

Also, resolutions adopted by the Twenty-seventh Infantry Association, in favor of returning our soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, Chicago, Ill., urging return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of jewelers of the United States, urging that the entire Title IX, covering sections 900 to 907, inclusive, be taken from the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, relating to the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Kingston, Ill., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Twenty-seventh Infantry auxiliary, asking for return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, urging that railroads be turned back to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, favoring import duty on live stock and its products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, indorsing the Kendrick bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Tioga County, Pa., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of David Cowan, Robert Macdonald, and Gustav J. Merbach, of Baltimore, Md., asking support of the initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of the United States and also the noninterest bond bill, as advocated by Jacob Sechler Coxey, sr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Leon Simon (Inc.), Baltimore Fur Manufacturing Co., Bernheimer Bros., Big Home Stores, Stewart & Co., all of Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York City, asking for immediate repeal of section 904 of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Maryland Federation of Women's Clubs, relating to Lewis-Raker bill (S. 4811; H. R. 12698), giving military rank to Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, urging repeal of section 904 of revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the imposition of luxury taxes and asking for the immediate repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918, as well as the other sales taxes in title 9; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of citizens of Fulton, N. Y., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of United Presbyterian Congregation of Chester, W. Va., urging constitutional amendment against polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of farmers from Polk County, Wis., for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of central committee, Socialist Party of Douglas County, Wis., transmitting certain demands of the Socialist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of County Board of Taylor County, Wis., for the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Iron River, Wis., relating to the sale of medicines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Self-Determination League, of Liberty, N. Y., asking for repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of jewelers of the United States, urging repeal of revenue-tax sections 900 to 907; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, Chicago, Ill., urging immediate return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of California Goldsmiths' and Silversmiths' Association, in opposition to the extent of the sales tax imposed upon their products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Messrs. Lensky & Laewin, of Los Angeles, Calif., in opposition to the tax imposed on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sacramento Valley Development Association, of California, in support of the Mondell bill proposing a soldier settlement plan for reclamation of arid and swamp lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of Bethel Friends Church, of Long Beach, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring enactment of laws to rigidly enforce war and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Council of Churches, favoring a Federal law to remove the disgrace of lynching from America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of First Church of the Nazarene, Pasadena, Calif., protesting against repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Pasadena, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring inclusion of a clause in the league of nations constitution guaranteeing freedom of religious belief; also guaranteeing equality of race treatment in respect of law and its administration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring restriction of immigration based on just and equitable regard for the rights of the nations concerned; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of prohibitionists of California against repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, of the city of Chicago, for an early return of the American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William Lorenz et al., of Farmington, Mo., for the repeal of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Papers in support of House bill 1331; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 26, 1919.

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

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the religious instinct and passion that Thou hast put into Thy creature, man. As we face the difficult tasks of life with faith and feel the need of the high inspiration for noble endeavor, we constantly turn back to the source of our life and our noblest thought and our highest inspiration. So we turn to Thee this day and pray that Thou wilt so guide us that our lives may count for the upbuilding of civilization, for the advancement of man, and the prosperity and interest of the world for the glory of Thy name. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

CONNERS BROS. v. THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 8).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims certifying that the cause of Milton C. Connors and George G. Connors, doing business under the firm name of Connors Bros., v. The United States, which was referred to the Court of Claims August 5, 1916, under the judicial code, was dismissed by the court March 24, 1919, for nonprosecution on motion of the defendants, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 9).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

The Fore River Ship & Engine Co. v. The United States and Genevieve Griswold Kennon v. The United States.

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

SILK INDUSTRY OF JAPAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented the statement of Sobel Mogi, a director of the Japan Silk Association and president of the United Export Silk Textile Association of Japan, concerning relations between the United States and Japan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1200) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR DEAF AND DUMB.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. POMERENE a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, under the requirements of the act approved June 10, 1872.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN a director of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, under the requirements of the act approved June 10, 1872.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring legislation providing for the adequate protection of the lives and property of aliens by the Federal authorities, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring the enactment of legislation for the suppression of lynching, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Owaneco, Ill., remonstrating against the proposed modification of the prohibition act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MOSES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Belmont, N. H., praying for the repeal of the luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPENCER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Clinton, Mo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a telegram, which is very brief, and I ask that it may be read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., May 22, 1919.

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Dakota, representing 3,000 women, strongly protests against the repeal or weakening of war-time prohibition.

ELIZABETH PRESTON ANDERSON, President.
BARBARA H. WYLIE, Secretary.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a petition of the Niagara-Shawnee Agricultural Club, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

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

To the Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,

Senator from the State of North Dakota, Washington, D. C.

Sir: We, the undersigned committee, were duly appointed to present to you the following resolution adopted at one of the club's regular meetings, in which you were respectfully requested to obtain, if possible, the repeal of the daylight-saving law, for the following reasons:

First. In our State we have many frosty mornings early in the spring. It is impossible to do good work and start early, so the men and teams lose time and the men refuse to make it up in the evenings. The same holds good in haying and harvesting time. On account of the dewy mornings it is absolutely impossible to make hay or harvest grain in the early hours, and the men refuse to work later. In thrashing, it is the same. It has caused untold loss of grain.

Second. We find it impossible to combine the two systems because it confuses our work and operations in such a manner that we can not attend meetings and gatherings conveniently if we work under the old time and conform with the new in other ways.

Third. We find that for the foregoing reasons it damages the producer more than it benefits the consumer.

Fourth. We find it works a hardship on the very young children attending the consolidated high schools. They have to make long drives and do not get sufficient rest under the new system.

Respectfully yours,

F. A. MUNSON,
Chairman.
FRANK GEORGESON.
DAVID KIRK.

Mr. CURTIS presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Arkansas City, Kans., and a memorial of sundry citi-

