhaps, some benefits may be derived therefrom.

It is time that the prohibition question should be dealt with not sentimentally, not hysterically, not in obedience to the unreasonable demands of any person or group of persons, but soberly, rationally, patriotically, and with a desire to enforce the Constitution according to its letter and spirit and to develop throughout the country a respect for law and the wholesome and proper determination to see that all laws of our country are justly, fearlessly, and efficiently executed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I desire to say just a few words to make clear my position on the question that is contained in the proposed amendment to the bill providing that

the field force of the prohibition service be placed under civil-service regulations.

It may not be interesting and in all probability it is not important for me to state that never, since the enactment of the Volstead Act, have I recommended any person for appointment in the prohibition service; and I never will do so, whether in or out of office myself. I do not wish to seem to use harsh expressions, but I do not want to have anything to do with it nor have my name connected with it in any degree.

I make this observation because it is contended or, at least, it is suggested that politicians, and I hope I am one, are opposed to placing the agents under civil service. As a matter of fact, it is, from my standpoint as a politician, a matter of complete indifference whether it is done or not, and under no circumstances will I ever have anything to do with it.

The time was when I believed that the placing of the agents under civil service might be beneficial. I think, perhaps, upon former occasions I have indicated that perhaps something might be hoped from that situation. I say very frankly that a continued study of this situation has brought me to the conclusion that nothing can be hoped from it, and that indeed we may find ourselves in a more distressing situation than the one in which we now find ourselves.

I gather that impression as the result of the study I have been able to give to the effect of the attempt on the part of the municipal police forces to enforce the State and Federal laws carrying out the eighteenth amendment. I have gathered the impression that every honest municipal chief of police in the country dreads the day when his policemen are to be set to work to join in enforcing this law. It certainly can not be denied that in many of our municipalities which up to the moment of attempted enforcement had boasted a splendid police force, the corrupting influences of the situation have become all too apparent and too distressing. When it is remembered that all municipal police forces—I say all; I think nearly all—are under civil service, either a municipal civil service or a State civil service, and that the system has not operated in the slightest degree as a deterrent or preventive in preventing municipal police forces becoming corrupted when once they take part in an endeavor to enforce this law, one is driven to the conclusion that the placing of the Federal agents under the Federal civil service will bring about no substantial change in the political and personal morality of the agents themselves.

If a service as old as the Coast Guard, if a service as steeped in traditions of honor and loyalty and discipline as is the Coast Guard, dating back, as it does, to a time antedating the establishment of the United States Navy—I say if a service like the Coast Guard, with all the restrictions and careful regulations and disciplinary measures which of necessity are imposed upon a military organization, can not stand the strain, how can we expect any improvement if the Federal prohibition agents are to be placed under the Federal civil service?

One may say it will do no harm. If I were convinced that it would do no harm, I think I could not bring myself to vote against the portion of the bill having to do with the civil-service proposition. I am afraid that in the end it will do harm, not only for the reasons suggested by the Senator from Maryland, in that it will tend to bring into the classified civil service a very considerable number of men who live so close to corruption or who, in the case of many of them, are so corrupted most of the time that the mere contact is apt to lower the morale and the traditions of the civil service itself but that the influence among the mass of employees classified under the Federal service is more than apt to be demoralizing. It may take some years to achieve such an effect, but frankly I dread it. This is a difficult situation. I do not get any joy out of it. The spectacle that we see over the country is too distressing. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Couzens] has stated very truly, I think, that the morale and the effectiveness of the organization must depend in the last analysis upon the head of the organization. If given unlimited time and means, and if equipped with a prescience and a judgment superhuman, the head of such an organization might finally weed out all the undesirable elements. But no public officer will ever be superhuman in the accuracy of his judgment. He will never be given time to indefinite length. And it comes down to this, in my judgment:

That no public officer, no matter how honest he is, or how industrious—indeed, he may be an idealist—can hope to command a body of men engaged in an attempt to enforce the prohibition law and at the same time eradicate the crooks. It is simply beyond his human abilities, the situation being as it is.

If they are placed under civil service, while it is true, as the Senator from Michigan says, that the head of the department is still the boss, he does not have the same right under

the law, as he conceives it and as it is generally conceived, to "hire and fire" as he pleases on a moment's notice. The mere fact that civil service covers his subordinates imposes upon him, willy nilly, a certain degree of caution, sometimes amounting to hesitancy, in removing a man; and in this prohibition service, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the superior officer finds it extremely difficult to prove that the subordinate has been crooked, although he is morally certain of it.

If the superior officer to-day—and I have reference not to the superior officer here at Washington so much as I have to the prohibition administrators in the several regional districts—is an amply courageous man, and has made up his mind and his judgment satisfies him that a certain subordinate is crooked, out he goes. He does not wait to go through any formalities which customs or regulations emanating from a Civil Service Commission may impose upon him. So if we are to have any hope of converting 110,000,000 human beings into total abstainers by legal compulsion—which is the attempt upon which we have embarked—our only hope, as I look upon it, is clothing the administrative officers with unlimited power over their subordinates and then trusting that we may get administrative officers brave enough, strong enough, and wise enough to keep their administration clean.

If I believed that putting these men under civil service would help the administrative officer keep his administration clean, I should be for it. It might make it cleaner for a little while; but if it should become unclean—as I think it would—it would make it more difficult for him to eliminate these characters that would contribute to the uncleanness.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. Does this thought occur to the Senator in connection with his discussion, which has impressed me very deeply. I haven't any desire in any way to participate in any move that would make enforcement less possible; but, at the same time, is it not probable that we might reach a situation that would better this whole condition if we tried out the civil-service proposition? If it fails, as I believe it will fail, and I am only voting for it because it has been suggested by the chief of the bureau and he wants to try it out—not that I hope it will fail; far from it—but if it does fail, is it not just one more argument, having tried both methods, that will compel finally a recognition of the fact that it is impossible to enforce this law?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator from New Jersey hug the delusion to his breast that he will ever be able to convert Wayne B. Wheeler as long as Mr. Wheeler lives off this situation?

Mr. EDGE. Not the slightest.

Mr. REED of Missouri. And does he think now that the majority of the Congress, as at present constituted, can be led to such heights of courage that they will break with Wayne B. Wheeler, and offend against his majesty's judgment and demands?

Mr. EDGE. Not the slightest, Mr. President; but, seriously—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am serious.

Mr. EDGE. If we give them a chance to try out every sane suggestion—and, of course, in this particular matter there can be only two, either civil service or no civil service—are we not just a little nearer demonstrating our convictions?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, but when this is through with, of course, there will be some other suggestion made, another plan brought forward. We are acting now under the second plan. We can act under the third. Then, there can be a fourth. Now, we have a proposition for spies. We have already had poison—spies and poison.

Mr. EDGE. That system has been pretty well punctured.

Mr. REED of Missouri. All I can think of that is left is the rack and the thumbscrew, and I have not any doubt that some of these people would be willing to apply that. Would the Senator be willing to try it if Mr. Wheeler suggests it?

Mr. EDGE. I repeat, that has been pretty well punctured, Mr. President. The Senator from New Jersey would not be willing to try anything that will encourage citizens to break the law in order to help from the standpoint of increasing arrests for the violation of prohibition.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is difficult to answer the question of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is more difficult to answer mine, is it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have my idea as to the accurate answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Missouri; but the answer might be taken as a reflection upon certain people in public life, and I shall not indulge in it.

The Senator from New Jersey suggests, "Let us try this thing, and, if it does not work, that will be another argument that nothing works." Well, that may be true. We might go on indefinitely trying anything that anybody suggested on that theory; but there will always be with us a certain number of people who will say out loud in public that they believe the thing can be made to work, although they contribute nothing in private to help make it work.

Mr. EDGE. I am not in disagreement with the Senator from New York in this viewpoint.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should not want to see anything done that would at all dampen the eagerness of the Senator from New Jersey to see the law work.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator from New Jersey at least is meeting the suggestion of those who are in charge of the administration of prohibition. I have no desire to see enforcement of the law fail. So far as I am concerned, I think I have demonstrated that I should like to see it enforced if it could be, but I am absolutely positive that it can not be.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I was endeavoring to state the considerations which have led me to reach the conclusion that nothing of good will be accomplished by the change, and that the danger is that we will be worse off than we were before; and I do not want to see us worse off than we are now.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me finish this statement; in just a moment.

I have been led the more surely toward that conclusion since I have learned about the "undercover" methods used by the departments, the so-called "undercover" men—prohibition agents, mind you—who are coached and advised and directed to violate the law themselves, encourage others to violate it, and then catch somebody.

I know of a case—I shall not describe all its details—but the shock to me which came with its knowledge has not yet passed away. A prohibition agent, well dressed, hiding his identity as a public officer, makes the acquaintance of a young man slightly his junior and two highly respectable young women, invites them to go to a restaurant and there, after three attempts, manages to persuade the proprietor to serve drinks to him and his companions in order that he may report the proprietor; and you propose to put that kind of cattle under the civil service of the United States!

Would he be discharged under the present régime for having done that? What charges would be made against him? Those charged with the duty of attempting to enforce this law openly state that those methods are required—the methods of spies, the methods of the provocateur—to entice people to break a law and by the help of that enticement, including the enticement of respectable girls, catch somebody higher up! Let the administrative officers who are responsible for that piece of tactics be solely responsible for their subordinates. Do not clothe them with the protection of the civil service.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, with the Senator yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that it is reputed that recently a judge of a State which I shall not mention connived at some sort of a scheme to aid in trapping men to violate the law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator need not be shy about mentioning the State. It was the State of New York.

No, Mr. President; I get no encouragement out of this situation. To me it is ghastly, and growing worse. If I thought we could clean up the Government agencies in their lower strata—and I make no criticism against the very splendid gentleman who is working his heart out over here in the Treasury to keep this thing straight and clean; I make no criticism against the administrative heads; they are doing their level best in a situation which I fear is impossible—were I convinced that a step of this kind would increase the percentage of cleanliness in this situation, I would support it heartily; but I fear in the long run it will make it worse, not only within the force itself, but that the contaminating influence radiating from that force may reach other branches of our Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I promised a number of Senators that before a vote was taken I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from South Carolina desires to speak at this time, I withdraw the request.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I have no desire to take part in any filibuster on this bill. In fact, if the civil-service provisions are taken out of it I think I could vote for it; but I do not want anybody to have an idea that prohibition is being enforced in this country, and I certainly do not think there is anybody who has any information at all who would say that prohibition is being enforced in this country.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in what he said; and he could have added to what he said "thieves, liars, and murderers." In my State an innocent man sleeping in a little boat out on the water was awakened in the night and murdered like a dog; an old man, as Webster said in his great speech, without an enemy in the world, quietly resting and attending to his own affairs. The man who murdered him was carried into court and a United States judge directed a verdict of "not guilty." He went off, so far as the law was concerned, a free man. The officers in this city who were in charge of this matter knew all about it. They left that man on the force; and yet, as was well said by the Senator from New York who has just taken his seat, that class of cattle—and I do not know that they should really be called cattle; I do not know but that they ought to be called serpents—are permitted by these people, who say that they are trying to enforce the law, to climb on their slimy bellies around over this country and into decent homes where respectable women and where little children are, protected by this great Government of ours, to commit other crimes worse than murder, possibly, and call themselves officers of the law!

Let me refer to another matter. Some months ago I introduced in the Senate a bill which I presume is quietly sleeping in the committee. It was to enforce the laws of this country to all people alike, to provide for law enforcement that will mean the same to the rich and to the poor, to the black and to the white.

What has become of that measure? Public attention was called to it, and these people who are in charge of the enforcement of prohibition are quietly sitting in their seats, these men who are commissioned by the United States to enforce the laws of the country, are blinding their eyes to the fact that the prohibition law is being violated every day that God gives to this earth and every night that the sun sets in this very city of Washington, under the very shadow of the dome of the Capitol, almost within sight of the office where the Prohibition Director is supposed to be sitting in his office, and no action is taken, not a single thing is done, not one arrest is made; but, on the contrary, the high officers of this Government sit and smile, some of them themselves going into these places and drinking liquor and wine and beer in open violation of this very law. Yet the authorities hound the ordinary man, the man without means, the man who possibly does not wear a uniform and brass buttons, the man who possibly works hard every day, a true citizen of the American Nation, a man who stands ready at any time, not to say "I am a slacker," not to say "I am over age," or "I am under age," but stands willing and ready at all times to sacrifice if necessary even his life in the defense of the American Nation. That man is hounded down, that man is watched, that man is trailed, that man, if you please, is under the shadow day after day of these sleuth hounds, called detectives and undercover men, the lowest element of white people God has ever created, people whom the negroes of South Carolina would not let sit down and dine at their tables if they knew their profession. Those are the barking hounds that people in high office are sitting behind and encouraging to go on with the suppression, while they know that they themselves are openly violating the very law for the enforcement of which they are appointing these people to hound down a man simply because he is humble and not in their estimation of sufficient station to deserve the protection from this Government which all the people ought to receive.

Are we to go on and give more power to them? Why does not the Senator from Utah insert an amendment in this bill providing that this law shall be enforced against the embassies in this city? Why does he not put in the law a provision that this measure shall be enforced against every official of this Nation? Why does he not put in this measure a provision that this measure, under which he wants to have these men appointed, under this bill which these people want to put through the Senate, must be enforced on every man on American soil, whatever may be his profession, whatever may be his nationality, whatever may be his religion?

I dare the Senate to pass a law, I dare them to put an amendment on this bill, providing that this law shall be enforced equally on all men alike who are under the American flag, whether they are citizens or not, or whatever may be their trade or profession.

They would not dare do it. The money power of this country would not let them do it. Andrew W. Mellon would not let them do it.

It is nothing but partisanship, the very worst form of it, and you gentlemen know it. You know that this law is being violated here, and you are making no effort to help enforce it. You know that the people who are in charge of the enforcement of this law know it, and they are making no effort to have it enforced. Why? I ask, and the American people ask, why? Oh, no; convict the poor devil. Take up the little negro, run around and hunt the man who has a little half pint, perhaps, for his own use, but do not touch the cellar, do not touch the champagne, do not touch the cognac, do not touch the beer, either homemade or otherwise, unless you find it in the home of some little, poor devil who has not enough to pay to be protected. There are officers, supposed to be enforcing this law to-day, who seize the liquor and themselves sell it. There are officers, who are supposed to be enforcing this law to-day, who are taking money, regular salaries, from bootleggers, and putting it in their pockets in addition to the salaries they are getting from the Government, and favoring bootleggers who pay this money, and who ply their trade without the slightest fear of being interfered with, because they are paying men who are in the service to protect them, and I will tell you how it is done.

Let us take four or five detectives. One of them gets money from A, B, and C. He goes and tells the others, "A, B, and C are my three men." One, two, and three pay the next man, and he goes and tells the others, "One, two, and three are my men." Not one of that force will bother a single one of those men who are paying these salaries. I am not talking about what I have heard; I am talking about what I know.

Those men ply their trade without being interfered with, without being bothered, because they are paying. The distiller, the man who runs a big liquor business, pays a certain amount for his privilege. He says, "Here are my customers." He hands a list to the man to whom he is paying his money, and that man passes it around, and nobody bothers that distiller's men who are doing his bootlegging for him. I know that to be absolutely true.

Yet men talk about prohibition. They say, "We have prohibition." As I said on this floor before, and I repeat it now, the only prohibition this country has is toward the poor devil who has not money enough to pay the high prices of the blind tigers, \$3.50 and \$5 a pint and from \$8 to \$12 a quart for liquor that possibly the bottle bottom has been taken out of and which has been mixed up with poisonous, damnable stuff, and the good liquor kept for the blind tiger himself to drink.

That is the situation in the United States to-day, and every Senator knows it. That is the condition this country is living under to-day, and there is not a Senator in the Chamber, if he wanted to buy liquor, who can not have it delivered in his office in 25 or 30 minutes, and almost any brand he wants; and most of them know that, too. That is no news at all.

That is the way this system is being run. The head officers of the enforcement bureau know it. In my own State of South Carolina it has been reported direct to Mr. Lincoln Andrews, and he has made no effort to stop it. In my own State of South Carolina Federal officials, instead of controlling blind tigers, are being controlled by blind tigers, being controlled in the most despicable way. The authorities have investigated it. I wrote to the Attorney General and asked permission to see a report from that State, and he said I could not see it. I propose tomorrow again to ask him to let me see the report against one of the district attorneys in South Carolina and against the United States marshal in South Carolina. Why have they not said something about it? Why have they not done something to try to stop it?