zens of Satanta and Clyde, Kans., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Sedgwick County Republican Club, of Kansas, praying for the separation of the peace treaty from the league of nations plan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lawrence, Detroit, Topeka, Pretty Prairie, Valley Falls, Netawaka, Oska-loosa, and Ozawkie, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Kansas and Michigan Association, praying for the establishment of a national soldiers' home at St. Cloud, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Dick Yates Post No. 50, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Eureka, Kans., and a petition of Princeton Post No. 111, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Richmond, Kans., praying for an increase in the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of deceased Civil War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry soldiers, members of Ambulance Company 347, Eighty-seventh Division, in France, praying for a congressional investigation of certain actions by the War Department, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Russell, Kans., praying for the deportation of aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first naturalization papers, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Manhattan, Topeka, Utopia, Nortonville, Paola, Columbus, Olathe, Oswego, and of Wheat Belt Grange No. 1735, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Arkansas City, Kans., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Council No. 976, Knights of Columbus, of Newton, Kans., praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Atchison, Kans., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroad, telegraph, and telephone lines, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Wichita, Kans., praying for the removal from office of Postmaster General Burleson, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange No. 1498, Patrons of Husbandry, of Holton, Kans., praying for an investigation of the interference by the Department of Agriculture with the work of the Bureau of Farm Management, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Columbus, Kans., favoring the repeal of the espionage act, the withdrawal of American troops from Russia, the reestablishment of the rights of free speech, free press, and free assemblage, self-determination by any country of their form of government without interference from troops abroad, and the immediate release of all political, religious, industrial, and other prisoners incarcerated for their views, etc., which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, of Beloit, Kans., praying for the independence of Korea, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the United Trades and Labor Council of Pittsburg, Kans., favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of all Federal judges, with short terms of office, and placing the power to recall Federal judges in the people, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Winfield, Kans., praying for the repeal of the tax on shoes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Independence, McPherson, and Kansas City, all in the State of Kansas, pray-

ing for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ASHURST presented a petition of Yavapai Council, No. 1032, Knights of Columbus, of Prescott, Ariz., praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Norumbega Club of Bangor, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of Local Grange No. 166, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tecumseh, of sundry school-teachers of Highland Park, and of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Pattern Makers' Association of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for Government ownership of railroads and the merchant marine, and also for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Joseph, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., praying that Fort Wayne, in that State, be turned over to the city of Detroit, Mich., for park and recreational purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FERNALD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Sanford, Berwick, and Pittsfield, all in the State of Maine, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MCLEAN presented petitions of the New Haven Theosophical Society of New Haven; Connecticut Alumni Association of Wesleyan University; Machinists' Lodge, No. 819, International Association of Machinists, of Meriden; Silver City Council, No. 21, F. B. L., of Meriden; Meriden Grange, of Meriden; Nepang Congregational Church of New Hartford; Beacon Valley Grange of Naugatuck; citizens of Middletown; Court Silver City Friendly Society; and Daughters of the American Revolution of New Haven; of the Men's Club of the First Congregational Church of West Haven; St. John's Church of Washington; Arawanna Tribe, No. 17, I. O. R. M., of Middletown; American citizens of Polish descent of New Haven; Excelsior Council, No. 2, O. U. A. M., of Waterbury; Admiral Foote Camp, No. 17, Sons of Veterans of New Haven; of the vestry of Christ Church of Westport; of Company D, First Regiment, Knights of Washington; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Watertown; First Church of Waterbury; congregations of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Howard Avenue Congregational Church, and the Howard Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, all of New Haven; St. Michael's vestry of Naugatuck; faculty of Wesleyan University, of Middletown; the vestry of St. John's Church, of Warehouse Point; Men's Club of the South Park Methodist Episcopal Church of Hartford; of Local Division, No. 281, A. A. of S. E. R. E. of A.; Central Labor Union of Waterbury; the First Church of Christ of New Haven; Visiting Nurse Association of New Haven; Lord Nelson Lodge, No. 137, O. S. of St. George, of Ansonia; Red Cross Lodge, No. 162, of New Haven; and Immanuel Congregational Church of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut; and of the New England Regional Conference of the Interchurch World Movement of North America, of Boston, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the New Haven District of Epworth League, of Waterbury, Conn., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Trades Council of New Haven, Conn., and a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Garment Retailers' Association, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, Putnam, Thompson, Taftville, Ellington, Litchfield, Canterbury, Wauregan, and Ivoryton, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 135, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Orange,

N. J., and a petition of Local Lodge No. 1246, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Summit, N. J., praying for the deportation of those aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first naturalization papers, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a very short petition from the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion.

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

PRIVATE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' LEGION

OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Washington, D. C., May 19, 1919.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

GENTLEMEN: Your petitioners of the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America, an organization incorporated in March, 1919, under the act of Congress of those who served as privates in the military and naval forces of the United States during the World War in the years 1917 to 1919, inclusive, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States for the enactment at the earliest possible date of the following legislation, believing as we do that this legislation will not only do a measure of justice to the private soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States who bore the burdens, hazards, and losses of the war but will promote in the highest degree the welfare and prosperity of all the people of the United States.

We respectfully ask:

First. That Congress enact legislation to provide employment on public works for all soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers who are unable to secure employment in private business.

Second. To tide over the change from military to civil life, and as a scant measure of justice to the soldiers, sailors, and marines who fought the war to save civilization in 1917 to 1919, we ask that Congress enact legislation to pay each private soldier, sailor, or marine upon his honorable discharge from the service the sum of \$500, this payment also to be made to those who were already discharged previous to the passage of this law.

Third. That as thousands of soldiers were subject to needless hardships and privations by the unjustly heavy fines and penalties imposed on soldiers by incompetent and unfit officers in courts-martial for insignificant, petty infractions of military regulations, Congress should at once take necessary action to see that these fines for petty offenses should be promptly repaid to the honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. Legislation should also be enacted to review all court-martial findings, with a view that justice may be done.

Fourth. In aid of the foregoing policy for providing work for the unemployed we ask prompt action by Congress to open up for demobilized soldiers, sailors, and marines the opportunity to employ their labor on the unused lands and natural resources of our country. And we don't want to be confined to swamp lands, cut-over stump lands, and desert lands, either. We hold that the hundreds of millions of idle acres of good agricultural, mineral, and timber lands and vacant city lots are none too good for the use of the soldiers who are conceded to have saved civilization at \$30 per month, minus large reductions for court-martial fines, insurance, etc. Nature's bounty has provided Uncle Sam and all his nephews with ample opportunity for all to work if the Government will only let down the bars of monopoly and privilege.

Fifth. We ask that the burdensome and onerous taxes now levied as a war measure on ice cream, soda water, and soft drinks, and those levied by section 906 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February, 1919, on the private soldier's and poor man's theater, known as the film tax, be repealed.

Respectfully submitted.

MARVIN GATES SPERRY,
National President Private Soldiers and Sailors'
Legion of the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are next in order.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, on Friday last the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] made a motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women. I rise for the purpose of calling up that motion in order that the joint resolution may be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not understand that the motion was formally made, and I do not think it is in order to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order to make the motion now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; but it must go over for a day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The motion was made on Friday under the rule and entered on the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion was made on Friday. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I think it is proper before the motion is put to state what the Committee on Woman Suffrage did on Saturday. I presented the question to the Senate on last Friday as to the authority and duty of the committee. Under the resolution adopted at the last session of Congress all the old committees were continued in power and authority, and likewise were subjected to the burdens and duties of whatever matters might properly be referred to the committees. After that announcement was made here on Friday I felt that I was under obligations, at least, to relieve myself of any duty that might devolve upon that committee, and there-

fore I called a meeting of the committee for Saturday morning last.