It is said, "Oh, yes; we know this condition is here, but this bill is going to improve it." How is it going to improve it? With the spy system? With the system that the Senator from New York has so well described? A man goes to a place and says, "I am sick. Haven't you got a little whisky?" Some good-hearted person—and I know this very thing to have been done—says, "Yes; I have." The man says, "Will you let me have a little whisky?" He lets him have it, and then he will take out the money and offer to pay for it, and the party will say, "No; I will not accept pay." He lays the money down and goes off, and the official has the poor devil who furnished the liquor indicted for selling the liquor, when he has not sold a drop. He is carried to court, and put in jail.

Why do you want to put that class of officials under the civil service? I want the prohibition law enforced. I think if you enforce it strictly to the letter before my term in the Senate is concluded I will have the pleasure of voting to repeal the whole business. But you are not going to enforce it to the letter. You simply want to enforce it to the pet, to the exclusion of the man who is not a pet.

Why not let the law alone so far as civil service is concerned? Why do you want to put these people in a status where you can not get rid of them? You are getting rid of a few of them. You are finding some men who have the nerve, when such officials come messing around, to kill them. Several have been found, some in my State.

A man's home is his own castle. God so decreed and so did man. Is that to be changed by this horde that is going around over this country now? No. It used to be that when a man went into his own home and turned the key in his lock he said, "This is my home. Certainly until the sun rises on to-morrow morning nobody can come here and disturb me. Certainly I have the freedom to go to yonder bed and expect to get a good night's rest." Does he get it? Sometimes. You do not have to sell liquor. You may be like the poor devil who was killed on the boat, who never sold a drop in his life and never had any, but was just murdered. There may be a rap on your door. If you do not get up as quickly as they think you should, they will kick your door down, come in, and ransack through your house, throw your wife's clothing and your own clothing around, and not find a single drop of drink in the house after going through it for the purpose of humiliating somebody. I say that whenever that happens, when a man kills one of them, he has done a good act; and if it is in the State of South Carolina he will have a criminal lawyer without paying a dollar for his services if he wants those services.

Now, Mr. President, to go another step. I know of cases where some dirty little beast would go and search a house of somebody he did not like. It was not very long ago when the home of one of the best men of South Carolina was searched by a dirty scoundrel on account of politics. He belonged to a different political faction from what the constable belonged to. He would not do what some people wanted him to do, and that fellow went to his home and searched it and had it brought out in the papers that this man's home had been searched. That would be humiliating to any man in the Senate. How would any Senator like to have his home searched? But you say, "If I sell liquor I would not care." This man was not selling liquor. He never drank a drop of it in his life. I do not know that he has ever had a drop of it in his home. If there has ever been any in his home, he has not known it. He is one of the most highly respected men in the whole State.

A gentleman living in my State, in Charleston, had a little houseboat. He is one of the greatest bankers in this country, a man who has been a steward in the Methodist Church for years and years and years. He had some company, and took them out on this boat on a little river trip. One of these fellows followed him, because he did not like him, and humiliated him in the presence of his guests, and that fellow is still on the force; and now you want to make it so that he can not be gotten rid of.

Consider the automobile situation. Recently a gentleman and his wife were coming from Augusta, Ga., to Columbia. When they reached the Congaree Bridge they were held up. The gentleman said to these three men, "I am so and so. This is my wife. I have been over to Augusta." One of them said, "We don't give a damn who you are. We are going to take you and her out of this car, and we are going to search it." They took him out, at least he got out; they would have taken him out. They jerked out his grip, they opened it, and scattered his things around over the ground, and scattered his wife's clothing on the ground. When they finished they said, "We do not find anything." This gentleman said, "I told you that, and I told you who I am." He said, "Now, I want to know who you are." Their reply was that they were Federal officers. That is all the reply he got. They were upheld in that. Yet everybody in the city of Columbia knows that man, everybody in South Carolina knows of him. They know he is of the highest character, the cleanest kind of a man, and they know that under no conditions or circumstances would he have liquor about him, either to drink it or to haul it.

We have a sample here in the Senate Chamber of the result of that law and of what happens with the kind of men you are trying to perpetuate in office. A Member of this body was shot like a dog when he was walking along the street attending to his own business, without any whisky. I do not suppose he ever drank any whisky, certainly did not have any, was not looking for any and did not want any. Has anything

been done about it? Yet the man who shot him belongs to the class that you want to perpetuate in office by civil service.

Senators, pass your law, but if you find that you are inviting lawlessness, if you find that you are inviting somebody to kill somebody else, if you find that your last state in this enforcement will be worse than the first, then blame yourselves. I have no objection to cloture being put on this bill, any more than on any other. If the Ten Commandments were going out of date to-night at 12 o'clock, and the only way to keep them in vogue would be for me to vote for cloture, they would go out of date, because under no conditions or circumstances will I ever vote for cloture in this body or in any other body.

Senator Arthur P. Gorman, of Maryland, God bless him and his memory, stood in this Senate and fought too hard, fought too nobly, to keep off a cloture to save my State from humiliation and disgrace, for me ever to write my name upon the records of the Senate in such a manner as have it said that I repudiated his fight. I love his memory; I love his name. I do not see how any southern man, remembering that fight, knowing what it brought about, knowing what it kept from us, can stand here and vote for cloture. I remember that as a boy I came down from the gallery yonder and shook hands with Senator Gorman and thanked him for his fight. I was a mere schoolboy at the time. I would be afraid, if I voted for cloture, that he would come to my room to-night—though it is said we may stay here all night and I may not be in my room—but wherever I am, I would be afraid that he would walk around my bed and point his finger in scorn at me and tell me I was an ingrate.

I want the law enforced. I come from a State where every time the people have had a chance to vote for prohibition they have voted for it. I have seen men go to the ballot box in my State and vote for prohibition who were drunk at the time they voted. I have seen men in my State get up and make temperances speeches when they had to hold on to the desk until they could get through because they were so drunk. I have seen men in the legislature of my State get up in the general assembly and make speeches for prohibition and come out and roll down the State house steps drunk. I can prove what I say. I have seen it with my own eyes and other people have seen it. But every time they have had a chance, the majority have voted for prohibition in my State. As their Representative in this body, I shall vote to uphold the Volstead Act, and I shall vote to uphold the eighteenth amendment.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Frazier	McMaster	Schall
Blease	George	McNary	Sheppard
Borah	Gerry	Mayfield	Shipstead
Bratton	Goff	Metcalf	Shortridge
Broussard	Gooding	Moses	Smoot
Bruce	Hale	Neely	Stanfield
Cameron	Harris	Norbeck	Steck
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Stephens
Caraway	Hawes	Nye	Stewart
Copeland	Heflin	Oddie	Swanson
Couzens	Johnson	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Tyson
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Wadsworth
Dill	Kendrick	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Edwards	King	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Ernst	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Ferris	Lenroot	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Fess	McKellar	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Fletcher	McLean	Sackett	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE.]

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let us have the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. May the amendment be read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] proposes to strike out on page 5, lines 1 to 11, both inclusive, being subsection (b), the following:

(b) The Commissioner of Prohibition, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to appoint such employees in the field service as he may deem necessary, but all appointments of such employees shall be made subject to the provisions of the civil service laws, notwithstanding the provisions of section 38 of the National Prohibition Act, as amended. The term of office of any person who is transferred, under this section, to the Bureau of Prohibition, and who was not appointed subject to the provisions of the civil service laws, shall expire upon the expiration of six months from the effective date of this act.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment if adopted, would be to separate the prohibition service from the civil service?

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that would be true only so far as the prohibition field force is concerned, but not so far as the office force is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS], which will be stated.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate from taking a final vote, and I should like to have permission to withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is withdrawn. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. WILLIS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FESS. The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] is absent because of illness. Were he present, he would vote "yea." I understand that he is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania (after having voted in the negative). Has the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have a pair with that Senator. In his absence I withdraw my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHEELER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. I understand that if he were present, he would vote "yea." I am therefore permitted to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily detained from the Senate. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71; nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—71

Ashurst	George	McNary	Sheppard
Blease	Goff	Mayfield	Shipstead
Borah	Gooding	Metcalf	Shortridge
Bratton	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Cameron	Harris	Neely	Stanfield
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Steck
Caraway	Hawes	Nye	Stephens
Copeland	Heflin	Oddie	Stewart
Couzens	Johnson	Overman	Swanson
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Trammell
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Tyson
Dill	Kendrick	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Ernst	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Ferris	Lenroot	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Fess	McKellar	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Fletcher	McLean	Sackett	Willis
Frazier	McMaster	Schall	

NAYS—6

Broussard	Edwards	Kling	Wadsworth
Bruce	Gerry		

NOT VOTING—18

Bayard	Glass	Means	Smith
Bingham	Gould	Norbeck	Underwood
Deenee	Greene	Pepper	Weller
du Pont	Harreld	Reed, Pa.	
Gillett	Howell	Simmons	

So the bill was passed.

Mr. BAYARD subsequently said: Mr. President, I was necessarily called from the Chamber when the vote was taken on

the customs and prohibition reorganization bill. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" upon its passage.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed severally to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills:

H. R. 1691. An act for the relief of Henry F. Downing;

H. R. 6246. An act to establish a national military park at the battle field of Stones River, Tenn.;

H. R. 10178. An act to confer authority on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Lester P. Barlow against the United States;

H. R. 10238. An act for the relief of Josiah Ogden Hoffman;

H. R. 13450. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 15344. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the conservation, production, and exploitation of helium gas, a mineral resource pertaining to the national defense, and to the development of commercial aeronautics, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the House had agreed severally to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 15668. An act authorizing negotiations for the acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16389. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and so forth; and

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution providing for the return of funds belonging to World War National Guard organizations that are not reconstituted.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for the year 1926, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the Department of Justice, fiscal year 1923, and prior fiscal years, amounting to \$5,000, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 235).

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1927, to remain available until June 30, 1928, for the Department of the Interior, to provide additional facilities for housing nurses at the Freedmen's Hospital in the District of Columbia, in amount \$165,000, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 232).

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation making available an additional \$10,000 of appropriations for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1927, for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 234).

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1927, to remain available until December 31, 1927, for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to determine the property loss by flood sustained by certain persons residing in the vicinity of Hatch and Santa Teresa, N. Mex., in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 25, 1927, in amount \$5,000, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 233).

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, without revision, a supplemental estimate of appropriation under the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, fiscal year 1927, to remain available until expended, in amount \$25,000, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 230).

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department (for Aviation, Navy; alterations to naval vessels; and increase of the Navy), fiscal year 1927, aggregating \$17,737,000, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 231).

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
February 22, 1927.

SECRETARY UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed herewith please find copy of assembly Joint Resolution 6, which was adopted by the California Legislature on January 21, 1927, and filed with the secretary of state on January 27, being chapter 23 of the statutes of 1927.

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS, *Chief Clerk.*

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6

Adopted in assembly January 21, 1927.

Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

CHAPTER —

Assembly joint resolution No. 6—Relating to the recreating of the position of United States district judge for the northern district of California

Resolved by the assembly and the senate jointly, That owing to the death in the month of May, 1926, of United States District Judge John S. Partridge, leaving but two United States district judges to function in the northern district of California, and in view of the greatly congested calendars in the Federal courts, both in San Francisco and in Sacramento, and the exigencies of the public interests and litigation requiring immediate relief, the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested and urged to recreate at the present session of Congress the position of United States district judge for the northern district of California made vacant by the death of United States District Judge John S. Partridge.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was ordered to lie on the table:

STATE OF MONTANA,
SECRETARY OF STATE,
Helena, Mont., February 26, 1927.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

Care of Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with the mandate of the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, now in session, I have the honor to transmit to you, for your consideration and appropriate action, Senate Joint Memorial No. 1.

Yours very truly,

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, Secretary of State of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "Memorial to the Congress of the United States praying for the immediate passage of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill, an act for the relief of disabled emergency Army officers, now pending," enacted by the twentieth session of the legislative assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 24th day of February, 1927.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 25th day of February, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Senate Joint Memorial No. 1. Introduced by Richardson to the Congress of the United States, praying for the immediate passage of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill, an act for the relief of disabled emergency Army officers, now pending

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the members of the twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, respectfully represent:

Whereas all other classes of officers who fought in the World War have been retired by Congress for their wounds, and the disabled emergency Army officers alone have been denied retirement for their mutilations and disabilities; and

Whereas more than 169 of these disabled Army officers have died since this legislation has been before Congress, awaiting in vain the affirmative action of Congress, giving them the relief to which they were so justly entitled; and

Whereas it is the claim of the veterans and organizations favoring the passage of this bill, that the same is being kept from being enacted into law by parliamentary tactics alone; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take immediate action on said bill to the end that the same be enacted into law and this discrimination against the disabled emergency Army officers be rectified at the earliest possible moment; and be it

Further resolved, That the secretary of state forward a copy to the President of the United States, to the president of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to our Representative in the United States Congress.

W. S. McCORMACK,
President of the Senate.
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 24, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed February 24, 1927, at 4.37 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. HOWELL presented petitions of sundry citizens of Omaha and Oakland, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NEELY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, W. Va., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bethel, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented petitions of sundry citizens of Seattle, Tacoma, and Prosser, all in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WATSON presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GOFF presented numerous petitions of sundry citizens of the State of West Virginia, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 4821) to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, or any other legislation religious in character, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 2, 1927, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 70. An act for the relief of Charles A. Mayo, T. S. Taylor, and Frank Hickey;

S. 105. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Colgate, administrator of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased;

S. 111. An act for the relief of the owners of the ferryboat *Oregon*;

S. 115. An act for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Neptune*;

S. 118. An act for the relief of all owners of cargo aboard the steamship *Gaelic Prince* at the time of her collision with the U. S. S. *Antigone*;

S. 227. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Connecticut;

- S. 1642. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;
- S. 1914. An act directing the resurvey of certain lands;
- S. 2081. An act placing certain noncommissioned officers in the first grade;
- S. 2197. An act for the relief of Paul B. Belding;
- S. 2594. An act for the relief of Odelon Ramos;
- S. 2597. An act authorizing the President to appoint and re-fire certain persons first lieutenants in the Medical Corps, United States Army;
- S. 3403. An act to amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913;
- S. 3418. An act to create an additional judge in the district of Maryland;
- S. 3888. An act to provide for the elimination of grade crossings of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;
- S. 4069. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange for lands in private ownership in Gunnison County, Colo., certain public lands in Delta County, Colo.;
- S. 4851. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the city of Springfield, Mass., certain parcels of land within the Springfield Armory Military Reservation, Mass., and for other purposes; and
- S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the acts of March 4, 1925, and April 13, 1926, relating to a compact between the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana for allocating the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

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

- On March 1, 1927:
- S. 244. An act for the relief of Elizabeth W. Kieffer; and
- S. 5722. An act to authorize the construction of new conservatories and other necessary buildings for the United States Botanic Garden.
- On March 2:
- S. 2085. An act to correct the naval record of John Cronin;
- S. 2700. An act to amend the naval record of Frank H. Wilson, alias Henry Wencel;
- S. 3110. An act to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Haiti the medal of honor and merit;
- S. 3464. An act authorizing certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Chile the order of Al Mérito;
- S. 4405. An act for the relief of Farrah Dane Richardson;
- S. 4558. An act to provide a method for compensating persons who suffered property damage or personal injury due to the explosions at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N. J., July 10, 1926;
- S. 4622. An act to authorize Capts. Walter S. Crosley and Paul P. Blackburn, United States Navy, to accept certain medals from the Republic of China;
- S. 190. An act for the relief of Samuel S. Archer;
- S. 722. An act to authorize the selection of certain publicly owned lands by the State of Oregon;
- S. 2139. An act for the relief of William W. Green, warrant officer, United States Army;
- S. 2141. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes;
- S. 4876. An act providing for the erection of a monument on Kill Devil Hill, at Kitty Hawk, N. C., commemorative of the first successful human attempt in history at power-driven airplane flight;
- S. 5762. An act to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio," approved May 13, 1926, as amended;
- S. 5791. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Mount Carmel, Ill.;
- S. 1787. An act for the return of \$5,000 to the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.;
- S. 4841. An act for the relief of Samuel J. Leaphart; and
- S. 5744. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church, of Oxford, N. C.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 236)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a communication from the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the period from July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1926.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1927.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

- S. 1490. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York;
- S. 2164. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Fort Smith, Sebastian County, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Poteau River;
- S. 4330. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to make settlement of the claim of the Franklin Ice Cream Co.;
- S. 5352. An act to provide for one additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan;
- S. 5479. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of certain parts of the frigate *Constitution*, to be used as souvenirs; and

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to provide for the expenses of delegates of the United States to the Eighth Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Lima, Peru.

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and received permission to print in the RECORD certain tables and memoranda, and data referred to in his address on the "Inquiry into Economic State of the Nations," which will appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5339) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into a lease of a suitable building for customs purposes in the city of New York, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 17157) to authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1339) for the relief of Katherine Southerland.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16886) to authorize the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to make loans to veterans upon the security of adjusted service certificates, and had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the said bill.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

- S. 2279. An act for the relief of James C. Baskin;
- S. 2320. An act to safeguard the distribution and sale of certain dangerous caustic or corrosive acids, alkalies, and other substances in interstate and foreign commerce;
- S. 4239. An act for the relief of homestead settlers on the drained Mud Lake bottom in the State of Minnesota;
- S. 4631. An act for the relief of Claude T. Winslow;
- S. 4754. An act to allow credits in the accounts of Harry Caden, special fiscal agent, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and
- S. 5757. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permission to the Port of Portland Commission to close the east channel of Swan Island, Oreg.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated on the following page:

H. R. 12414. An act for the relief of homestead settlers on the drained Mud Lake bottom in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys;

H. R. 17130. An act to conserve the revenues from medicinal spirits and provide for the effective Government control of such spirits, to prevent the evasion of taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance;

H. R. 9009. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon of a fireproof office building or buildings for the House of Representatives; and

H. R. 17157. An act to authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. REED of Missouri and Mr. WARREN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of order that under Rule XIX, the Senator from Missouri having first addressed the Chair, is therefore entitled to recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote on the bill which has just been passed had not been announced before both Senators were on their feet.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I was on my feet. If the point of order is overruled, I propose to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question of recognition is in the province of the Chair.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I appeal from the decision of the Chair, and upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LENROOT. I make the point of order that the question of recognition is wholly within the province of the Chair and is not appealable.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senate will decide that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the appeal of the Senator from Missouri from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, what is the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the point of order as to whether or not the Chair should recognize the Senator from Wyoming.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McLEAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLES], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FLETCHER. I find that I can transfer my pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. I do so, and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD];

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MEANS] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 35—as follows:

YEAS—42			
Blease	Fess	Metcalf	Smoot
Cameron	Goff	Moses	Stanfield
Capper	Gooding	Norbeck	Stephens
Couzens	Hale	Oddie	Stewart
Curtis	Johnson	Phipps	Wadsworth
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Deneen	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Dill	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	Watson
Edge	Lenroot	Sackett	Willis
Ernst	McLean	Schall	
Ferris	McMaster	Shortridge	
NAYS—35			
Ashurst	Broussard	Copeland	Frazier
Bayard	Bruce	Edwards	George
Bratton	Caraway	Fletcher	Gerry

Harris	La Follette	Nye	Shipstead
Harrison	McKellar	Overman	Steck
Hawes	McNary	Ransdell	Trammell
Howell	Mayfield	Reed, Mo.	Tyson
Jones, N. Mex.	Neely	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
King	Norris	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—18

Bingham	Gould	Pepper	Underwood
Borah	Greene	Pittman	Weller
du Pont	Harrel	Simmons	Wheeler
Gillett	Heflin	Smith	
Glass	Means	Swanson	

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 17291) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1927, and June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1692) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object.

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the bill be taken up.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 364.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent to take up the appropriation bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. WARREN. I now move that we take it up.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I had the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KING. Under the rule the Senator from Wyoming can not move to take up the bill. It has to lie over for a day.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I made the motion which is before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Missouri, who has the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) to amend subdivision A of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. REED of Missouri. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 364, and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I announce my pair as before. Being informed that my pair would vote the same way that I shall vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before in regard to my pair, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]; and

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MEANS] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—53			
Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Sheppard
Bayard	George	McKellar	Shipstead
Bratton	Gerry	McMaster	Stanfield
Broussard	Goff	McNary	Steck
Bruce	Gooding	Mayfield	Stephens
Capper	Harris	Neely	Stewart
Caraway	Harrison	Norris	Swanson
Copeland	Hawes	Nye	Trammell
Couzens	Heflin	Overman	Tyson
Curtis	Johnson	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Edwards	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Mo.	
Ferris	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	
Fletcher	King	Sackett	
NAYS—24			
Blease	Edge	Gould	Lenroot
Cameron	Ernst	Hale	McLean
Deneen	Fess	Keyes	Metcalf

Norbeck
Oddie
Phipps

Pine
Reed, Pa.
Robinson, Ind.

Schall
Shortridge
Wadsworth

Warren
Watson
Willis

NOT VOTING—18

Bingham
Borah
Dale
du Pont
Gillett

Glass
Greene
Harrell
Howell
Means

Moses
Pepper
Simmons
Smith
Smoot

Underwood
Weller
Wheeler

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 364, continuing during the Seventieth Congress Senate Resolutions 195, 227, 258, and 324, relative to senatorial campaign expenditures, and enlarging the authority of the special committee.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would not want the Senator to lose the floor.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If it is understood that I do not lose the floor, I will yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. For what purpose?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to present a report from the Committee on Commerce, to go to the calendar.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I call for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Regular order!

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object on the ground that the Senator from Pennsylvania can not yield for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not want the Senator to yield if it will take him off the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The objection is well taken.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I will continue the remarks that I commenced this morning when this matter was under consideration in the morning hour. I desire to call attention to the situation in which the Senate now finds itself.

It is claimed by the proponents of this resolution that they desire a count of the ballots cast in the last Pennsylvania election. I have offered them an opportunity to secure the immediate passage of a substitute resolution requesting the Committee on Privileges and Elections to make such a count, and to count every ballot after opening every ballot box. They resist that amendment because they want to pass the original resolution, which gives this committee power, in its discretion, to open some ballot boxes and count some ballots, and they base their resistance upon the argument that they want to inquire into corruption in elections, but at the same time they resist my other amendment to investigate corruption in the elections in the Southern States.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. There has been no question about the Southern States. All of their constitutions have been passed on by the Supreme Court of the United States. There has been no charge of fraud in any of them; but in the Senator's State the governor of his State refused to give Mr. VARE a clean-cut certificate of election.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Senator says there is no doubt about the elections in the Southern States. I say that your primaries there are held under party rules, and not under the State law; that there has never yet been a chance to bring them to the Supreme Court of the United States. What this committee ought to do, and would do if it sincerely desired to investigate corruption in elections, is to inquire into the methods by which those primaries are successfully kept away from the law and away from the fourteenth amendment.

Let me give an illustration, Mr. President, in the State of Alabama, which I think may appeal to the Senator who spoke last. In the county of Marengo there were, according to the last census, 12,360 negroes more than 21 years of age, 12,360 adult negroes, and yet in the presidential election of 1924 there were cast for President Coolidge only 17 votes in that entire county.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Do you not think that calls for an investigation, for the Senate to find out how it can be that the presidential candidate of the Republican Party can receive only 17 votes out of 12,360 black people of voting age?

Mr. HEFLIN. We have an educational qualification, and a poll-tax qualification, and the negro will not pay his poll tax in advance. But that is not the only reason why the Republicans

got only 17 votes in that county. The Republican Party has gotten now to where even the negroes will not vote the ticket. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is a very strong point. I am glad the Senator made it. I suppose, then, that our majority of over 7,000,000 in the last presidential election was all white, and I am glad to accept the Senator's statement to that effect.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think most of them came from Pennsylvania and were counted in. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That, again, is very interesting. At least they were counted.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Apparently even those who are permitted to vote in the South have not very much civic pride, when Senators are elected with a total vote of less than 2 per cent of the entire population of the State.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; I am wondering what is the matter with the white men of the South, when we see that in the last senatorial election in South Carolina, the successful candidate, who was a Democrat, got the votes of less than 1 per cent of the population of that great State. There must have been something wrong with him, Mr. President, or else—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. After the nomination was made, they were all satisfied. They knew the nominee would be elected, and there was no necessity of going to the polls.

Mr. MOSES. Most of them came up north to campaign in Republican States.

Mr. REED of Missouri. And to be paid for their votes in States like Missouri.

Mr. MOSES. I do not follow the Senator.

Mr. EDGE. In other words, they will not vote in some of the Southern States unless they are paid. Is that the inference?

Mr. REED of Missouri. The colored vote that comes up from the South to vote in the Northern States comes up for money, and you pay the money.

Mr. EDGE. Yes; but when the returns from a Southern State show only 28,000 votes, less than 2 per cent of all the population, as shown by the certificate of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], in a State that has a population of a million and three-quarters, it would look as if the white voters do not bother to vote unless they are paid.

Mr. REED of Missouri. They do not bother to vote because there is nobody running down there but one man.

Mr. EDGE. That is a good thing to investigate, then.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator may go and investigate it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will not the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield to the Senator, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator from New Jersey knows that this committee's authority was limited to the last election. If he wants to go back of that election, let him get up his committee and bring in his resolution. It may be he wants to go down and make some investigations or go back into the past. If I were going into the remote past as to the purchase of votes and the corrupt use of money, if we were really to try that, to run that to its fountain source, we might go back to "Blocks-of-Five Dudley," secretary of the Republican committee, who boldly sent out his instructions to vote repeaters. There would be no end to it. We might go back to Mr. Quay, who said to fry the fat out of the protective industries. We might go back into Mr. Hanna's régime. We might follow it down into Delaware, where Mr. Addicks so corrupted the situation that Delaware had only one representative in the United States Senate for two years. If we went into all the corruption that happened in the past, the Senator, as young and vigorous as he is—I do not mean to reflect on his youth, for happily he is not as old as I am; he has not yet become venerable. [laughter], although he is always respectable—would be dead long before he got through with that journey.

The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that this investigation was strictly confined to the last election. If the Senator from New Jersey wants to contribute further to the filibuster, he

may do so. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to contribute to it any further.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me one observation?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield first to the Senator from New Jersey. Of course, the Senator will understand that I am pressed for time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOSES. Yes, Mr. President; there are only about 40 hours of the session left.

Mr. EDGE. My interruption will be very, very brief. As far as I have understood, no one has suggested an investigation back of 1926. The whole reference that has been made up to the present moment has been in connection with 1926. The illustration I just gave as to the Senator from Arkansas was as to the election of 1926. So that if the Senator retained in his resolution the second paragraph, which was objected to by the Senator from Alabama on several occasions, he would go to the State of Arkansas, the election of 1926. I have no desire to have him go back of that. He will have plenty of work with the election of 1926 in other States in addition to Illinois and Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. President, it is not necessary to go back into ancient history. If the Senator really wants to find out where corruption exists in primary and general elections, he does not need to go back of 1926.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator himself just referred to some most illuminating figures in one State, in the election of 1926.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have been trying to give the most up to date illustrations of the sort of election corruption that I am talking of.

For example, in the State of South Carolina in 1920 the population was a million and three quarters. Yet in the election in November, 1926, four months ago—if that is not too ancient for the Senator from Missouri—I find that for United States Senator the successful candidate, who happened to be a Democrat, received 14,560 votes, or about four-fifths of 1 per cent of the population of that State, and there were no votes for any other candidate.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I will help him out a little more with his filibuster.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. For a brief question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Has the Senator any complaint from any responsible party about that election for Senator?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. REED of Missouri. From whom is it?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not recall any particular names, but I fancy that there are several million Republicans in this country who will make complaint, and will say that the colored vote is absolutely suppressed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly; but has he any complaint before him now that anybody was driven away from the polls, or that any votes were miscounted? Has he any complaint from any responsible party, and if so, what is the party's name?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If I produce the cases and the parties' names within 48 hours, will the Senator agree to investigate them?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I will investigate any case where there is a good prima facie case made out.

Mr. MOSES. On the certificate of five Senators?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly the same as we have every case that has been called to our attention. But we will not investigate, as far as I am concerned, every complaint that is made by any irresponsible person. Such a course would have meant that we would investigate every State in the Union, and every part of it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator investigate the suppression of the colored vote in the State of South Carolina if I produce for him a hundred affidavits of persons who tried to vote and were refused the right?

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; not necessarily on any such statement. But if the Senator will produce the prima facie evidence by responsible and reputable people that the man who sits here sits here dishonestly, he will get an investigation. But the Senator does not want an investigation. The last thing in the world he wants is an investigation. That is why he is taking up the time and clogging the business of the Senate trying to prevent a vote to continue the powers of a committee that was created here by an almost unanimous vote.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Is this a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is why he is holding up by these obstructive tactics a vote on the bill that proposes to give

reparations to those people whose property was taken during the war. That is why he is holding up the vote upon an appropriation bill. That is why he is holding up the votes upon many other important measures, filibustering to try to stop an investigation which has already been largely completed.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. President, that brings me just to the point I want to discuss. At this moment there lies upon the clerk's desk an amendment which will provide for the most comprehensive and sweeping investigation that is possible of the election in Pennsylvania, and if the Senator will accept it as a substitute for his fishing-excursion resolution he can have it adopted within five minutes, and the business of the Senate may proceed. He says I am holding up the alien property bill. Four times last night I tried to get unanimous consent that we might consider that bill at a night session to-night. Every time it was objected to, once by the Senator's colleague on this committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], once by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], once by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and I do not remember who objected the fourth time, but I think it was the Senator from Wisconsin. Four times I tried to get that bill up. The Senator will not permit it to come up, and why? Because he says that if his resolution does not pass to continue this investigating committee, he will not let anything else pass; and he knows, as surely as we are here in this room, that his resolution is as dead as Julius Caesar, and he can not pass it; but, knowing that, he is keeping the Senate here in session and refusing to let it do useful work.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Is that worse than for the Senator from Pennsylvania to take the position that if the Senator from Missouri insists on passing this resolution nothing else shall pass during this session?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I say that this resolution is not going to pass. Senators had an opportunity a minute ago to let the second deficiency appropriation bill pass. They had an opportunity, and they are going to have another in about an hour to pass the public buildings bill. Senators opposed that simply because they say this Reed committee must continue its anti-Republican activities for another two years.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield, provided I do not yield the floor.

Mr. MOSES. If there is any indication that the Senator is yielding the floor, I will stop. During the time that the Senator from Mississippi was carrying on his filibuster against the antilynching bill—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I want to warn the Senator from Pennsylvania that if he yields for a speech in the middle of his speech—

Mr. MOSES. I am asking a question, and I am leading up to it, just as the Senator from Missouri led up to his.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I warn the Senator that if he yields for that kind of a statement in the middle of his speech, we will raise the question on him.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is understood, is it not, that I am now speaking for the first time on my amendment by way of a substitute for this bill?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no; Mr. President—

Mr. MOSES. I have no intention of interfering with that. Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no. The Senator has already spoken once on this bill.

Mr. MOSES. When?

Mr. REED of Missouri. To-day.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I was speaking this morning when I was taken off my feet by the close of the morning hour.

Mr. MOSES. The second time a matter is brought up is a brand new occasion.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Go ahead, do your own talking.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We will find other things to speak of if necessary. There may be motions to take up other bills. We have a veto message to act on yet. My colleague's credentials have still to be presented.

Mr. MOSES. We have not yet moved to adjourn.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We are going to have the public buildings bill up, unless I am very much mistaken, in about an hour.

Mr. EDGE. There is a very important veto awaiting action.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I call for the regular order.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Senator is going to have the regular order. I am going to continue to talk on my amendment, which is now on the table. I am sorry the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has been required to leave the Chamber. I had some most illuminating informa-

tion for him. I find in the Montgomery Advertiser, a good Democratic paper, which came out on the morning of November 3 entirely satisfied with the situation, a heading saying:

Democrats hold lead in Alabama contested points.

I want to show the Senate just what that lead consisted of. It was a great lead they had. I find that in the first ward of Montgomery there are four precincts, four ballot places, and in the first precinct the Democrats secured 41 votes and the Republicans nothing. But when we turn to the second precinct we find the Democratic lead was greater. There they got 44 votes and the Republicans nothing. Understand, Mr. President, this is in a city of the South which was electing a United States Senator in November, as to which the Senator says he has no grounds for suspicion and no occasion to investigate. They were electing Senator Black, who will come to the Senate, whose credentials have already been presented, who will come here to be sworn in next December. This is the way the election went.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. BLEASE. I would like to have the Senator find and point out some precinct in South Carolina where the Republicans got any votes.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am busy with Alabama. I can not investigate two States at once. We are still in the first ward of Montgomery, Ala. We have gone to the third precinct, and there the Democrats slipped a little.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for a question.