We had a meeting of the committee. Of course, I recognize the delicate situation with respect to my successor on the committee, but at the same time I did not feel that I could avoid taking some action and assuming the responsibility of my position. When we met we decided that the quickest way to bring the joint resolution before the Senate for action was to favor the motion made by the Senator from the State of Washington, that the committee be discharged from its further consideration. Under the rules, if we had made a report from the committee, on objection that report would have had to lie over a day for consideration. The Senator from Washington made this motion on Friday and let it lie over under the rule, so that it can be acted upon at this time, and as representing the Committee on Woman Suffrage I desire to support the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the motion be read from the Secretary's desk.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I call for the regular order. I do not think it comes up until later in the day under the order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is as much in order now as at any other time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will occupy the attitude of a resolution. It is in the shape of a resolution and comes up when we reach resolutions. There is a prescribed order of business—petitions, reports of committees, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be read, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The Secretary read from page 129 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, 1919, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the consideration of House joint resolution No. 1 that was referred to that committee to-day, and I ask that the motion lie over for one day under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). That action will be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is an entirely new question to the Chair. Resolutions that go over under the rule, of course, are never taken up until after the conclusion of routine morning business; but this is not a resolution. This is a motion to discharge a committee. The Chair believes it was the appropriate time when reports of committees were called to take up the motion. Unless there is an appeal from the Chair, we will go ahead with it. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that the Chair is going to proceed with the ordinary business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The question has never arisen before, but the Chair believes that under the call of reports of committees the motion to discharge the committee is in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate by any extended debate on this motion, but I desire to say a few words in giving my reasons why I shall vote against the motion at this time.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] if it is his purpose to proceed at once to a vote to-day?

Mr. WATSON. I think so, if we can reach it on the calendar. My understanding is that a motion to discharge a committee, if carried, carries a bill to the calendar, and if, under the rules, it could be taken up to-day, I should be very glad. I have not consulted the Vice President to know whether or not that is in order.

Mr. BORAH. I presume it will be in order if the Senator is disposed to make the motion to take it up at the proper time. I want to know whether the Senator is proposing to do that.

Mr. WATSON. I am.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Rule XXVI provides that—

All subjects from which a committee shall be discharged shall lie over for one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. WATSON. That is my understanding. It has to lie over for a day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, this body has been called in extraordinary session at an unusually early date. There are nearly two years before the Constitution the life of the Congress will expire. This particular resolution came over here without any lengthy consideration by the House of Representatives. It was sent through without any extended debate. It is

a matter of grave interest to the American people, whether it be decided in the affirmative or the negative.

I recognize that under the rules of the Senate there is a provision for the discharge of a committee, but I also recognize that under the rules of the Senate committees are organized to aid in the transaction of the business of the Senate. You may say in answer to that that whether there is a two-thirds majority of the Senate in favor of the joint resolution or not, there is unquestionably a majority in favor of the joint resolution, and a majority determines. All of which is true. But there is an orderly way of doing business, and there is a way to conduct business under the rules of the Senate.

That is the purpose of appointing committees. The rule requires every piece of legislation that is not passed by unanimous consent to go to some committee of the Senate, not merely that the will of the majority may be worked out in that committee, but the rules of the Senate and the rules of all parliamentary bodies are primarily made to protect the minority. The majority can always do what it pleases. The rules of a parliamentary body are for two purposes. One is to conduct business in an orderly way, and the other is to protect the minority and give it a reasonable opportunity to be heard on all questions, to present its amendments and present its view to the country, and afford an opportunity to be heard. If you wipe out the rules and wipe out the committees, you proceed then to the brutal will of the majority. I am one of those who have always believed that the majority have a right to act. I was one of those who supported the cloture rule at the last session of the Senate, because I believe a majority have a right to act. I would support a cloture rule in the Senate of this Congress. But that does not excuse the majority from living up to the rule and conducting business in an orderly way.

There is no reason for the immediate consideration of this proposal unless it be that Senators who are in favor of the resolution desire to show that they are more enthusiastic about its immediate adoption than anybody else in the Senate. There can be no question whatever that the majority of the Senate will bring the joint resolution before the Senate for consideration. They did so two or three times at the last session of Congress, and there can be no question that when they bring it before the Senate they can keep it here until it is disposed of. There are a number of amendments that may be proposed to the joint resolution. Amendments, whether they are adopted or not, are entitled to consideration. The committee is already organized. We know that to-morrow or the next day the new committees of the Senate as proposed by the majority will be elected. We know that the committee can consider it, can give hearings on it, and ought to give such hearings. It is idle to say that the question was heard in the last Congress and that that bars the consideration by the committees of this Congress, for the complexion of the Congress has changed, and possibly there may be some change in public sentiment.

I see no reason why a motion should be made at this early hour to discharge a committee that has consideration of the matter, everyone knowing that a majority of the members of that committee are in favor of the resolution and will report it in an orderly way, if they are allowed to do so. The only purpose that can be accomplished by this procedure is possibly to hasten the passage of the resolution by a day or two. I can not see, if the resolution commands a two-thirds vote, why this is necessary; and, if it can not command a two-thirds vote, then there is no object to be accomplished by the motion anyway.

I do not think we ought to make the precedent in the very first act of this new Congress of breaking down the committees, of breaking down the protection of the minority by proposing at once to discharge a committee that has not had the opportunity to consider this resolution, for if it had considered it the committee would have reported the resolution to the Senate. It can get just as good a place on the calendar and have practically as early a hearing, barring possibly a day or two, by being considered in the proper and orderly way, being reported by the committee and brought up from the calendar in due course, as it can by this motion. For that reason I think a protest ought to be made against this method.

Of course I recognize what the rule of the Senate is for. It is to prevent a committee from suppressing legislation that a majority of the Senate desires to consider. If this resolution had been before this committee for days or weeks possibly, and there had been no consideration of it and no report, and a majority of the Senate desired to consider the resolution—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just one moment. I recognize that in such case it would be in perfect order and perfectly proper to move to discharge the committee. That, however, is not the case.

There is no Senator here who says that this committee is not in favor of the joint resolution; there is not a Senator here who says that this committee in the new Congress has had an opportunity to consider it. It is simply adopting revolutionary tactics in the Senate in order to railroad a piece of legislation through as the very opening method of this Congress.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does not the Senator from Alabama recognize the fact that the Committee on Woman Suffrage met on last Saturday and considered this question, and would not that have any bearing upon the argument which he is now presenting?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The committee had possession of the documents, did they not?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The committee had possession of the documents; they considered the situation; and, in order to expedite the consideration of the resolution by the Senate, instead of reporting the resolution favorably, the committee decided to support the motion of the Senator from Washington in order that there might not be any delay in coming to a vote upon the resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am always glad to listen to the Senator's arguments, and he always has sound grounds behind them. The Senator says that the Committee on Woman Suffrage pursued this course in order to expedite the matter. I suppose there was a majority of the committee present?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. There was.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. With a majority of the committee present and desiring to expedite the resolution, instead of ordering some member of the committee, either the present acting chairman of the committee or the Senator who will be the chairman in a few days, to report the resolution to the calendar—and it would have been on the calendar right now if that course had been pursued—instead of doing that, conducting it in the orderly way, bringing the resolution up here in the most expeditious way, the committee resolved in favor of adopting revolutionary methods. I can not see how such action expedites the legislation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It seems to me the Senator from Alabama overlooks another rule of the Senate, that any report of a committee must lie over for one day in order to be considered, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That does not change this proposition in the least.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It changes the proposition to this extent, that by the committee supporting this motion the matter can be brought to a vote to-day by a majority of the Senate, and if it came up on a report of the committee any Senator could object and require the report to go over for one day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, my friend from New Mexico is again stepping into deep water, for the President of the Senate has just announced a ruling that, if this motion is adopted, on objection it must go over for one day before it can be considered, and that is the rule of the Senate. So the situation will not be expedited at all.

Therefore I ask why these revolutionary methods? Why was it necessary for a committee that had the power to report the joint resolution and had the power to bring the measure before the Senate to disregard the rules of the Senate, disregard the situation in the case, when it would really have expedited the matter if it had pursued the usual course in an orderly and proper manner? That I can not understand.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico why it was that the committee thought it more desirable to support a motion to discharge the committee than to report the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. As I have already stated, it was for the purpose of expedition.

Mr. BORAH. In what respect? It does not change the rule at all. The matter goes over a day under the same circumstances.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It was the understanding of the committee that it would expedite the consideration of the joint resolution to-day.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, there has been a specific ruling on this question, which is found in Gilfry's Precedents, in which Mr. Pettigrew, on the 26th of February, 1901, made a motion to discharge a committee. It came up on the 28th, and Mr. Platt, of Connecticut, raised a point of order—

That the consideration of the resolution was not in order during the morning hour; that it not only proposed to discharge the committee from the consideration of the bill but to consider it on the same day, and therefore the resolution was not in order.

The President pro tempore sustained the question of order and decided that the resolution was not in order.

It is not stated whether the President pro tempore decided so on account of the motion being made during the morning hour or because of the motion then to proceed to its consideration. Clearly the motion ought to go over for one day; there is no dispute about that. Nothing can be considered in the morning hour except by unanimous consent. It seems to me that after the morning hour has been concluded this motion would come up regularly, but clearly it would have to go over under this decision until to-morrow for action upon it, unless by unanimous consent objection was waived.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not so consider the decision just referred to by the Senator from Virginia. I think it is quite probable that this joint resolution, after it goes to the calendar, must then wait at least until 1 o'clock, or until the morning business shall have been disposed of, but that then, like any other measure upon the calendar, it can be brought up on motion.

Mr. SWANSON. The decision was specific on this point. The resolution was introduced on the 26th of February, and it came up on the 28th, when a point of order was made against it on two grounds: First, that it could not be considered during the morning hour—until morning business was disposed of; and, second, that it could not be brought up for consideration on the same day, except by unanimous consent; that all motions must lie over for one day. The point of order was sustained by the Chair, and no appeal was taken from the decision, which was specific.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I call the Senator's attention to the point that the heading of this decision, or that which might be called the syllabus of the decision, in capital letters, simply declares, "Motion to discharge not in order in morning hour." That was the point that was decided by the Chair at that time.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator from New Mexico will read the decision, he will find that the point of order was made on two grounds: First, that the resolution could not be considered in the morning hour; and, second, that even if the motion carried it could not be considered on that day but would have to go over one day. The point of order was sustained, as the Senator will find if he reads the decision.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to ask if the Senator from New Mexico contends that the syllabus to a decision ever controls the decision or that it affords even an index to govern in any way the decision unless the syllabus is written by the deciding power itself? In this case, of course, it was written by some Public Printer.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Nobody knows better than does the Senator from Missouri—and I suppose he will concede that it is a subject with which we are all quite familiar—that what he has stated is undoubtedly sound; but where a case involves two propositions, either one of which might be good, and the heading or syllabus indicates the ground on which it was decided, I think the syllabus can be taken into consideration for that purpose.

Mr. REED. In other words, the Senator thinks that a Public Printer can decide what part of the decision of the Senate is controlling.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not take it that a Public Printer framed these rules or made the syllabus to them; I take it that that was done by the Committee on Rules of the Senate, as going to indicate and make explicit what the rules intended to convey.

Mr. REED. But it is not a rule; it is a decision we are talking about.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; but it is in this volume that we are talking about.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the rules are very plain that this discussion is out of place. I will merely refer to Rule XXVI, paragraph 2 of which provides:

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over for one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

I do not think that the case cited by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is parallel; but our rules are so plain on the question it seems to me that there is not any need of discussion.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will yield in a moment. I desire to call attention to and to read the decision referred to by the Senator from Virginia.

The President pro tempore [Mr. Frye] laid before the Senate the resolution submitted by Mr. Pettigrew on the 26th instant to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6882) limiting hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics—

And so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already ruled, probably incorrectly, that this motion to discharge the committee was before the Senate. No objection has been made to debate; but the Chair has heretofore ruled on all such motions that prior to the hour of 1 o'clock they are not debatable, and unless there is an appeal from the Chair—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico one question, and that is, if he relies upon the syllabus of the decision, then is it not true that the decision of the Senate was that a motion to discharge a committee, going over a day, could not be considered during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That decision is perfectly plain. The motion in that case was not the same as the pending motion at all; that motion was to discharge a committee and then proceed to the immediate consideration of the question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desired to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. He insisted that the syllabus controlled; that the effect of the decision was that the motion had to go over one day, and that it could not be considered in the morning hour. If he is right about that, is not our entire procedure now out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is true.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona and Mr. SMOOT called for the regular order.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is entirely immaterial to me. What I am after is to have this motion acted upon now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled, and that ruling stands unless there is an appeal, that this is not a debatable question. The question is, Shall the committee be discharged?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is that motion in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so ruled, and there was no appeal.