Mr. GEORGE. Was there a Republican candidate for the Senate?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes, Mr. President; I will give the Senator his name. The Republican candidate for the Senate in Alabama was Mr. Edward H. Dryer, of Birmingham, Ala. The Democratic candidate was Mr. Hugo L. Black. Now, will the Senator permit me to resume my investigation?

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wanted to ask the Senator if he is going to deal with my State.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Presently, yes; Mr. President.

Mr. GEORGE. At this time?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Not at this moment.

Mr. GEORGE. I mean, in his speech?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am working up to the Senator's State.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he is coming to Mississippi later?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Indeed I am. I have some of the most illuminating information about Mississippi. I may not be able to finish.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad the Senator has some illuminating information about something.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I might not be able to reach the State of Mississippi, because I am fearful that the consideration of this resolution is going to be cut off by the Senate deciding to take up some more useful business.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator one more question? Since he is likely in due course to reach my State, is he likely to reach it to-night, or to-morrow? I shall want to be here when he reaches my State.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That encourages me very much. I can assure the Senator that I will scarcely reach Georgia before 8 o'clock.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the Senator is called away by hunger or anything else, he may rely upon that.

We are still in the first ward of Montgomery, Ala. Remember, there has been no reason to suspect that there has been election corruption in Alabama in recent years. The committee has not even looked that way, because it has not any reason for thinking that any law has been violated. This is the general election to which the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States does apply, but the committee has found no reason to suspect that votes have been suppressed.

In the third precinct of the first ward the Democrats slipped a little. They went down from their lead of 44 in the second precinct so that in the third precinct they only got 43 and the Republican candidate for the United States Senate got zero. Then they strengthened up when they got to the fourth precinct, because there the Democrats again got 44 and the Republicans consistently got zero.

Those were the four precincts in the first ward of Montgomery, Ala., where there is no reason to suspect that votes have been suppressed. Forty-one to nothing in the first pre-

inct, 44 to nothing in the second, 43 to nothing in the third, and 44 to nothing in the fourth. The Republican candidate for United States Senator got four zeros, but the Democrats held their lead.

When we get to the second ward I have not the complete returns. The fourth precinct is missing, for some reason, but I have the returns from the other four. It seems that in the first precinct of the second ward the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate received 66 votes, while the Republican candidate for this body received zero. In the second precinct the Democratic candidate got 50 votes and the Republican candidate got zero.

Then we come to one of the miracles of the last year, one of the strangest things that happened in American public life, it might be called, because in the third precinct in the second ward of the city of Montgomery, Ala., while the Democratic candidate got 52 votes, the impossible happened, and Mr. Dryer, the Republican candidate for Senator of Alabama in this general election, received 2 votes. That of itself deserves investigation, Mr. President. How in the world a Republican ever got 2 votes in Montgomery, Ala., deserves investigation. It is enough to arouse suspicion of corruption. It is probable that they hired watchers. It is even possible that they had a vast fund contributed by sinister persons with malign motives, who intended to corrupt the electorate of the State of Alabama. No other explanation can account for that vast turnout of Republican voters in the third precinct of the second ward of Montgomery, Ala.

As I said, the returns from the fourth precinct are missing. I do not know why. It may be that nobody voted on either side, as they do in Texas, where they just return the Democrat elected without going to the trouble or expense of an election.

In the fifth ward, which must be a poor ward for the Democrats, the Democratic candidate got 51 and the Republican candidate got 2. So while there was no Republican vote in the first ward, yet, probably as the result of the great uprising, there were 4 votes cast for the Republican candidate in the second ward.

I am sorry that I can not continue that encouraging progress on the part of the Republican ticket, because when we come to the third ward the Republicans slumped. In the first two precincts, the returns for which were consolidated in the Montgomery Advertiser, the Democratic candidate got 153 votes and the Republican candidate had zero in the two districts. In the third precinct the Democrat got 62 and the Republican 1. In the fourth precinct the Democrat got 58 and the Republican zero. In the fifth precinct the Democrat got 28 and the Republican zero. So in the third ward we did not do as well. There was not the same uprising as in the second ward. Only 1 vote was cast there and that voter who "uprose" was in the third precinct. In case investigation is to be made I suggest that the third precinct be investigated first.

We come now to the fourth ward, and that is another Republican stronghold, because there in the first precinct the Democrats got 63 votes for their candidate and the Republicans 1; in the second precinct, Democrats 65, Republicans 1. That is a consistent ward. In the third precinct the Democrats got 56 and the Republicans 1; in the fourth precinct the Democrats 58 and the Republicans 1. So there, as in the second ward, there has been a great uprising and 4 votes were cast by Republicans. We can see those four Republicans marching down the street in triumph ready to register this great revulsion in the popular will.

When we get to the fifth ward, it seems to be a small ward with only two precincts. In the first precinct the Democratic candidate, our coming colleague, Senator-elect Black, got 82 votes and his adversary, the Republican candidate, got zero. In the second precinct, the Democratic manager must have been careless, because his candidate only got 75 and the Republican candidate got 2. In this ward, with only two precincts, the Republicans got two votes. That is doing pretty well.

In the sixth ward there is only one precinct, according to the Montgomery Advertiser, and there the Democratic candidate got 80 votes and the Republican 1.

In the seventh ward we did not do so well. The Democratic candidate got 106 votes in the first precinct, and the Republican candidate got 1. In the second precinct of the seventh ward the Democratic vote was 94 and the Republican candidate did not get any. In the third precinct the Democratic candidate received 109 votes and the Republican 1 vote.

All told, in the whole city of Montgomery, Ala., the Republican candidate for United States Senator received 14 votes. The city of Montgomery, Ala., is a large city. I am going to ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment until I find its exact population, because in a matter of this importance

I do not want to make the slightest error in statistics. The city of Montgomery, Ala., has a population of 43,000 persons. Among them are 19,800 negroes. Out of 19,800 negroes there were only 14 votes for the Republican candidate for the Senate of the United States. Now, it may be that the negroes of this country have forgotten the party of Lincoln, have forgotten their great debt to that party to which they owe the liberty that was theirs by natural right and had been denied to them for so long. It may be they have forgotten that fact in Montgomery, Ala., but they have not in my section of the country, and they are the same kind of people.

It seems too plain for argument that out of 19,800 citizens of that race there were not more than 14 who paid their poll taxes and had the educational qualifications and wanted to vote for the Republican candidate for the Senate. And yet my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. REED] says that his committee has no reason to suspect that election irregularities existed down there, no reason for going down there to make their examination of election conditions. Everybody admits that it is as bad to suppress votes as it is to make undue efforts to get them out, and yet with all those zero districts there, with only 14 Republican votes in the whole city of Montgomery, the committee saw no reason for going down there to investigate. Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that we Republicans, who have been pilloried for the last year by this industrious committee, should pause to wonder why it does not get industrious in some Democratic cases and not confine its unlifting to Republicans alone? Is it any wonder that we want our election contests decided by the same committee that has decided election contests for the last 140 years—the Committee on Privileges and Elections—already established, capable, with clerks experienced in such matters here in the Senate ready to go ahead with this case? And yet we are asked to turn the Pennsylvania contest over to a committee with no experience in such matters, with no clerks qualified to conduct the work, which committee comes here and on the face of its own resolution asks to have the examination limited to only a part of the ballots and ballot boxes of the State, showing right at the outset that it is not its intention to make a thorough job of it and examine all the returns of the State.

I promised the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that I would not discuss Georgia until he returned, so I want now, in his absence, to turn to some of the other precincts in the State of Alabama, where we have some very illuminating results to consider.

They have a county down in Alabama called Bullock County. In 1924, in the great presidential election, when the largest popular vote ever cast in the United States was registered, Bullock County cast 8 votes for President Coolidge, although in Bullock County at that time—at least, according to the census of 1920—there were 8,840 adult negroes or persons over 21 years of age. I am not now giving figures as to children or persons disqualified by age to vote. In that county there were adult negroes to the number of 8,840, and yet the returns show that only 8 votes were permitted to be cast for President Coolidge.

They have another county in Alabama called Choctaw County, with 4,949 adult negroes, according to the census of 1920, and yet in that county only 19 votes were cast for President Coolidge.

They have another county, Greene County, where there were 7,057 adult negroes of both sexes; and out of those 7,057 there were only 5 votes cast for President Coolidge, assuming that every white man in the county who voted cast his vote for the Democratic candidate.

In Hale County they have 8,346 adult negroes, according to the census of 1920, yet in that county only 23 votes were cast for President Coolidge.

In Lowndes County, where there were 9,818 negroes over 21 years of age, only five votes were counted for President Coolidge. Presumably some of those five were white men—some, at least—but, if none of them was a white man, then it would follow that only one-twentieth of 1 per cent of the adult negroes of that county wanted to and were permitted to vote for the Republican candidate for President.

As to Marengo County, I have already given the figures. There are 12,360 adult negroes in that county, according to the census of 1920, and among those only 17 were permitted to vote for the Republican candidate for President.

In Monroe County there were 6,796 adult negroes, and yet only 22 votes were cast in that entire county for the Republican candidate for President.

In Perry County, where in 1920 there were 8,203 adult negroes, only 25 votes were cast for the Republican candidate for President.

In Pike County, where in 1920 there were 6,579 negroes over 21 years of age, there were only 29 votes cast for the Republican candidate for President.

In Russell County, where in 1920 they had 8,816 adult negroes, only 14 votes are recorded as having been cast for Mr. Coolidge. That is something less than one-sixth of 1 per cent of the adult negroes in that county.

In Sumter County, Ala., they were reported in 1920 as having 9,217 adult negroes. Of that number only 28 apparently were permitted to vote for the Republican candidate for President.

We have heard a lot about the 19 zero districts in Philadelphia County, where they have well over a thousand districts. Nineteen of them showed zero votes. Mr. Wilson got many thousands of votes in Philadelphia County. Now, let me show you what President Coolidge got in Tallapoosa County, Ala.

Although in that county there are 4,282 negroes over 21—and this, you understand, is in a State the virtue of whose elections is so transparent that the committee has never once thought of going down there to investigate; they criticized 19 zero districts out of several thousand in Pennsylvania, but they have never once thought of looking into Tallapoosa County, Ala.—yet, if they did, this is what they would find. I realize that I am saving them a lot of work in bringing the results to them.

Although there are 4,282 negroes in that county over 21 years of age, in the presidential election of 1924 the vote, as recorded, was 1,713 for Mr. Davis and for Mr. Coolidge 1—a great uprising! I have been trying to ascertain the percentage of the qualified negroes who have participated in the election, who have enjoyed the suffrage that we guaranteed to them after a somewhat long and arduous war and two constitutional amendments. The calculation of the percentage in Tallapoosa County, Ala., is difficult, but it comes to about one forty-third of 1 per cent, assuming that the one Republican who uprose at the election in 1924 was black. If he was white, then the percentage is smaller than that, you see.

And so on, Mr. President; but, of course, I do not want to bore the Senate with too many of these statistics. I think I have given enough to indicate that there was at least ground for a reasonable suspicion that that free exercise of the suffrage which we have all longed to see extend throughout this country does not obtain in Alabama, at least on the face of the returns, to the extent that the most ardent advocate of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments would have wished.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was not here when I gave the returns from the city of Montgomery, Ala., which has been called to the attention of the committee, but apparently does not excite in their minds any suspicion that there was any corruption of the election there through the suppression of votes. We found, however, that in the whole city of Montgomery, Ala., where there are, by the way, over 19,000 black persons, there were only 14 votes cast in 1924 for the Republican candidate for the Presidency, giving rise in some minds—perhaps I am oversuspicious—but giving rise in my mind, at least, to a suspicion that some of those colored people might, by some methods which could be but have not yet been inquired into, have been prevented from casting the votes for the Republican candidate for the Presidency which their general disposition toward our party would lead one to suspect they would cast.

I hope the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] will not leave. I was coming next to his State. I have only one county so far calculated. That is Crittenden County, where I find that in 1920 there were 13,343 adult negroes of both sexes; and yet in the presidential election of 1924 there were cast for the Republican candidate only 77 votes, or approximately one-half of 1 per cent of the number of persons that would be reasonably expected to want to vote for Mr. Coolidge.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no, Mr. President. The trouble about it is that your white Republicans put in their pockets and kept the money that you folks sent down there; and no negro anywhere, not even in Pennsylvania, votes until you pay him.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am to gather then, Mr. President, that the white Republicans kept it and did not vote? Is that what the Senator means to intimate?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, there are no white Republicans except the office holders, and the Lord only knows how they vote. They double-cross you after they get your money.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Can the Senator explain how it comes that in Crittenden County, Ark., the negroes do not vote at all?

Mr. CARAWAY. I thought I explained that.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Perhaps I am dull, but I did not understand the Senator's explanation.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think so. The Senator seems to think that nobody is going to vote unless he is paid. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], who is cooperating with the Senator from Pennsylvania, said that his experience was that you always had to pay the negro delegates. He testified under oath to that effect; and, as I suggested, all the money, whatever you all sent down there—I do not know how much—your white Republicans kept, and the negroes, of course, refused to vote without pay. That seems to be the Republican rule.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I suppose the Senator implies that we sent money to Arkansas, because all the money they get for all purposes comes from the North; but I do not admit that any was sent for that purpose.

Now, Mr. President, we come to some other even more interesting figures. These deal with various States in which there was no election whatever.

Bear in mind that in the State of Texas they have a statute, an act of their legislature, that forbids any negro from participating in a Democratic primary. In the presidential election of 1924, in the following counties of Texas, there was no election whatsoever held at the time of the general election. The statute prevented a colored man from voting in the primary, and they did not have any general election at which he could vote for any candidate.

In Angellina County—not a sparsely settled county, as the Senator from Texas intimated to-day, because the last census showed 22,287 persons there.

Briscoe County.

Cochran County.

Crane County.

Harrison County. That is an interesting county. Harrison County, Tex., has 43,565 citizens. Of those, 26,858 are negroes, and of negroes over 21 there are 5,853 men and 6,141 women—approximately 12,000 negro voters in that county. They were not permitted by the Texas law to participate in the Democratic primary in that county. The election officials never opened any polls. There was no election held in that county. These people were denied every chance of indicating their choice for President of the United States. It is not denied. The Senator from Texas admits frankly that there was no election held in that county and in these others; and yet in Harrison County, if you please, the Democratic nominees of the primary were returned as elected and sat in the Legislature of Texas, although everybody admits that they never went through the formality of holding an election to put them into office; and the committee say, if you please, that they see no reason for investigating in Texas!

Those were not all. I have named five counties in which they did not hold any election; but the same thing was true in Hays County, with a population of 15,920; in Hockley County; in King County; in Loving County; in McMullen County; in Reagan County; in Roberts County; in Upton County; in Yoakum County. That makes in all 14 counties in Texas in 1924, containing upward of 100,000 citizens. No black man was permitted in the primaries to cast a vote, because the statute forbade it. That statute is coming up for construction in the Supreme Court of the United States soon; and if the primary is part of the general election, as this investigating committee has been claiming that it is, then that statute must go by the board. They were not permitted to vote in the primary because of the statute, and in those 14 counties no election whatsoever was had. Can anything more flagrantly transgress the commands of the Constitution of the United States than that?

Mark what they are holding against us in Pennsylvania. They are claiming that "the successful candidates in the primary spent more money than we think they ought to"—not more money than the law said; there was no limit to which they had to adhere under the law; not more money than any fixed standard prescribed in advance; but more money than this investigating committee, after it is all over, think should have been spent. Yet that same committee shut their eyes to such a flagrant violation of the plain commands of the Federal Constitution as appears from that shocking record in Texas; and they ask us now to continue their authority for two years more, so that through the long recess of the Senate they may go on with their fishing excursion into all Republican elections, and blind their eyes to what is going on in the South.

I have spoken of Alabama and of Texas. Now, let us take some more. In Louisiana there is a county called Union County. They have a population there of 19,621 persons; and in that whole county in the presidential campaign of 1924 there were only seven votes cast for the Republican candidate.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, of course it would not be enlightening to the Senator from Pennsylvania to let him know that there is not a county in Louisiana, and never was.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. They call it a parish, perhaps. I am translating so that even the dullest of my auditors might understand.