Mr. BORAH. The Chair has since modified his opinion, has he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair stated that he did not know whether he was ruling right or not, but he was ruling.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I desire to enter an appeal from the decision of the Chair as to this matter being in order at this time.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I make the point of order that the appeal comes too late.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order of the Senator from New Mexico, that the appeal comes too late. The question is, Shall the Committee on Woman Suffrage be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon that question I wish to be heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled that it is not a debatable question before 1 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Chair to rule that the point of order is not a debatable question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that the motion to discharge is not debatable before 1 o'clock under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, does the Chair rule that an appeal can not be taken from the decision of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator can appeal from that decision, if he wishes to do so, because that is the last one made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The decision I desired to appeal from was the decision of the Chair that this motion could come up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that; but the Senator did not appeal until there was intervening business; that was the trouble.

Mr. REED. What intervening business?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did not the Chair permit it to intervene?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair permitted it until the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] raised the question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did the Senator from Utah raise the question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I called for the regular order, because it seemed to me that it was a waste of time, under the rules of

this body, to talk about the question whether this matter can be discussed now or acted upon on this day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It seems to me an inconsistency to deny the right of appeal because it is too late, and at the same time shut off debate, no matter how late objection to debate is raised.

Mr. SMOOT. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	McNary	Simmons
Ball	Hale	Martin	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Harding	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harris	Myers	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Henderson	New	Smoot
Calder	Hitchcock	Newberry	Spencer
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Stanley
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sterling
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Swanson
Culberson	Kellogg	Owen	Townsend
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Trammell
Curtis	Kenyon	Penrose	Underwood
Dial	Keyes	Phelan	Wadsworth
Dillingham	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Knox	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	La Follette	Poindexter	Warren
Fernald	Lenroot	Pomerene	Watson
Fletcher	Lodge	Randsell	Williams
France	McCormick	Reed	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Robinson	
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	
Gore	McLean	Sherman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move to lay upon the table the motion to discharge the committee; and on that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays having been ordered and taken, the result was announced—yeas 27, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bankhead	Fletcher	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gay	Penrose	Swanson
Borah	Gore	Reed	Trammell
Brandegee	Harrison	Shields	Underwood
Dial	King	Simmons	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Fall	Moses	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—64.

Ashurst	Harding	McKellar	Randsell
Ball	Harris	McLean	Robinson
Calder	Henderson	McNary	Sheppard
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Sherman
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Jones, Wash.	New	Smoot
Culberson	Kellogg	Newberry	Spencer
Cummins	Kendrick	Norris	Stanley
Curtis	Kenyon	Nugent	Sterling
Edge	Keyes	Owen	Sutherland
Elkins	Kirby	Page	Townsend
Fernald	Knox	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
France	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Gronna	McCormick	Poindexter	Watson
Hale	McCumber	Pomerene	Williams

NOT VOTING—5.

Gerry	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin	Thomas
Hitchcock			

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia. [Putting the question.] By the sound of the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WATSON. I insist on the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is for the yeas and nays. Is it seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered, and the motion was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the Committee on Woman Suffrage be discharged from the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Capper	Dillingham	Frelinghuysen
Ball	Chamberlain	Edge	Gay
Bankhead	Colt	Elkins	Gore
Beckham	Culberson	Fall	Gronna
Borah	Cummins	Fernald	Hale
Brandegee	Curtis	Fletcher	Harding
Calder	Dial	France	Harris

Harrison	McCumber	Phipps	Spencer
Henderson	McKellar	Pittman	Stanley
Hitchcock	McNary	Poindexter	Sterling
Johnson, Calif.	Martin	Pomerene	Sutherland
Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Randsell	Swanson
Jones, Wash.	Myers	Reed	Townsend
Kellogg	Nelson	Robinson	Trammell
Kendrick	New	Sheppard	Underwood
Kenyon	Newberry	Sherman	Wadsworth
Keyes	Norris	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
King	Nugent	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Kirby	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
La Follette	Owen	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Lenroot	Page	Smith, Md.	Williams
Lodge	Penrose	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott
McCormick	Phelan	Smoot	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to offer the following amendment to the pending motion:

That the committee be discharged at the end of three days, unless they shall have sooner reported.

Upon that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays; and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the motion by substituting the following:

That the committee be discharged at the end of three days, unless they shall have sooner reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays are requested. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays having been ordered and taken, the result was announced—yeas 24, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bankhead	Gay	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harrison	Reed	Swanson
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Shields	Trammell
Dial	King	Simmons	Underwood
Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Moses	Smith, Md.	Wolcott

NAYS—63.

Ashurst	Harding	McNary	Robinson
Ball	Harris	Myers	Sheppard
Capper	Henderson	Nelson	Sherman
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	New	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Smoot
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Spencer
Cummins	Kellogg	Nugent	Stanley
Curtis	Kendrick	Owen	Sterling
Edge	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Elkins	Keyes	Penrose	Townsend
Fernald	Kirby	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
France	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Gore	McCormick	Poindexter	Watson
Gronna	McKellar	Pomerene	Williams
Hale	McLean	Randsell	

NOT VOTING—9.

Borah	Gerry	Knox	Martin
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCumber	Thomas
Fall			

So the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was rejected.

At this point Mr. MYERS introduced sundry bills, which appear under the appropriate heading.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I call for the regular order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood the Chair to rule that debate was out of order until 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did so rule, but now the motion to discharge the committee is debatable from this time forward.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to say a word on the question of order, as to whether or not it is now debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that it is.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I dislike to appeal from the decision of the Chair, but let me state a proposition for his consideration. I have looked through the rules and I can not find anywhere a statement that when a motion is made that is undebatable it becomes debatable at any subsequent period. The question is as to the time when the motion was made. If it is debatable when made, it continues to be debatable; and if it is not debatable when made, then I find nothing in the rule to show that it becomes debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is exactly right. The ruling of the Chair was based upon a former ruling of the Chair to the effect that until the hour of 1 o'clock had arrived motions are not debatable. The Chair is ruling consistently, admitting that the ruling was perhaps altogether wrong. The hour of 1 o'clock has passed, and after the hour of 1 o'clock motions are debatable.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In view of the statement of the Chair, I appeal from his ruling.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Business has since intervened and no appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair at that time. As I understood the Chair a little while ago, I was unable to

appeal from the ruling of the Chair that a motion was in order, because I did not appeal at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no recollection of having ruled that it was debatable until just now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Chair announced that it would be debatable only after 1 o'clock and stopped debate upon it about half past 12.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia rose to get the opinion of the Chair as to whether the motion was debatable. The Chair ruled, to be consistent, that at that time it was debatable. The Chair feels that the Senator from New Mexico has appealed from the ruling of the Chair within the proper time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The appeal from the ruling of the Chair is debatable, I think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks so; but we might as well go ahead and talk a little while on suffrage.

Mr. WATSON. In this connection I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is the motion debatable until 2 o'clock or after that time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was not here when the Senate adjourned on Friday. Is there a special order for 2 o'clock?

Mr. WATSON. I have been informed that there is a special order, which is the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I was wondering whether or not when we reach the hour of 2 o'clock the special order must be taken up to the exclusion of this motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me the prohibition on debate until 2 o'clock comes under Rule VIII, which is that—

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

This is not a motion to proceed to the consideration of any matter; it is a motion to discharge a committee. I do not see anything in the rules that prohibits debate on the pending motion. Rule VIII limits it to a certain kind of motion that shall be determined without debate. I have not been able to find any rule of the Senate which prohibits debate on this motion. A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject on the calendar before 1 o'clock is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If Senators will listen to the Chair for a moment, they will hear the reason for the ruling. It was based upon a former ruling of the Chair, from which no appeal was taken, that a motion to discharge a committee was not debatable prior to 1 o'clock. At 1 o'clock the Senator from Georgia asked whether it was debatable or not and the Chair said that it was. The Senator from New Mexico appealed. The Chair thinks the question, whether or not the appeal is well taken, is debatable.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It seems to me that whether it is debatable depends upon the decision on the other appeal. An appeal with respect to a question which is not debatable is itself not debatable under the decision, and so in this case whether the appeal is debatable depends upon the question whether the prior motion to which it relates is debatable or not. It seems to me there must be a decision upon the other appeal.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator is debating now the very point he makes. I submit that the ruling of the Chair that the subject was debatable on an appeal is also a ruling according to the view expressed by the Senator from New Mexico that the appeal is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Was the Senator from New Mexico rising to a point of order?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I raise a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That the appeal from the Chair is not debatable?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That the appeal from the Chair is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules that point of order. Do you appeal from it?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I suppose it would do no good to appeal from it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If you do not, it stands.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. Let us find out what the Senator from New Mexico wants to do.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the prior decision that where the original motion is not debatable, then an appeal from a decision on that motion is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the Chair has ruled.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not want to multiply appeals here. It not only takes time but it may take more time than the

discussion which is likely to follow. Nevertheless, I appeal from that decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, that appeal is not debatable. The Chair calls attention to the rule:

When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once and without debate.

Now, the Chair has decided that the appeal from the ruling of the Chair is debatable. The Senator from New Mexico raises the point of order that it is not debatable and appeals from the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and being taken, resulted—yeas 70, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—70.

Ashurst	Harding	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Harris	Overman	Smoot
Bankhead	Harrison	Owen	Spencer
Beckham	Hitchcock	Page	Stanley
Brandegee	Kellogg	Penrose	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Phipps	Sutherland
Colt	Keyes	Pittman	Swanson
Dial	King	Pomerene	Townsend
Dillingham	La Follette	Ransdell	Trammell
Edge	Lenroot	Reed	Underwood
Elkins	Lodge	Robinson	Wadsworth
Fletcher	McCormick	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
France	McLean	Sherman	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Shields	Watson
Gay	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gronna	New	Smith, Ga.	
Hale	Newberry	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—10.

Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	McKellar	Poindexter
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	McNary	
Henderson	Kirby	Phelan	

NOT VOTING—16.

Borah	Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin
Calder	Fernald	Kenyon	Norris
Culberson	Gerry	Knox	Thomas
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	McCumber	Warren

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to disclaim any purpose of delaying action upon the proposed constitutional amendment. I think action should be had in a few days, and I certainly would be the last simply to consume time in order to prevent a vote upon this question after a reasonably decent opportunity had been given to those of us who are opposed to it to express ourselves. The little delay that I helped to cause, from half past 12 until 1 o'clock, was due to a conviction upon my part that Senators who intended to vote against this motion to discharge the committee ought to have an opportunity to express themselves. By consuming a half hour's time of the Senate I was sure they would have the opportunity to say why they desired some little delay on the adoption of this motion to discharge the committee, as after 1 o'clock the Chair had said debate would be in order.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that it would be much better if the committee were allowed to consider the subject in order to see if any amendment were needed to this proposed constitutional amendment, to perfect it, if it needs perfection in any way, and to bring it back to the Senate. It can be brought to the Senate within a week; indeed, it could be brought to the Senate in two or three days. It seems that the committee did not consider it yesterday, because they hoped by failing them to consider it the committee could be discharged to-day and the Senate could proceed to-day with the consideration of the proposed amendment to the Constitution. Mr. President, that is not giving due consideration to so important a subject. If the Senate shall determine to-morrow, or when the time comes to vote upon the motion, that they prefer to discharge the committee, of course the Senate has the right to do so, and we shall all submit; the amendment will then go to the calendar; and the day after it goes to the calendar a motion will be in order to take it from the calendar.

Mr. President, at the time the attention of the Senate was called to the motion to discharge the committee we were engaged in "morning business," and the Senate rules prescribe what that business shall be. There was no report of a committee. If there had been a report of a committee, it would have gone over for a day before any action or the report of the committee could have been had. Although the Chair ruled upon it, and there was no appeal, I wish to say, as an explanation in part of the course which I have pursued, that, in my opinion, a motion to discharge the committee could not be taken up during the morning hour. The rules of the Senate prescribe the business to be transacted during the morning hour. Such a motion as this motion to discharge a

committee is not found in that list. It might possibly be passed as a resolution and be called up in that way; but it was not a report of a committee, and it could not properly be taken up, with all due deference to the ruling of the Chair, I submit, as a report of a committee or in connection with that part of the order of business which provides for reports of committees. I was inclined to think that the Chair also had changed his opinion as to the proper ruling.

Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate, during the morning hour until 1 o'clock no motion is debatable. A motion to discharge a committee frequently involves matters of serious importance. To permit it to be called up or to provide for it to be called up at a time when debate is impossible would be to make an order of business unwise and unsafe.

I feel sure that the motion to discharge the committee should not have been taken up when it was, and several of us concluded that it was desirable to delay action until 1 o'clock in order that those of us who had opposed the immediate consideration of the motion might have an opportunity to say briefly, not with any consumption of time that amounted in any sense to a filibuster, but merely for the purpose of making it known that we did not intend in any way to filibuster and that we did not intend in any way to unduly delay a vote upon this proposed constitutional amendment, but that we thought a few days should pass before action should be had. I have no doubt that within the week, certainly next week, we will vote on this proposed amendment. I for one shall take less than an hour, perhaps not half an hour, to say what I wish to say about the condition in my State and to express my objections to a proposed constitutional amendment which would interfere with the right of each separate State to settle this question to suit itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think this question needs debating; it needs settling. It has been debated for some 20 years. Big men, little men, and middle-sized men have talked about it until the whole country is tired of hearing talk upon this subject. The advocates of it have consumed time enough. Let us, the opponents of it, not imitate their example. I think the sooner we can get a vote upon this question the better. I expect to vote against this proposed constitutional amendment, but I do not want to retard its consideration.