Mr. CARAWAY. I presume by that the Senator means that he is not accurate. Is that it?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In Mississippi there is a county—

Mr. CARAWAY. I hope the Senator will answer my question.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I beg the Senator's pardon; did he ask me a question?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes. I said, by the Senator's saying that he was translating so that dull people might understand, I assume that he means that he is not being accurate?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The county is a political subdivision of a State, as we call it.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is not what we were talking about.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The name used for that political subdivision varies as we go from one State to another and from one nation to another.

Mr. CARAWAY. That was not what we were talking about.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It makes it easier to understand if we use the same phraseology for these varying conditions.

Mr. CARAWAY. I was taking about the Senator's statement. He knows what I am talking about.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator, then, repeat the question?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no; the Senator might not understand it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In Mississippi they have a county—I think they call it a county—Tate County, where they have 19,636 citizens, and only 7 of them are recorded as having voted for President Coolidge. How many of them would have voted had it not been for these unconstitutional suppressions of the vote, no one can say; and no one will ever be able to say unless this committee, or some one like it, goes down there.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Gladly.

Mr. STEPHENS. What county in Mississippi does the Senator refer to?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The name I am given is Tate County.

Mr. STEPHENS. Yes. I understood the Senator to say something about the unconstitutional provisions of the law of the State.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Oh, no; I did not. I said the unconstitutional suppression of the right to vote of large blocks of the citizens.

Mr. STEPHENS. I should like to ask the Senator just what he means by the "unconstitutional suppression" of votes in the State.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad the Senator asked the question, because it is a point I think we ought to clear up. The primaries in Mississippi, as I understand, are not regulated by the State statute. I believe they are regulated by the rules of the Democratic Party. Is that so?

Mr. STEPHENS. Not entirely; no.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Democratic primary is regulated by the Democratic Party rules.

Mr. STEPHENS. We have a primary election law; and I may say, while I am on my feet, that it is strictly complied with. In Mississippi the negroes have not voted in the Democratic primaries, I believe, since the election of 1899. There is no law that prohibits them from voting in the general election. There is no law that prohibits them from voting in primary elections if they care to call such primaries in Mississippi.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will not the Senator tell us why they do not vote in the Democratic primaries?

Mr. STEPHENS. I shall be very glad indeed to explain that. The reason is quite simple.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Of course it is understood, Mr. President, that I am not yielding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. STEPHENS. We prefer down there to require that there shall be certain intelligence tests. Men must be able to read and write before they are allowed to vote in the State of Mississippi—before they are allowed to register in order to be entitled to vote, I may say. If unable to read or write, then

if the applicant for registration can explain a simple clause of the Constitution when read to him he is entitled to register. There is no suppression of the votes in that State. There is nothing done to prohibit any man who under ordinary circumstances should be entitled to take part in the affairs of the Government from taking such part.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, that is just the point I want to have elucidated.

Mr. STEPHENS. Now, just a moment with reference to the primary system.

Since 1890, whenever the leaders of the Democratic Party want to provide for a primary election, a call is issued by the executive committee to the effect that on a certain date a primary election will be held at which all white Democrats may vote. That is not an injustice to the negro, if we do not want him in the Democratic Party in our State. The negroes in the main are Republicans. Under the same law that the Democrats operate under the negroes and all other members of the Republican Party can call a like primary and can nominate their candidates for office, and they can be voted for, and their votes will be counted just as they are cast.

So I resent the suggestion that there is an unconstitutional suppression of votes in the State of Mississippi. The Senator is simply not informed as to the situation.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am very glad to pursue that just a little further. Does the Senator agree with the theory advanced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that the primary is an integral part of the election and the process of election, so that it is within the right of the Federal Congress to regulate it and within our right to investigate it? Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. STEPHENS. Unfortunately, I did not hear the remarks of the two Senators to whom the Senator has referred; but I am going to say on the general proposition that in my judgment the Federal Government has absolutely nothing to do with a primary election.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. But the Senator has been voting for a resolution which requires the investigation of the Pennsylvania primary election. How does he justify that?

Mr. STEPHENS. As I understand, there is more involved in that resolution than the primary in Pennsylvania. As I recall, under the terms of the present resolution it is provided that the ballots that were cast in the general election shall be brought before this committee and counted. Is not that true?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Oh, that is true; that is the general election; but I am talking about these prior resolutions for the investigation of the Pennsylvania primary which were passed before the general election was held.

Mr. STEPHENS. The Senator means the original resolution?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; for the investigating of the Pennsylvania primary last May. The Senator voted for that resolution.

Mr. STEPHENS. I may say, Mr. President, that I think it is probably true that I did vote for this resolution, just as on other occasions I have cast votes with which I was not entirely satisfied. I am going to say now that, regardless of what has been done in the past—because I am not overly anxious about being consistent; I would rather be right than consistent—whatever vote I may have cast in the past, my idea now is, after more mature consideration of the proposition, that the Federal Government has no right whatever to have anything to say about a primary election; and, so far as I am concerned, in the future, unless I shall again change my mind on the subject, and I hardly think I will, because I have thought it out pretty well, I shall never again vote for the Federal Government investigating a primary election in any State in the Union.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there is more joy over one who is brought to salvation than over ninety and nine who have been previously saved.

Mr. STEPHENS. If I have brought any joy to the Senator's heart, I am very happy.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the statement which the Senator has just made brings out very vividly the issue which has been ignored, it seems to me, in all of the punishment that has been inflicted upon my State. All of the vilification to which we have been subjected there has gone on the theory that it was competent for the Federal Congress to regulate the conduct of primary elections; and, that being so, that it was competent for either House of Congress to investigate in advance of legislation. The whole investigation by this so-called "slush-fund" committee in Pennsylvania and other States has been carried along on the theory that the primary was a subject for legislation and investigation by the Senate.

If it is, obviously the Federal Constitution applies to it; and we can not, by our laws, sanction practices in a primary which violate the fourteenth amendment. Now, for the first time our friends in the South are beginning to realize the dilemma in which they have put themselves; because, if we can regulate the primaries—if they are part of the elections which we are given the power to regulate—then we must regulate the primaries in accordance with the fourteenth amendment; and the moment we do that, down goes the Texas statute, down goes the regulation of the Democratic State committee in each of these Southern States that only white men may participate in their elections. It makes a great difference whose ox is gored.

We all sat around and enjoyed seeing resolutions passed for an investigation of Pennsylvania, and even the best lawyers in the Senate were not shocked when things were proved by double hearsay evidence, as they undertook to prove the expenditures of the Pepper committee in Allegheny County, by calling a witness who managed the campaign for Pinchot, who said that he was told by the manager for VARE that the Pepper people had spent so much—double hearsay, subsequently proven to be as far from the truth as the two poles are apart.

Now this is beginning to have its bearing on other States, and in a little while the Senate will be asked to vote on an amendment to this resolution which will require this committee, if it is continued, to go into these Southern States and find out what has happened to the votes there that have caused this complete suppression of the colored vote. Pretty soon we are going to be called on to vote on that amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Missouri, and then it will be interesting to see what the vote will be.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. STEPHENS. The Senator has referred again to the suppression of votes. I would like to say, in addition to what I have already said, that there is no suppression of votes in Mississippi. I can tell the Senator exactly why negroes do not vote in Mississippi.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator has already told us. He says the primary is only open to whites.

Mr. STEPHENS. I understand; but I refer to the general election.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Why do they not vote in the general election?

Mr. STEPHENS. The reason is this: Under the laws of Mississippi there is levied what we call a poll tax. A man is not required to pay if he has no property, and most of the negroes have no property.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. How much property must they have in order to vote?

Mr. STEPHENS. Any amount of taxable property.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Is personal property taxable?

Mr. STEPHENS. There is no requirement with reference to the ownership of property in order to vote. The Senator did not catch what I said. I said that we have what is called a poll tax, which goes into the school fund. That is \$2. But under our law, there is no method of collection unless a man has other taxable property. Suppose he has a mule.

When he comes to pay on the mule, he must pay his \$2 poll tax. But suppose a man has no property at all that is taxable. He is taxed on the tax rolls with a \$2 poll tax. But there is no method provided for enforcing collection. Most of the negroes down there own very little property. They do not pay that poll tax.

We have another provision, to the effect that in order to vote a man must pay all taxes that have been levied against him for two years, I believe the law says, "on or before the 1st day of February" of the year in which he offers to vote. Our elections come every four years. The negroes do not pay the poll tax, and therefore when they come to register, or if they have registered, and it is found that they have not paid the poll tax, they are not allowed to vote. The same law applies to the white people down there. If negroes do not vote, it is simply because they failed to pay their taxes, and have failed to contribute to the fund that is used for the education of the children of the State. If there is any reflection on anybody, it is on those who fail to pay their taxes, and not on those who operate the machinery of government down in Mississippi.

I may say, too, that our constitution with reference to these matters has met the test in the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court has said that there is no objec-

tion to it, that it is entirely valid, and does not conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have no doubt about that, Mr. President; and that the constitution and the laws of Pennsylvania and of these other States that have been investigated are in full compliance with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. STEPHENS. But the Senator is talking about the suppression of votes.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Precisely, I am. I am talking about suppression of votes under these perfectly proper laws. For example, the Senator says they have an educational test there in the South. I have been told that the president of a large negro college could not explain the Constitution of the United States to the satisfaction of an election board, and was not permitted to vote, while any teamster, if he were white, could come in and do it to their complete satisfaction.

Mr. STEPHENS. That, of course, is a matter of misinformation of the Senator. It is absolutely absurd, for a negro teacher in a college would not be required to explain a clause in the Constitution, because every man who can read and who can write his name on the poll books, or anywhere else, can register, and is not required to explain a clause of the Constitution. Therefore there is no fact to the statement that a negro college professor was refused the right to vote.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I did not say that was in Mississippi; I think, as a matter of fact, it was in Alabama; but the problem is the same. A question that some day somebody with courage has to investigate is, What methods are adopted, legal or illegal on their face, to eliminate from a share in the suffrage practically half of the population of those Southern States?

Mr. STEPHENS. So far as I am concerned, I will be perfectly willing for the investigation to be made with reference to Mississippi along that line, because it would be shown that no injustice had been done to any citizen of the State in that regard, no matter how black his skin may be.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It seems to me that when the Senator says that the Democratic primary is open only to whites, he points to a very manifest injustice to the colored population.

Mr. STEPHENS. Not at all; because a primary is not an election. It does not settle anything: I want to suggest that the Senator's own party only recently met in caucus and decided that only certain men should be allowed to participate in the caucus, and should be classed as Republicans. In Mississippi we Democrats say that we do not want anybody to belong to the Democratic Party down there unless they are white men; and I say we have the right, no matter how you may view it, whether from a moral or legal standpoint, or otherwise, to select our own companions, our own associates, our own party mates, and we do it; but we say to the negroes, "If you want to hold a primary and nominate your candidates, you can have the same machinery that the white people of the State of Mississippi have, go to it, nominate your men, let their names go on their ballots, and be voted for at the general election."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. With part of what the Senator says, I am in agreement. I have always felt that the primary was not a part of the election, that the primary was not within our authority to legislate about or to investigate; but the Senate has overruled that, in effect, by its repeated examinations into the primaries in our State. The Senate voted on the other theory necessarily when it authorized last year an investigation of the Pennsylvania primary. What I argue is that if I am wrong, and the majority of the Senate is right, that a primary is within our authority to investigate, then I say common fairness and the face of the returns demand that some investigation should be made of those Southern primaries, where votes are confessedly suppressed by the very call for the primary, which eliminates all colored men.

I think the Senator is right when he says the primary is none of our business, but the Senate has repeatedly ruled the other way and voted against the theory on which we are in agreement in sending this committee into Pennsylvania with unlimited authority to examine anybody and everybody, giving nobody the right to cross-examine except itself, receiving hearsay evidence as well as competent evidence, giving nobody the right to call witnesses except itself; and it calls that a judicial investigation.

Mr. President, before I get too far off that subject let me call attention to some of the results in South Carolina. This is the State that in the election last November had a total vote for senatorial candidates of four-fifths of 1 per cent of its population.

Back in the presidential election of 1924 they did not have any election at all in November in Lee County, where there are 26,000 people, or in Spartanburg, where there are 94,265 people. This country was electing its President in the November election, and yet in Spartanburg the people had no opportunity whatsoever to cast their votes for either candidate for the Presidency. In that town alone were nearly seven times as many people living in the aggregate as voted for Senator in November, and yet to every one of them was denied any right whatsoever to vote for Coolidge or for Davis. But their vote, which was never cast, was recorded as if it had been cast for the Democratic candidates; and yet the committee sees nothing to investigate down there.

Still in South Carolina, let us run down the list here and see what we find. I shall give only the figures in thousands, leaving off the hundreds:

In Anderson County the population is 76,000; the vote for Coolidge was 9.

In Bamberg County the population is 20,000; the vote for Coolidge was 7.

In Calhoun County 18,000 people live; the vote for Coolidge was 5.

In Darlington County 39,000 person live; the vote for Coolidge was 3.

In Dillon County the population is 25,000; the vote for Coolidge was 3.

Edgefield County is the home of 23,000 people; the vote for Coolidge was zero.

In Hampton County there are 19,000 persons; the vote for Coolidge was 3,000.

In Horry County the population is 32,000; the vote for Coolidge was 1.

In Jasper County there are 9,000 inhabitants; the vote for Coolidge was nothing.

In Kershaw County there are 29,000 people; the vote for Coolidge was 1.

Why do not some of you progressives, who talk so much about the equality of men, the rights of all men to be equal politically, find out how it comes that in great counties like these those who believe in Republican candidates, and in the republican form of government, are denied all right of suffrage? Why does not your committee, with its zeal to uncover irregularities in elections, find out how it came that in Edgefield County not one of 23,000 people was permitted to cast a vote for President Coolidge?

In Lancaster County, where 28,000 people live, 8 of them were permitted to have their votes recorded as being in favor of the Republican candidate for the Presidency.

In Laurens County 42,000 people live. There were 6 votes for Coolidge.

In Lexington County 35,000 people live. Seven votes in the entire county were counted for Coolidge.

In Marion County 23,000 people live, and 2 votes out of the 23,000 were counted for the Republican candidate for President.

In Marlboro County, with 33,000 inhabitants, the vote for Coolidge was zero, and the committee wants something to investigate.

In Oconee County, 30,000 population, the vote for Coolidge was 5.

In Saluda County, with 22,000 people, the vote for Coolidge was 3.

In Williamsburg County the population is 38,539, and only 4 of them were permitted to vote for the Republican candidate for President.

Then they wonder why we think their committee has been partial in its action when it talks, as it does, about 19 zero districts out of the thousands in Pennsylvania, and here we have whole counties in the South turning in zero districts, and they are never mentioned.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator mean to say that the committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman ever made any report commenting upon zero districts?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It was my impression that it had made such a report.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We have not.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad to know it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator also answer another question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think I have been confused between the language of the report and the language of the debate on the floor. It may not be in the official report.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator know of any complaint having been filed before the committee with reference to the matter about which he is talking now?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not know what the Senator's committee has received, but if his committee would listen to what I have been saying for the last hour it would know something about it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator accuses the committee of having refused to do its duty, but he does not say that any of the matters about which he is talking has ever been laid before the committee.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I say those are matters of public knowledge, and every member of the committee knows it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Nobody ever heard of them but the Senator himself. I never heard of them before this time.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the Senator will stay in the Chamber he will hear more of them.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I shall stay here.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think the Senator was probably out of the Chamber when I called attention to some of the votes in Alabama. I now call his attention to the record which we have from Marion County, Ala., where, with 22,000 people living in the county, the vote for Coolidge was zero.

In Wilcox County, Ala., where 31,000 people live in the county, the vote for Coolidge was 6.

In Bullock County, Ala., 25,000 people live, but only 8 of them are recorded as voting for President Coolidge.

In Greene County, Ala., the population is 18,000, and there were only 5 votes for Coolidge.

In Lowndes County, Ala., with 25,000 inhabitants, 5 votes were counted for Coolidge.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] asked me to reserve for his return to the Chamber what information I might have about that fair State. I agree that it is a fair State, but I do not agree that the record of votes cast there indicates much fairness to the colored population. Let me give the Senator some typical counties. I have not the population worked out on the sheet before me, but I shall try to have it by to-morrow.

Brantley County, Ga., cast 9 Republican votes in the presidential election. Bryan County, the whole county, cast 9. Camden County, the entire county, cast 1. There are many counties in which the vote was less than 26. Candler cast 14, Chattahoochee 14, Clinch County 13, Crawford County only 7, Echols County 11, Evans County 21, Fayette County 24, Glascock County 26, Hancock County 22, Harris County, which I suppose is named after our friend, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], cast 20, Jenkins County 16, Jones County 26, Long County 19. So it goes through a long list until we get down to Putnam County, which cast 7, Whitman County cast 8, Taliaferro County cast 4.