Now, the whole world—not only America, but all the world—is messed up and mussed up with every sort of important question, and this question is not of the slightest importance on the thoughts or the habits or the legislation of men or of women here or elsewhere. The trouble has been that the advocates of it have thought that the entire civilized world depended upon its passage, and the opponents of it have thought that the home life and morality of the world depended upon its defeat.

The truth is that in some 11 or 12 States where for 20 years or more it has been tried it has done neither good nor harm. So far as I am concerned, I was opposed to it, and am yet, because I think it affects to a certain extent the social fabric of the South; but I see the handwriting on the wall. I do not want to imitate old Jonathan Higginbotham, who during the war refused to secede with Arkansas, and after the war refused to make peace when Arkansas surrendered but who carried on war against both the State of Arkansas and the Federal Government for about two years afterwards, until he had to be hunted up and rooted out of the Ozark Mountains.

What is the use? We have many matters to get through with here. The world has got to reconstruct itself; it has to demobilize from a war basis and remobilize upon a peace basis, to reconstruct industry and society. Those of us who are opponents of this measure who can see anything when written upon the book of fate at all can see that this is written there. The question is settled. Why not simply satisfy ourselves in voting against it, and why not benefit the country and the world by getting it to a vote just as soon as possible?

I am in favor of making a fight to the last ditch when you have got to fight and making it as long as there is a scintilla of hope upon the horizon, making it as long as you think you can beat your opponents in any proper, honest, or right way. One of the proper and honest and right ways is, if you think you can defeat a proposition next week, and you can not defeat it now, to carry it over until then; but nobody believes that in this case; everybody knows it is a question of whether the thing shall come to a vote now and be passed or whether it shall come to a vote, according to the judgment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], in three days and be passed. What good will talking do? I have done my share of talking upon it privately and publicly, although I never made a stated speech about it. It seems to me that it is having the Federal Government take a power and authority that was intended originally for the States. This Union never would have been formed if anybody had known that the Federal Government was ever going

to try to exercise a power of that sort; but when two-thirds of Congress are in favor of submitting a joint resolution to the States for adoption by the usual three-fourths, and when you know beforehand that that is the case, and when you know that the country and the world have important business to attend to, and when you know that the practical results of the adoption or defeat of woman suffrage will amount to nothing, as the experience of the world wherever it has been adopted has demonstrated beyond cavil or doubt, then why should we stand here and just delay things for parliamentary advantage of one or two days or something else?

There is no one in this body to whom, temperamentally and sectionally, this motion is more obnoxious; but my ancestors have been through this temperamental and sectional opposition once before, and when they found out that the game was lost no less men than Robert E. Lee and Joseph E. Johnston and other great men said, "We will not carry on a war by ambush. When we have lost the last regular battle that we can lose, and the last regular army that we have, we will quit, and we will make peace in good faith, and we will keep it in good faith."

I am sorry that it is written upon the book of fate, but it is written there. Now, let us face the situation, and go down in honor, as we do in defeat, which we can not help. Let us not spend any time trying to get three or four more days to talk in; and, by the way, here I have just been taking fully my share of what would have been the three or four days to talk in.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand, of course, this measure will at no distant day be passed. It seems to be a settled proposition that the votes have been secured to submit it to the States for ratification; and it has not been my purpose to unduly delay the vote.

If those who have charge of the measure and are anxious that it shall be voted on will suggest a day when we can take it up and proceed with its consideration to its final disposition, I certainly shall not stand in the way of any such proposition. I had expected to submit some reasons why I shall vote against the joint resolution, and I shall be brief in doing so. If an arrangement may be had so that we may proceed in an orderly but expeditious way to final submission of the question, giving those who have not yet been converted to the program an opportunity to state their reasons, so far as I am concerned they may proceed. I have not changed my view; and while anything said here will not change a vote, I nevertheless, for reasons satisfactory to myself, would like to make some observations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I just want to suggest to the Senator that we will be in a position to do that just as soon as this motion is carried, and the joint resolution goes to the calendar; and I feel that that would be the disposition—to try to fix a definite time, so that every Senator would know when the matter was coming up to be considered and voted on just as quickly as possible.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that I asked the Senator in charge of the measure if it was his purpose to proceed to-day, and he said it was if he could. Of course, he could not bring it to a vote to-day as long as Senators desired to discuss it. I think there might be some question as to whether it would be in order to move to take it up to-day; but I feel satisfied that if it goes on the calendar an agreement can be made, satisfactory to everybody, to fix a time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I voted for the motion to table the motion to discharge the committee. I would not have it inferred from that vote that I am adverse to the proposed constitutional amendment. I have voted for it on two or three previous occasions. In fact, I have formed the habit; and I shall vote for this amendment whenever it comes in a regular parliamentary way to a vote. My objection was against the procedure. The committee on Saturday last could have voted a favorable report upon this amendment, and it could have been reported to-day, and after going over one day under the rule it would have been in order. If the motion to discharge the committee prevails, the amendment will still have to go over for one day under the rule, if there be objection; so, if there be any responsibility for this one day's delay, that responsibility attaches to the committee.

I see no reason why we should not proceed in the regular way to the consideration and adoption of this constitutional amendment. The tactics proposed are somewhat revolutionary in their character. The friends of this constitutional amendment might justify those revolutionary tactics in this particular instance; perhaps I could overlook it myself; but I do not like to have a revolutionary procedure established so early in the session, just after the change in the control of the Senate—a revolutionary method which might hereafter be invoked as a precedent, and there might be universal objection on this side.

I do not wish to be committed in advance, and I am sorry to see this side committed in advance, to revolutionary methods of procedure of this sort.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I feel with reference to this matter as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] has expressed himself. I think the sooner we have a vote upon this joint resolution the better. I have myself, therefore, absolutely no disposition to delay action for one day; but I do think that this is a very important matter. I do believe that every Senator desires to be recorded upon this question; and I think the best solution of it would be—and I wish to suggest that to the Senator from Washington—to fix a day as early as he pleases, but sufficiently in the future to give Senators an opportunity to be present, and let us agree to a unanimous-consent rule to take up the matter on that day and bring it to a final vote.