Wheeler County, I find by the 1920 census, had a population of 1,438 negroes over 21 years of age, and yet Wheeler County, which showed a vote of 772 for Mr. Davis for the presidency, showed zero for President Coolidge. Does it occur to the Senator from Missouri that in that fact alone there is ground for suspicion and warrant for an investigation?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I think the postmaster down there ought to be investigated if he did not vote for the President.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. He may have voted for the President. I am only reading the returns as they were filed.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator does not mean to say we did not count his vote?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If he did vote for the President, it could not have been counted.

Mr. GEORGE. Presumably, therefore, he did not vote.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If his vote was counted it must have been for the Democratic candidate.

Mr. GEORGE. There are several postmasters in the county and I think really that matter ought to be investigated.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad the Senator agrees with me about it. But, seriously, will the Senator tell us why in his opinion none of the negroes in Georgia vote? How are they prevented from voting?

Mr. GEORGE. They do vote. Many of them vote. If the Senator will permit me, I do not mind assisting him a little in this discussion because I realize the Senator is absolutely within his rights.

Georgia has 161 counties, a very large number of counties. The total number of votes in many of those counties is relatively very small. The Senator has called attention to a few counties. On the other hand, there are several counties in Georgia where the Republican vote is actually the majority vote. I do not know the vote of 1924, but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that perhaps two whole Congressional districts voted for President Taft when he was a candidate for the presidency on the Republican ticket. There are many

counties in the State where the officers or at least a majority of the officers are always Republican. They also vote in the general elections, in the presidential elections.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Are those Republicans all colored men?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Are colored men permitted to vote in the primary election there?

Mr. GEORGE. They do vote in some counties, perhaps.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In the Democratic primary?

Mr. GEORGE. I have known that to happen. In my own county it has happened in a few instances. I do not mean to say on a large scale or as a rule, because the primary is a white primary. But our primary has no relation, no proper relation, to our election. I agree with the Senator that under a primary law or under a system of holding party primaries such as we have, the primary has nothing to do with the election, that is, no legal relation to the election, and in my judgment the Congress has nothing to do with the primary. In my State any man may run in the general election and may run under exactly the same conditions as the nominee of a party. He may file and he may become a candidate in any general election as a matter of right. The primary has nothing to do with it. You do not have to go through the primary in order to be listed on the ballot in the election.

In my State the party to which the Senator from Pennsylvania belongs has almost uniformly, and I think uniformly, resorted to the convention plan for the nomination of its candidates, while the Democrats have resorted to the primary. That is, the Democrats have insisted upon holding a primary in recent years. There was a time when both parties used the convention plan.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator agree with me that it is not within the province of the Federal Congress to legislate about or to investigate the conduct of those primary elections?

Mr. GEORGE. Where the primary elections are held as in my State, and where the primaries preclude nobody, and where anybody, whatever may be his political faith, whatever may be his color, who is a qualified elector, can enter the general election on the same terms as the man who is nominated either by a convention or a primary, in my judgment the Congress has no power whatever to regulate that primary.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. And having no power to regulate, has no power to investigate.

Mr. GEORGE. I would say so, but I would say this, and I would like to make myself clear on the proposition: If in my State in the primary there is found to be fraud and corruption, and if I participated in it at the primary and subsequently appeared in the general election as a candidate for the office of United States Senator and was elected, then undoubtedly, I think, the Senate could inquire not only into my election but it could also inquire into anything in the primary which affected me. It is not a question of the power of the Congress over the primary, but it is a question of the power of the Senate over Members elect to the Senate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Now the Senator makes a distinction with which I think most of us will agree.

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to make myself clear.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. For instance, if I were to commit a murder in Europe, the Congress would have no power whatsoever to punish that crime, but would clearly have the power to exclude me from membership, assuming that the Senate has power to demand other qualifications than those mentioned in the Constitution; the Senate could exclude me as a criminal, although it could not punish the crime.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to make my view clear. I do not mean to say that under some primary laws the primary is not essentially a part of the election. That may well be so. In fact, I think it is true, because for practical purposes you can only get on the ballot in the general election through the primary. Practically, one must have submitted himself to a convention or to a primary in order to have his name appear on the ballot in the subsequent election. I do not mean to say there may not be primary election laws that are, in effect and fact, a part of the election machinery of the State.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I have not the floor.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have the floor, and I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. MOSES. Is the primary conducted in the State of Georgia under statute or by regulation of the State committee?

Mr. GEORGE. By regulation of the State committee; but there are certain general laws which are made applicable to

any primary or convention if a political party desires to hold a primary or convention.

Mr. MOSES. I am told that there are some States wherein the primaries are held under regulation of the State itself, but there is no form of certification whatever to the election officer; that is, the secretary of state. But, as a matter of course, the winner of the primary notifies the secretary of state that he is a candidate, and, having won the primary, his name is put upon the ticket.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is true.

Mr. MOSES. What would be the connection between that primary and the election?

Mr. GEORGE. I would not want to answer that without seeing what is really behind it. I can very well see that many primaries, where they are held under the State law, may really be a part of the general election and may be subject to congressional regulation.

Mr. MOSES. I am asking this question because I see the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is on his feet, and the Senator from Idaho takes the position that the primary is an essential part of the election.

Mr. GEORGE. I can very well appreciate that that is true in some instances.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MOSES. I do not want to take the Senator off the floor, but I would like to have this matter cleared up.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If I do not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I ask the Senator to permit me to interrupt him to ask for unanimous consent, if he will do so?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If it will not cost me the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. With the understanding that it will not take the Senator from the floor, I now ask unanimous consent that not later than 10 o'clock p. m. of March 2 the Senate shall proceed to vote on the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 364; that not later than 11.30 o'clock p. m. of the calendar day of March 2 the Senate shall proceed to vote on Calendar No. 1697, commonly known as the second deficiency bill; that on the calendar day of March 3, not later than 2 o'clock p. m. of said day, the Senate shall proceed to vote on H. R. 17355, commonly known as the public buildings bill; and that not later than 3 o'clock p. m. of said day the Senate shall proceed to vote on Calendar No. 1415, commonly known as the alien property bill.

I ask unanimous consent for that agreement.

Mr. MOSES. Is the Senator willing to modify his request by striking out the first clause of it?

Mr. REED of Missouri. No.

Mr. MOSES. Then I am constrained to object.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator from Pennsylvania, I presume, joins in the objection?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If necessary, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MOSES. Now, if I may do so without removing the Senator from Pennsylvania from the floor, I should like to continue my colloquy with the Senator from Georgia. Referring to a State like mine, for example, where the primary is held under the statute and the election office culminates with the secretary of state putting on the ticket the names of the winners in the primaries of the parties, does that effect the differentiation as with a State where the primary is conducted, as in the Senator's own State, under the regulation of the State committee? In other words, may I ask the Senator, with the permission always of the Senator from Pennsylvania, how the winner of the primary in Georgia gets upon the ticket for election?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Georgia declines to answer, so I will have to refrain for the moment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there is not anything to be hoped for in the situation. There is only one matter which the Senator from Missouri mentioned that is doomed, and that is the Senator's resolution, Senate Resolution 364, for the continuation of this investigating committee, which is as dead as a doornail, and there need not be any doubt about it.

It is not going to be revived by unanimous consent or by attempts to keep us in session all night, or by threats to kill other measures, or by announcing that we who object to his resolution are killing everything else. The price which the Senator puts on the transaction of the public business is the passage of his resolution, and we decline to pay that price to him for the very necessary business which he is stopping. Over and over again we have asked consent to bring up these different measures, the second deficiency bill, the public buildings bill, which my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO] has tried so earnestly to get action on here.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Is the Senator willing to take a vote and find out what the Senate wants to do on his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am perfectly willing to take a vote on the public buildings bill.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Is the Senator willing to let the Senate vote on this resolution, or even on the Senator's own amendment?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Of course, I am not willing to let the Senate vote on the resolution.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly not; and the Senator wants to tie up all the business because he wants to prevent the Senate from voting. Go ahead.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Because you have made a combination between the Democrats and the so-called Progressives—who progress only in circles—to vote this resolution through, and then you will investigate our Republican States only.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator has no right to say that.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am only drawing that conclusion from what has been done in the past.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator has no right to say that. That has not been done in the past.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. What Democratic elections has the Senator investigated?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not want to take up time and help the Senator out, but I do not propose to let statements that are not correct go into the Record.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I hope the Senator will not. I do not want to make erroneous statements.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We went into Indiana at the demand of the Republican chairman of Indiana to investigate whether the Democrats were flooding the State with money. We went into the State of Arizona at the demand of the Republican Senator of that State, who was a candidate for reelection, to investigate whether the Democrats were using too much money. That is a Democratic State. We went into the State of Oregon at the demand of one Republican, the sitting Senator, to investigate the activities of another Republican.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; you went there to investigate one Republican at the request of another.

Mr. REED of Missouri. At the request of another Republican. Can you complain about that? What is wrong about that?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Why, that is what the Senator did up in my State.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We went into the State of Washington at the demand of the Republicans to investigate the supposed "slush fund" that was being used by a Democrat. Is not that correct?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not at the request of the Republican candidate for the Senate, however, but at the request, I will say, of the Republican organization.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Republican organization; not the request of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Washington. No.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Now, that is the story. What is wrong about that?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MOSES. "What is wrong with this picture?" is what the Senator from Missouri wants to know.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator from Missouri knows all about the proceedings of that committee. I know only what I read in the newspapers; but I got the impression that the investigation in the State of Indiana was to ascertain whether the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] belonged to the Ku-Klux Klan.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If there was an investigation into Democratic expenditures, the papers I read did not mention it in any of the copies that I saw.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MOSES. At the hearing in Chicago—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. MOSES. I am asking a question.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I had agreed to yield for a question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; the Senator is not asking a question.

Mr. MOSES. Do I understand correctly—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am in the same dilemma as the Vice President; I never can tell what Senators understand.

Mr. MOSES. Do I understand correctly that at the hearing in Chicago a witness was permitted to testify that somebody told him that another person had told the first one that Senator Watson had "got to me"?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I saw that in the paper, but I do not know whether the report in the paper was correct.

Mr. MOSES. Now, may I ask another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania further yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for one more question.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator will yield for at least one more, I hope. I am propounding this question to the Senator from Pennsylvania as a great lawyer, and I hope the Senator may cash in on this some time. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania, as a lawyer, would that kind of testimony be permitted in any court of law before which the Senator from Pennsylvania has ever practiced?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I hope not, Mr. President.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from Pennsylvania has no right to conduct a moot court for the benefit of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is not a lawyer.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I admit I am not a lawyer. I am not even a member of the bar.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator ought to quit practicing, then. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOSES. I think, if I may say so to the Senator from Pennsylvania, that the last remark of the Senator from West Virginia convinces me that I should retire from the practice of law, at least for the time being.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the situation in which the Senate now finds itself is very clear. Practically everybody in the Senate wants to pass the second deficiency appropriation bill. Practically everybody here wants to pass the alien property bill. Practically everybody here wants to pass the public buildings bill; but we can not do it because they are blocked behind this resolution of the Senator from Missouri, which is dead, and which he knows is dead, which can not pass because we will not let it pass, and which he knows we will not let pass; and because, knowing all that, he still persists in forcing us to protract the consideration of his resolution, he is willing to see all of these meritorious bills die by the wayside.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for one question.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, this is a question. One of these meritorious bills, I understand, does it not, contain an item of \$1,000,000 for a public building in Kansas City?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I believe it does, Mr. President. Another one, the alien property bill, will involve the return of upward of \$200,000,000 of property of German nationals which has been seized and held by the Alien Property Custodian, and will involve the payment of approximately \$175,000,000 of American claims against the German Government, the German royal family, and other German nationals.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The owners of those claims against the German Government for vandalism committed nearly 10 years ago in the World War, and for violations of neutrality committed more than 10 years ago, including the relatives of the sufferers on the *Lusitania*, are all to be denied

relief so that this resolution for the further persecution of Pennsylvania may be forced through an unwilling Senate.

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

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So that the Senator can defeat it. Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; so that a resolution which has no chance of passage may be held here and use up the Senate's time.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. For a question, yes, Mr. President.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the Senator mean to say that he is going to prevent the passage of the public buildings bill and the alien property bill and the deficiency bill because he is opposed to this resolution? Is the Senator seeking to force an extra session? I will fight with the Senator for an extra session, because I should like to keep Congress here when they call us into war.

Mr. MOSES. That is impossible.

Mr. HEFLIN. It may be possible.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am of one mind with the Senator about these other bills. I am so anxious to see them passed that I am willing to stop my speech at this moment if we can have unanimous consent now to take up the public buildings bill for the next hour and a half. We can pass it in that time. Give us unanimous consent, and your resolution will be no worse off than it is now.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will say this to the Senator: I believe that if the Senator will cease his opposition, and let this resolution pass, it will pass and both these other bills will pass before we adjourn on Friday.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the public buildings bill, Senate bill 4663, with a view to concurring in the amendments of the House.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. President, you see how anxious we are to get the public buildings bill through.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator should take a vote on the resolution, and then take up these other measures.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I now raise the point of order that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had the floor twice on this bill, intervening business has occurred at his own motion and instance, and that he must now take his seat.

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on that point of order I desire to be heard. I spoke on the pending amendment to the bill. I spoke in the morning hour and was taken off my feet by the arrival of the hour of 1 o'clock, when the Chair laid before the Senate the unfinished business, which was then under cloture. I continued my remarks this evening, when the resolution came up on the motion of the Senator from Missouri. I am now speaking—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Against time.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If I am permitted to continue, I will now be speaking after the request for unanimous consent, it being no more than the second time.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I insist on my point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Are we to understand that the Senator is now making his second speech, then?

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no; oh, no; not on this question to-night.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, yes. Mr. President, business has intervened. The Senator asked unanimous consent and it was refused. Of course, that, beyond any question, ends his speech, and he begins again. If that is not to be understood, I desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair. I say he has spoken twice on this bill already.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds the point of order well taken.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, let us get this straightened out. The Senator from Pennsylvania is now speaking what—speaking the second time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The second time.

Mr. MOSES. On this question, on the amendment which he has proposed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the Senator's amendment is not before the Senate. He had it read. It has not been called up yet.

Mr. MOSES. Then he is speaking the first time, if it has not been up.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, how long can the Senator hold the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No, Mr. President; perhaps the Senator is entitled to the floor. I will not insist on that.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Senators need not concern themselves in the least about this question, because pretty soon there is going to be a motion to proceed to the consideration of the public buildings bill. That will displace the Senator's resolution, if the motion is carried. That will be a new question, on which I am privileged to speak twice.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for a question.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, is it not a fact that on the 28th of November, 1922, at a time when the senior Senator from Mississippi—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I object to the interruption, and insist that if it is permitted the Senator loses the floor.

Mr. MOSES. Is this a parliamentary inquiry that the Senator is making?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I inquire whether, if this is to proceed, the Senator from Pennsylvania will not lose the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can not yield to another Senator to take the floor, but he can yield to a Senator for the purpose of allowing the Senator to ask him a question.

Mr. MOSES. Yes; I had asked one. Is it not a fact—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would hold that the asking of a question can not be unduly prolonged for the sake of using up time unnecessarily.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his question to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOSES. Is it not a fact that on November 28, 1922, a very distinguished Member of this body—to wit, the senior Senator from Alabama—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that he will not be disposed to regard questions which are not serious in their nature if the question proves to be such—

Mr. MOSES. I protest that it is serious. I am quite as serious as any man on this floor in this matter.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire will take his seat. The Senator from Pennsylvania will proceed. The Chair desires to state at this time that he conceives it to be the duty of the Chair to expedite business.

Mr. MOSES. Under the rules, however, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the rules.

Mr. MOSES. I hope so.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the effort to invoke this rule as to Senators speaking twice in one legislative day on one question will not have any important results on the course of business in the Senate. I should like to call to the Senate's attention a few of the subjects on which I feel a deep concern which will be brought before the Senate, and on which I shall feel at liberty to speak twice. I had started to catalogue them when I was interrupted.

They are, first, a motion to take up the public buildings bill, which will be made soon, and which, in my judgment, will pass. After that has been completed, and the bill is passed, there will undoubtedly be a motion to take up the alien property bill. On that any one of us who feels as deeply as I do will undoubtedly speak twice.

There is a veto message which we must consider. The veto of the McNary-Haugen bill has not yet been acted on by the Senate, and we do not know whether the veto of the President is going to be sustained or not, although most of us feel quite certain that it will be sustained by an ample margin.

Then there is the second deficiency appropriation bill; and undoubtedly there will be a motion to take that up, on which each of us may speak twice.

Then, on the pending measure, I now have lying on the desk three other amendments in addition to the amendment on which I am now speaking; and on each of those amendments each Senator may speak twice.

So that this species of cloture which is attempted to be invoked under Rule XIX is absolutely impossible of operation.

It is worth noticing also that the time for cloture under Rule XXII has passed; that if a cloture petition were filed under Rule XXII, it could not be voted on until Friday at 1 o'clock, which is after this Congress ceases to exist.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is perfectly self-evident that Senate Resolution 364 has no chance of passing, and that we are just wasting time to continue our consideration of it—valuable time that ought to be spent on these other measures which affect so much the welfare of tens of thousands of people—and how any Senator can explain to one of those Americans who has a *Lusitania* claim, for example, why he prevented the payment of that claim under the alien property bill, in a headstrong determination to pass a resolution that everybody knows is dead, is more than I can understand.

Before I take my seat I want to call attention to what was said by the Democratic leader of the Senate in the course of what he frankly admitted was a filibuster against the Dyer anti-lynching bill. I might say that the filibuster then was characterized by much discussion of other subjects than the bill before the Senate. When we are accused of filibustering on the pending resolution, I think I can fairly claim that we have talked to the point. That differentiates it from the self-confessed filibuster on the Dyer bill.

On November 28, 1922, Senator UNDERWOOD, then the Democratic leader in the United States Senate, stated:

We are not disguising what is being done on this side of the Chamber. It must be apparent, not only to the Senate but to the country, that an effort is being made to prevent the consideration of a certain bill, and I want to be perfectly candid about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it in order for a Senator, in the course of a filibuster, to read a speech of another Senator in the body? I remember some years ago that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] held that it was not, and I make the point of order that it is not in order for the Senator at this time to read the speeches of another Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. A part of the Senator's statement which I wish to read—

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there has been no request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire made the point of no quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Bayard	George	McKellar	Sackett
Bleas	Gerry	McLean	Schall
Borah	Glass	McMaster	Sheppard
Bratton	Goff	McNary	Shipstead
Broussard	Gooding	Mayfield	Shortridge
Bruce	Gould	Metcalf	Steck
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Stephens
Capper	Harrell	Neely	Stewart
Caraway	Harris	Norris	Swanson
Copeland	Harrison	Nye	Trammell
Curtis	Hawes	Oddie	Tyson
Deneen	Heflin	Overman	Wadsworth
Dill	Howell	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Johnson	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Edwards	Jones, Wash.	Pittmah	Warren
Ernst	Kendrick	Ransdell	Watson
Ferris	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Fess	King	Reed, Pa.	
Fletcher	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	
Frazier	Lenroot	Robinson, Ind.	

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. JONES of New Mexico], is absent from the Chamber on account of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is absent on account of illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

A moment ago the Senator from Tennessee made a point of order that a Senator speaking could not read from the speech of a Senator which was printed in the Record.

Mr. McKELLAR. After objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer overruled the point of order, and from that ruling the Senator took an appeal.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did appeal. I ask for the yeas and nays on the appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MOSES. That appeal is debatable.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it is not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appeal is debatable.

Mr. McKELLAR. Rule XI provides as follows:

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate without debate.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, that is not the question at all. It was not the reading of a paper that was called for. The Senator did not ask the clerk to read something. This was a part of the speech which the Senator from Pennsylvania was making, quoting from a speech of one of his colleagues, and I insist that quoting from the speech of one of my colleagues is to me a matter of high privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I withdraw the appeal for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appeal is withdrawn.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, some days ago I introduced a resolution asking that a committee of five Senators be appointed to revise the rules of the Senate, not to cut out any of the present rules or to change any of the present rules, but to try to simplify them, harmonizing them where they are contradictory, in order that Senators themselves might know what the rules of the Senate are. I think the conduct indulged in on the floor of the Senate within the last few days is sufficient argument to show the necessity of the revision requested by that resolution.

I am not criticizing anybody, particularly when it comes to a filibuster, because in the past I have, both in this body and others, engaged in that pastime and possibly may be placed in a position to do so again soon. But I do think that appeals from the decision of the Chair are becoming so common that it is time for us to demonstrate that we are the men who our people must have thought we were when they voted for us, men having brains enough to come here and to understand what plain English means. I do think that there should be rules of the Senate adopted by this body and printed and placed in the hands of every man who is a Member of this body, so plain that every Senator may know what the rules provide and so that the Vice President of the United States, or whoever may at the time be occupying the chair, may know how to decide a question and that when it is once decided it may stand instead of proceeding under the theory that might is right.

What is the condition in the Senate now? If the Vice President, the man elected by the people of this country to preside over this great body, shall in his wisdom, after careful thought and consideration, and after consultation with parliamentarians who are familiar with the rules of this body, make a ruling, some Senator, whether the ruling is right or not, may appeal from the decision of the Chair, and when the appeal is made, a majority of the Members of the Senate vote as to whether the decision of the Chair is correct or not. The majority, whether right or wrong, establish the precedent by which the Senate is governed, and that is not right. The humblest man in this body, the man who comes in on the 4th day of this month, if we shall have a session then, the young man, the new man, who comes into the Senate, should have placed in his hands a rule book which he can understand, so that he can make a motion or make an argument or discuss matters without the power of might hanging over his head.

Some Senators here voted for cloture the other day. They got scorched for that, and they are going to get burned later. I do not mean in the hereafter; I mean right here. I propose to see that they get some of that burning, if one vote will help to do it. Why should we have cloture? There was no reason in the world, there was no excuse in the world for it. It was the application of the power of might, not right. It was a small power, exercised by a majority of this body, supposed to be great, but I am beginning to believe it is not so great, and I think the people are beginning to think that stronger than I do. It was the rule of might, an attempt to take into the hands of the majority the power to choke to death any man or any few men who simply refuse to bow to the lash either of party or otherwise.

Personally I have never bowed to any lash. Personally I have never bowed to any party or any power, and I never expect to. I expect to vote for what I believe is right on the floor of the Senate, regardless of the source from which it comes. I propose to vote as I please on every subject that comes here, except prohibition, and the people of South Carolina have told me to vote for that; and while I know it is the rankest hypocrisy, I shall carry out their wishes.

Now, Mr. President, as to the matter before the Senate, I want to read the constitution of the State of South Carolina:

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE

SECTION 1. All elections by the people shall be by ballot, and elections shall never be held or the ballot counted in secret.

SEC. 2. Every qualified elector shall be eligible to any office to be voted for, unless disqualified by age, as prescribed in this constitution. But no person shall hold two offices of honor or profit at the same time: *Provided*, That any person holding another office may at the same time be an officer in the militia or a notary public.

SEC. 3. Every male citizen of this State and of the United States 21 years of age and upwards, not laboring under the disability named in this Constitution and possessing the qualifications required by it, shall be an elector.

The next is the section to which I wish to call the attention of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania:

SEC. 4. The qualifications for suffrage shall be as follows: (a) Residence in the State for two years, in the county one year, in the polling precinct in which the elector offers to vote 4 months, and the payment 6 months before any election of any poll tax then due and payable: *Provided*, That ministers in charge of an organized church and teachers of public schools shall be entitled to vote after six months' residence in the State, if otherwise qualified.

(b) Registration, which shall provide for the enrollment of every elector once in 10 years, and also an enrollment during each and every year of every elector not previously registered under the provisions of this article.

This constitution was adopted in 1895.

(c) Up to January 1, 1898, all male persons of voting age applying for registration who can read any section in this Constitution submitted to them by the registration officer—

Listen to this. I want Senators who are always talking about the negro voting to listen to this—

any section in this Constitution submitted to them by the registration officer, or understand and explain it when read to them by the registration officer—

How many Senators here do you suppose could pass that test? Three men are appointed by the governor, who might possibly know we had a Constitution and might not, but the applicant for registration must read it and explain it to their satisfaction before he can vote.

shall be entitled to register and become electors.

Then it goes on down and says what records shall be kept, and so forth and so on, and provides that—

The general assembly shall provide for issuing to each duly registered elector a certificate of registration.

I want to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania in all frankness that I do not see any use of people getting under a bushel and hiding their light and trying to deny the truth. I do not see any use in southern Senators getting up here and apologizing for our position. I, as one representative of the South, do not expect to make any apology. We keep the colored man from voting in South Carolina by that constitution. We do not allow him to vote in the Democratic white primaries, and we never expect to let him vote in them, no matter what may be done here.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BLEASE. No; I will not yield now.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Those laws have been upheld by the courts, have they not?

Mr. BLEASE. I do not know and I do not care. [Laughter.] They are on the statute books and in the constitution, and the white people of South Carolina have been following them, and they are going to continue to follow them. If that be defiance, make the most of it!

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. BLEASE. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I wish merely to congratulate the Senator from South Carolina upon following the frankness and courage of one of his great predecessors in this body, Senator Ben Tillman, who stated that same thing here and who maintained it to the end of his days. And may I say, Mr. President, if others would do the same thing with equal frankness, we might be much better off?

Mr. BLEASE. What I started to say was that the constitution of South Carolina contains a further provision which I do not care to take the time of the Senate to read.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, please read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BLEASE. I will read it.

The constitution of my State further provides that:

Any person denied registration shall have the right to appeal to the court of common pleas, or any judge thereof, and thence to the supreme court, to determine his right to vote under the limitations im-

posed in this article, and on such appeal the hearing shall be de novo, and the general assembly shall provide by law for such appeal, and for the correction of illegal and fraudulent registration, voting, and all other crimes against the election laws.

Persons convicted of burglary, arson, obtaining goods or money under false pretenses, perjury, forgery, robbery, bribery, adultery, bigamy, wife beating, housebreaking, receiving stolen goods, breach of trust with fraudulent intent, fornication, sodomy, incest, assault with intent to ravish—

Such criminals hardly ever get any opportunity to appeal if they are caught—

miscegenation, larceny, or crimes against the election laws—

are disqualified from being registered or voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BLEASE. I yield if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MOSES. I am about to propound a question. May I ask if the offenses which have just been enumerated by the Senator are offenses which are most common among the Negro race?

Mr. BLEASE. Yes; and if any of them is committed the perpetrators never get a chance to apply for a registration ticket.

We have had a few cases in which colored men have thought they were discriminated against. They went into the courts, and there is not a case on record in the State where a colored man ever appealed to a white Democratic judge that he was not given an order instructing the board of registration to put his name on the registration books. The reason why I mention this is to show that when these people feel that they have been discriminated against, they can go into the courts, and Democratic judges, elected by Democratic legislators, give them their rights, and, if it is a proper case, they are given registration certificates. That is the true history as to my State. Any of you may go down there and find it out. Any of you may send a committee down there and find it out.

Senators talk about the circumstances of there being no votes; I forget the expression that was used on the other side of the aisle—"zero" voting boxes, I believe. We have plenty of ballot boxes in South Carolina in our primary election, where nobody is permitted to vote but white people, where one candidate receives every vote. There are boxes in that State where I have never lost a vote; there are boxes in that State where other Democratic candidates have received a unanimous vote in the white primary. Is it any reason to say there is fraud there, because the white people of that voting precinct decide that Senator Tillman—as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] has mentioned his name—is their unanimous choice, and they go to the primary and cast their ballots for Tillman; which they did do time and time again? They have done the same thing for my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], in the recent primaries, he receiving every vote in the ballot boxes in certain precincts. That is no sign of fraud. It is simply the unanimous will of that precinct.

I have known men to sit around in the country precincts, where possibly there was a small vote of only 40 or 50 or perhaps less. They will sit around in the shade of the trees and make out the whole ticket, starting with the governor and going right straight down the State ticket, then taking the county ticket, and going straight down the county ticket. They will sit there and agree among themselves how they will vote. Sometimes one of them will say, "Let us give So-and-So a few votes; let us compliment So-and-So with a few votes." They sit around there in a common, plain, friendly manner and fix up their ballots and put them in the ballot box, and they could have been counted before they went in. Is that any reason to say there is fraud? Those men have a right to do that just as much as two of us would have a right to go out and get together and agree how we would vote in an election.

I think Mr. Coolidge received 1,100 votes in my State. I do not know where he got them. [Laughter.] I was astonished to know that they were cast and shocked to know that they were counted. [Laughter.] I actually was, because I can not imagine where they came from. Eleven hundred Republicans in my State! I do not believe it yet. [Laughter.]

I think somebody just counted a few in order to keep it from being, as the fellow said, so "new unanimous." I know we have not got that many white Republicans in the State, and I do not believe we have that many colored people who could vote.

It is true we have some people down there holding office, white folks who are working for the Republican administra-

tion. They say they are Republicans, but they vote at the Democratic primary and they are not Republicans. Right now if the Democrats were to win the next election, all of them, in order to hold their jobs, would present affidavits that they never did vote the Republican ticket. That is exactly the condition there.

I will tell Senators now why I am opposed to the resolution. I do not believe that the United States Senate has anything to do with how a party nominates its candidates. If we can enact a law or if we can pass resolutions along the line of this resolution, why can we not say that the Democratic Party and the Republican Party and the Progressive Party and the Prohibition Party shall hold primaries and nominate their candidates for the Presidency instead of doing it by the convention method? This committee is proposing to go back into Pennsylvania. I make no apologies for Pennsylvania.

I have been up there twice, I think. But why do we want to punish Pennsylvania? I do not believe if this resolution applied to any State south of the Potomac River that a Democratic Senator who lives south of the Potomac River would vote for it. This committee has no business in my country fooling around with my primaries, and I warn you and your committee to stay out. We have a right to hold the primary, and we do hold it. We have strict regulations; we have a constitution of our Democratic Party, which provides all the machinery for the purpose of holding our primary. We appoint the managers; we have the ballots printed. The State has not anything to do with it. When the ballots are counted, they are sent to the county Democratic committee. When the county committee has tabulated them they are sent to the State Democratic committee. When the State committee has tabulated them they declare the candidates of the Democratic Party for the State of South Carolina. That is the system that we use down there. Then the tickets are printed, the boxes are sent out, and at the general election every man who has a registration ticket has the freedom and the right to walk up to the ballot box and vote for such ticket as he sees fit.

There is no coercion about it; there is no force about it; there is no shot-gun government about it. It is clean, it is safe, and it is honorable. Then, Senators, every man goes up and casts his own ballot in his own way. Since we have adopted woman suffrage, of course, the ladies go just as they want to. We have a lot of them in my State who will not vote; they do not believe in women being in politics; and not believing in it themselves they will not take part in it. I congratulate them. They are God's choice people.

When that general election is held, the ballots are counted and sent in to the State board of canvassers. The State board of canvassers count them. There is nothing unfair in my State. The little book which I hold in my hand contains the printed constitution of my State, and that is what governs us.

We are perfectly willing to have and we welcome the Senate to appoint, at the next election in South Carolina, one man or two men or three men to go to every ballot box in that State and stand there, not letting anybody know who they are, and watch. They will see a fair, clean, straight primary, no buying of votes, no fraud, no corruption, no shot-gun policy. When those people are nominated, you can go down there to the general election and very often you will not see a soul around the boxes. A man will come in and cast his ballot and leave.

What is the result? Out of a possible 445,000 voting population in my State my colleague [Mr. SMITH] the other day, when up for reelection to this body, received 14,000 votes. Why? Because the white Democratic primary settles the question. There is never any opposition; there are never any two tickets. Therefore, it is not necessary for the people to quit their daily vocations and ride their mules or get in their little "John Henrys" and ride 4 or 5 miles to vote. If there should be any opposition, even at the last minute, it would take only a very short time to let them know and have them come down and cast their ballots in order to prevent any independence that might be attempted. Senators, those are the straight facts and the true conditions in South Carolina.

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]—and I know he is my friend, and I speak of him in the most friendly terms—need not worry himself about the colored voters down in my State not voting. They do not want to vote; they do not want to be bothered with it. They have belonged to the Republican Party ever since the Civil War, and since the Republican Party has been in office they can not even get the job of a negro janitor around the customhouse or the courthouse. The Republicans give those jobs to the white folks. The negroes have not even got a rural-free delivery mail carrier. If I may be excused a common expression, "They ain't got nothin'"; and that is what they are going to keep on getting. [Laughter.]

If we are going to start to run all over the United States looking after everybody who has been elected to the Senate, we are going to have a big job on hand. Just the other day we adopted a resolution about the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD] and we spent \$40,000 or \$50,000 for the investigation of that matter. He got \$10,900 for his expenses. We spent \$40,000 or \$50,000 for investigation, and, thank God, I was the only Democrat who voted against the investigation. What did we get for it? Nothing. It was an absolute waste of the people's money.

Talk about economy! Talk about cutting down expenses! Talk about reducing taxes! And yet we spend \$40,000 or \$50,000 to investigate something that happened 15 years ago. A man could have changed the color of his hair, shaved off his mustache, changed his name, and have been forgotten by that time, much less have been sent here. Now it is proposed to send into Pennsylvania this special committee.

Here we have the Committee on Privileges and Elections. What do we have them for? Are we afraid of them? Are you afraid of RICHARD P. ERNST, of Kentucky? He is here now. Are you Democrats over here afraid of your Democratic members on that committee? It seems so. If I had been on it when this resolution was passed, I would have resigned as soon as the President of the Senate declared that the resolution had been agreed to. I would not belong to a committee if the Senate of the United States would appoint a special committee to do my work. If they did not have enough confidence in me to refer matters within our jurisdiction to my own committee, I would get off it and let them put somebody on it that they did trust and have confidence in.

Why these special committees to run all over this country to advertise themselves or somebody else? Why this special committee to try to hurt somebody politically? Why this special committee to try to please the fancies of an old man over here in Pennsylvania who could hardly get over here, if he had enough votes, to get his name in the Record? He knows he was not elected. Everybody else knows he was not elected in Pennsylvania. Why should we have a contest here? It ought not to have been received when it came here at the door. It ought to have been held frivolous, and ought not to have been received in this place just to please some old, broken-down hack of a politician. It never ought to have been received, and it ought not to be considered now.

If you want to investigate this matter, send it to your own Committee on Privileges and Elections. Why pay the expenses of somebody else to run around over this country?

I know a great deal of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I know that he would not do a single thing that was dishonorable. I know that if this resolution goes through he is going to act the man, and the true, honest, honorable man that he is; but the principle of the thing is wrong, and if you start it in Pennsylvania and Illinois why have we any reason to believe that in later years it would not be started elsewhere?

Why, in 1876, when Rutherford B. Hayes had the Presidency stolen for him—I suppose everybody admits that it was stolen—even then, Mr. President, with all that bitterness, that hatred, that internecine strife, that time when brother was grappling at the throat of brother, when the hooded klan rode the Southland for the purpose of shaking the shackles from the limbs of the white race—even then, in that bitterness, in that time of struggle, in that time when men resorted even to killing people in order to redeem themselves from political slavery—even then they did not dare to go to a Southern State and say, "Bring your ballot boxes to Washington and we propose to recount your votes."

Senators, you are stepping away over yonder. You are stepping across the border line. You are going to a dangerous extent. When a State holds its election, when three managers supposed to be honest men count those ballots, make out a return, and sign it right there while it is fresh, and send it in to the commissioners of election, it ought to be accepted. Why wait for a year or two years and go and get those boxes and haul them from the State capitol, wherever it may be, to the city of Washington on a train, guarded?—yes, possibly by one or two men; possibly by some man who can be bought. What is to hinder somebody from going in that courthouse with a pocket full of ballots already marked, taking out of that ballot box a hundred or five hundred votes cast for a certain candidate, destroying them, putting in these other ballots, sealing that box up, and letting it come to Washington; and then why should you, through your subcommittee, brand as thieves and perjurers the managers of elections who have counted those votes because the stealthy hand of some political coward in some way has gotten into that box and changed those ballots before they came here to Washington?

Do you think that is fair to the men who counted those ballots in the first place. Do you think that is fair to those men, my fellow Senators, when you had a right to contest them at the time? Why did not Mr. Wilson contest this election right then, while those ballots were fresh, demand a recount, if you please, and have that recount made by the county committee in Pennsylvania, or, if you please, have that recount made by the State committee in Pennsylvania?

No! You wait from 1926, you wait month after month, when these boxes have been indiscriminately pitched around, and then bring them here to Washington, and put them in the hands of people to count who are no more honest—I do not care who they are; the men who will be appointed to count these ballots are no more honest—than the managers of election who held that election, saw those ballots put in the ballot box, and counted them.

That is my opposition to this matter. That is my position before the Senate and before the Nation, and that is the position of the white people of South Carolina. I speak for them on this occasion, the unterrified white democracy of South Carolina; and if this gallery were full of them, and I were to turn around and ask them, as I have done many a time, "Those of you who agree with me, hold up your right hands," it would be a unanimous vote, because we believe in honest elections. We believe in abiding by the laws that we have; and if those who are not pleased with these laws will carry them into the courts, and the courts say that they are unfair, or that they are not in accordance with the Constitution of the United States of America, we will wipe them out, and we will call our general assembly together, or, if it be necessary, call a constitutional convention, and we will pass others.

I shall never cast my vote in this body or in any other body to drag ballot boxes from any State up here to Washington. I was not here when this resolution was passed. That is the only day I have missed being in the Senate since I have been a Member. I was called home on political business, and I presided over my State convention. If I had had this thing there, and had submitted it to them, they would have voted unanimously against it. When I came back here I was surprised to find that any such resolution as this, reflecting on the Committee on Privileges and Elections, had been passed. I was surprised when the Vice President, my friend—and I voted to sustain him on every ruling that has been appealed from because I believed he was right; if I had not believed he was parliamentarily right, I would have voted against him—I was surprised when he compromised in the appointment of this committee. He should have appointed this committee of five Senators without a compromise. I am not criticizing him; I do not know what his party said to him; I do not know what obligations he had; but I do say that this committee should have been appointed squarely from the shoulder.

How much farther are we going? When are we going to stop? Suppose a resolution comes in here saying that my good friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] was illegally elected; that charge was made against my friend HARRY HAWES. I knew it was a lie when I read it in the papers down in South Carolina, and I told Congressman DOMINICK so. But suppose that fellow were to come back, or suppose he gets, as any man can get in his State, a few affidavits or a petition. Suppose he should bring that petition up here and lay it before the Senate, and say: "We want the election of HARRY HAWES investigated." Suppose they go back down to Tennessee, where some one said that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON] spent over \$1,000,000. One of his big men down there charged him with it—a man supposed to be a reputable citizen.

Mr. HEFLIN. I never heard of that, I am sure.

Mr. BLEASE. I certainly have, and I guess the Senator from Tennessee has, too. Suppose they bring that thing in here and lay it down. Are you going to drag the votes of Tennessee, are you going to drag the votes of Missouri, up here and count them?

Somebody said my friend Mr. Watson over there, from Indiana, belonged to the Ku Klux Klan. Well, suppose he did. If they are composed of as good people in Indiana as they are in South Carolina he has been in darned good company. [Laughter.] I will tell him that, although I do not belong to them; but they stand for a whole lot of things that I stand for. Are you going to go back now to Indiana and drag all the ballot boxes of that State up here? When would you get through? When would you finish? When would we say a man had the right to his seat here? Is there to be no end of it? Is there to be no time when a man can feel that he is in his seat and he is not to be bothered? Is the time never to come when we can sit down here quietly and feel that "I am a Senator, and I have the right to handle affairs for my State in the proper manner"?

Are we to sit here all the time with a wasp's nest in the cushion of our chair, not knowing what minute it will be turned loose on us? [Laughter.] They are organized, you know. Wasps are organized. They may turn loose on us and have us jumping up here and running up to the Vice President and running to somebody else and asking whether we are going to be allowed to sit here or not.

Why, Senators, you ought to kill the resolution. That is what you ought to do—kill it now, and stop this bitter feeling that is starting here. It is hatching out just as slowly, but just as surely, as it can come. The speech of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] shows it. Some of the remarks made by my other friend from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] also show it. It may be hidden elsewhere. I see it on this side of the Chamber. I see the resentment in certain references that have been made.

Why should we, who have been so nice to each other—why should the Democrats over here, who have let you Republicans use them as a rubber stamp to get through all of your pet measures, voting with you to help you on all occasions—why should you and they fall out about it? Why bring back the North and the South? Why drag in Sherman and Lee and Jackson and Davis and Sheridan and the rest of them? This is a great Nation. God grant that she may ever be a great Nation! Why should we, over one little seat, split asunder, I will say, and bring back this political hatred and this political strife, for what? Let each man in his own conscience answer, for what?

I appeal to you as Americans to place the duties of the Senate upon the committees of the Senate. Let us treat each other as men, as brothers of the same great race, and stand united for our country and for our God.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], in the nature of a substitute, on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the motion to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion is not debatable.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	George	McLean	Sackett
Bayard	Gerry	McMaster	Schall
Blease	Glass	McNary	Sheppard
Borah	Goff	Mayfield	Shipstead
Bratton	Gooding	Metcalf	Shortridge
Broussard	Gould	Moses	Stanfield
Bruce	Hale	Neely	Steck
Cameron	Harris	Norbeck	Stephens
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Stewart
Caraway	Hawes	Nye	Swanson
Copeland	Heflin	Oddie	Trammell
Curtis	Howell	Overman	Tyson
Deneen	Johnson	Phipps	Wadsworth
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Kendrick	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Edwards	Keyes	Ransdell	Warren
Ernst	King	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Ferris	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Fess	Lenroot	Robinson, Ark.	
Fletcher	McKellar	Robinson, Ind.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BRUCE. Is that motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion is not debatable.

Mr. WATSON. May the motion be reported?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the motion.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Missouri filed the following modified resolution:

Resolved, That Senate Resolutions Nos. 195, 227, and 258 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, and Senate Resolution No. 324 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, be, and they hereby are, continued in force during the interim between the Sixty-ninth Congress and the Seventieth Congress and thereafter until the 30th day of December, 1927.

That the special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 195 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, is authorized in its discretion, and/or at the request of either William S. Vare or William B. Wilson, to open any or all ballot boxes and examine and tabulate any or all ballots and scrutinize all books, papers, and documents which are now in its possession, or any that shall come into its possession,

concerning the general election held in the State of Pennsylvania on the 2d day of November, 1926.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] offers the following amendment in the nature of a substitute, namely, on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "Resolved" down to and including line 4, on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Committee on Privileges and Elections is authorized and directed to take possession of and to open all ballot boxes and to examine and tabulate all ballots and scrutinize all books, papers, and documents, which are now in its possession or in the possession of any standing or select or special committee of the Senate, or any that shall come into its possession concerning the general election held in the State of Pennsylvania on the 2d day of November, 1926.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] moves to lay the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania on the table.

Mr. JONES of Washington. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the substitute of the Senator from Pennsylvania is laid on the table, would the original proposal then be subject to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and vote "yea."

Mr. HARRELD (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MEANS] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—46			
Ashurst	George	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.
Bayard	Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard
Bratton	Glass	McMaster	Shipstead
Broussard	Goff	McNary	Steck
Bruce	Harris	Mayfield	Stephens
Caraway	Harrison	Neely	Swanson
Copeland	Hawes	Norris	Trammell
Dill	Heflin	Nye	Tyson
Edwards	Howell	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Ferris	Johnson	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kendrick	Ransdell	
Frazier	King	Reed, Mo.	
NAYS—34			
Blease	Gooding	Moses	Shortridge
Borah	Gould	Norbeck	Stanfield
Cameron	Hale	Oddie	Stewart
Capper	Harreld	Phipps	Wadsworth
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Warren
Deneen	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Edge	Lenroot	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Ernst	McLean	Sackett	
Fess	Metcalf	Schall	
NOT VOTING—15			
Bingham	Gillett	Pepper	Underwood
Couzens	Greene	Simmons	Weller
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Smith	Wheeler
du Pont	Means	Smoot	

So the amendment of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania was laid on the table.

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Curtis	Gerry	Jones, Wash.
Bayard	Deneen	Glass	Kendrick
Blease	Dill	Goff	Keyes
Borah	Edge	Gooding	King
Bratton	Edwards	Hale	La Follette
Broussard	Ernst	Harris	Lenroot
Bruce	Ferris	Harrison	McKellar
Cameron	Fess	Hawes	McLean
Capper	Fletcher	Heflin	McMaster
Caraway	Frazier	Howell	McNary
Copeland	George	Johnson	Mayfield

Metcalf	Pine	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Moses	Pittman	Shipstead	Walsh, Mass.
Neely	Ransdell	Shortridge	Walsh, Mont.
Norbeck	Reed, Mo.	Steck	Warren
Norris	Reed, Pa.	Stephens	Watson
Nye	Robinson, Ark.	Stewart	Willis
Oddie	Robinson, Ind.	Swanson	
Overman	Sackett	Trammell	
Phipps	Schall	Tyson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana to adjourn.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. BRATTON (when the name of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was called). My colleague is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the evening.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MEANS] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRELD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence, I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of illness. As has just been stated, he is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD].

The result was announced—yeas 21; nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—21			
Blease	Hale	Phipps	Wadsworth
Cameron	Harrell	Pine	Watson
Deneen	McLean	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Edge	Metcalf	Robinson, Ind.	
Ernst	Moses	Shortridge	
Gould	Oddie	Stanfield	
NAYS—58			
Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Sackett
Bayard	George	Lenroot	Schall
Borah	Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard
Bratton	Glass	McMaster	Shipstead
Broussard	Goff	McNary	Steck
Bruce	Gooding	Mayfield	Stephens
Capper	Harris	Neely	Stewart
Caraway	Harrison	Norbeck	Swanson
Copeland	Hawes	Norris	Trammell
Curtis	Heflin	Nye	Tyson
Dill	Johnson	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Edwards	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Ferris	Kendrick	Ransdell	Warren
Fess	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	
Fletcher	King	Robinson, Ark.	
NOT VOTING—16			
Bingham	Gillett	Means	Smoot
Couzens	Greene	Pepper	Underwood
Dale	Howell	Simmons	Weller
du Pont	Jones, N. Mex.	Smith	Wheeler

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am about to offer an amendment which I think will bring the Senate to a decision of that essential question whether they want this to be a complete investigation of the suppression of votes throughout the United States or whether they want to limit it to a few Republican States in the North.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield for a question.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator read his amendment before he offers it, so we may not be taken by surprise by the motion which his cousin from Missouri is about to enter to lay on the table?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am very glad to do that. My intention, in good season, unless I should change my mind in the meantime, is to offer an amendment which will read as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the figures "1926," or if the four lines on page 2 have been stricken out of the substitute, then, at the end of the resolution—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). The Chair desires to call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that the resolution at the desk is in

typewritten form, so it is not possible to follow the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I now find that the modified resolution has been printed, and I am about to offer my amendment to that. On page 2, line 4, it is my expectation presently to offer an amendment reading as follows:

And the said committee—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator from Pennsylvania has spoken twice upon the bill. He has not offered an amendment. He is now talking, if at all, upon the bill, and is, therefore, out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would feel inclined to overrule the point of order, as he understands the Senator from Pennsylvania is now offering an amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But he is not offering it. It must be offered and read to the Senate, and not a speech made while he holds the paper in his hands. If he is speaking to the Senate, he must be speaking upon the question which is before the Senate, which is the resolution in hand. The Senator can not stand with a paper in his hand and say he is going to offer something which he has not offered, and speak on that when his time is exhausted, because that which he says he will offer is not yet before the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator intends to conclude his statement by offering an amendment, he is clearly in order.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no. What is he talking on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator is entitled to some latitude in offering his amendment. He hopes, however, that the Senator from Pennsylvania will not abuse that privilege. He is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. May I be heard on the point of order before the Chair rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has overruled the point of order. The Senator will offer his amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I would simply like to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that I have spoken twice on my substitute resolution which has been laid upon the table. I have not spoken at all upon the resolution of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator is speaking on it now under the rule, and the time must be counted against him.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator can not yield the floor to another Senator. I demand recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania offered his amendment?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have not yet offered the amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Then I do not care to hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to inquire whether the Senator from Missouri has just used one of his rights in addressing the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would not hold to that technical construction.

[CONTINUED ON PAGE 5464]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, March 2, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Heavenly Father, our hearts are filled with gratitude because the mercies of earth have their seat in the bosom of God and their voices make up the sweet harmonies of the world. Far out beyond our dreaming, Thy love extends and Thy bounty reaches. So we are not cast down, for Thou art our strength, the rock of our salvation, and our high tower. We most humbly ask Thee to bring sight out of blindness and purity out of