I make that suggestion to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I was interrupted, and did not catch the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS. My suggestion was, in order to give every Senator an opportunity to be recorded upon this very important matter, that the proponents of this joint resolution ask for unanimous consent to vote at a certain time, making that sufficiently far in the future to enable Senators to be present if they desire.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator refers to a vote upon the joint resolution submitting the amendment, not upon this motion?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should be very glad myself to do that. I do not know that it would be in order, however, to do it until the joint resolution is brought before the Senate. The joint resolution is now before the committee, and the purpose of this motion is to get it from the committee and get it on the calendar. Then we can make just such an arrangement as the Senator suggests; and I think that is a very good suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no particular interest in the procedure by which the joint resolution is brought before the Senate, but I have some interest in the question of whether we are to vote here without due notice to Senators that this important matter is to be acted on.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no; I agree with the Senator that it should be set down in plenty of time so that every Senator will have notice to be here, and I have no doubt that that will be done.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to take this action, as proposed by the Senator from Washington, at this time. I am consistently a friend of the constitutional amendment itself, and shall vote for it whenever opportunity offers, and shall vote for any legitimate method of expediting that opportunity.

Under the ruling of the presiding officer this morning, if such ruling continues to be the rule of the Senate with reference to all legislation, the situation would be this: An appropriation bill coming over from the House, and being referred to a committee, any Member of the Senate the next morning, or immediately, could make a motion to discharge the committee. That motion would lie over one day; and under the ruling of the Chair the next day, under "Reports of committees," it could be brought up, and must be voted on without debate before 1 o'clock.

I can not vote to sustain any such ruling of the Chair. That ruling was erroneous. I will not vote to take a measure from a committee which does not exist. According to my interpretation of the joint resolution, the committee had no jurisdiction of this measure at all, and has not had the joint resolution in its hands; and therefore a motion to discharge it should not be entertained.

For those two reasons I can not vote in favor of this motion, and shall vote against it. It will pass; it will be adopted, and I shall cheerfully vote for the constitutional amendment whenever I have an opportunity; and I will vote for any motion which I consider a proper motion to expedite a vote upon the constitutional amendment itself.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I want to say just a word in reply to those who consider this action revolutionary.

The Committee on Woman Suffrage met and considered this very situation and decided to support this motion; so the committee has considered this joint resolution, which came from the House, proposing the amendment, and it has decided to take this course in order to bring the matter to a vote in the Senate. It is a joint resolution which has been before the Senate and the country for a generation, and no one can say that he has not had an opportunity to consider it fully.

When the committee charged with the duty of considering the joint resolution decides to bring it before the Senate in this way, I can not understand how anyone can claim that it has not had consideration, that it is revolutionary, or that it sets any bad precedent. The committee has considered it time after time, brought it to a vote before the Senate at least twice during the last Congress, and it is the same thing, the same committee; and can anyone say that to recommend this procedure is revolutionary?

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

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

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

Ashurst	Gay	McCormick	Sherman
Ball	Gore	McCumber	Shields
Bankhead	Hale	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Harris	McLean	Smith, Md.
Calder	Henderson	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Moses	Spencer
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Stanley
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Dial	Kellogg	Norris	Townsend
Dillingham	Kendrick	Nugent	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Overman	Wadsworth
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	King	Pittman	Warren
Fletcher	Knox	Poindexter	Watson
France	La Follette	Reed	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from California, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be temporarily laid aside until we dispose of the other proposition. It will take only a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FLETCHER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand the Senator from Florida to object?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California entered the Chamber.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from California is now here.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I did not know the Senator from California was entering the Chamber. A request was made that the resolution be temporarily laid aside, but unanimous consent was not granted for that purpose, and in the absence of the Senator from California I expected to move that it be laid aside temporarily for the purpose of disposing of the motion which has already been considered this morning. I should like to ask the pleasure of the Senator from California regarding the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have no objection if the matter is to be concluded within a brief period. I do not want the particular matter which is now the unfinished business to be supplanted indefinitely.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator from California understand that a motion can not be made to lay aside the resolution temporarily, but that it is supplanted by the matter that comes up? However, the Senate can afterwards take up this particular resolution if it sees fit.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If that be the case, I ask that we proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I simply wish to make a suggestion. I am satisfied there is no one on this side of the Chamber who desires to discuss the motion. I have the impression that no one on the other side cares to discuss it further, and we could probably dispose of it in three or four minutes. I suggest to the Senator from Florida that he withdraw his objection to laying aside temporarily the unfinished business in order that we may see if we can not get a vote on the motion to discharge the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I notice the absence of a good many Senators who are interested in the subject which has been under consideration, and I did not feel that it was fair to them to let the matter come to a vote in their absence.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have heard several Senators who are opposed to this constitutional amendment express a de-

sire to discuss it. I understand that some of those Senators are now absent from the Chamber. It seems to me the difficulty could be met if the chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, if there be such a committee, would call a hurry-up meeting of the committee in the cloakroom. It would not take two minutes for that committee to report the resolution, and it would then take its place on the calendar properly and obviate this discussion. It would have to go over for a day in either case, and it would facilitate the consideration of the constitutional amendment, which I favor. I do not think we should adopt a method which some regard as revolutionary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 731) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

A bill (S. 732) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Canton, Ohio, one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 733) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milford, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 734) for the promotion of Col. William A. Simpson, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 735) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Redman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 736) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Idabel, Okla.; and

A bill (S. 737) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 738) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Wakeeney, Kans., for use in library grounds.

A bill (S. 739) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Coffeyville, Kans., for use in Forest Park;

A bill (S. 740) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Greenleaf, Kans., for use in City Park;

A bill (S. 741) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Pittsburg, Kans., for use of the Manual Training Normal School;

A bill (S. 742) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Lawrence, Kans., for use in the Memorial High School grounds;

A bill (S. 743) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Topeka, Kans., for use in the State capitol grounds;

A bill (S. 744) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles for use in the City Park, Salina, Kans.;

A bill (S. 745) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to John A. Dix Post, No. 59, Columbus, Kans.;

A bill (S. 746) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Baker University, Baldwin City, Kans.;

A bill (S. 747) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Kirwin, Kans.; and

A bill (S. 748) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Wellington, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 749) for the relief of Ellen Oglesby (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 750) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Fulton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 751) granting a pension to Laura E. Hugess (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 752) granting an increase of pension to John J. Boles (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 753) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Chapman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 754) granting an increase of pension to Ethalemia Scott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 755) granting an increase of pension to Elijah G. W. Ebert (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 756) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Keith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 757) to found and maintain a mutual insurance fund for depositors in national banks, to be kept available in the United States Treasury, and to be administered by a bureau in the Treasury Department organized and regulated for that purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 758) to provide for a commission to investigate commissions and to make recommendations concerning the same; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 759) to authorize certain late physicians and surgeons of the United States Volunteer Army in the War with Spain to practice their respective professions in any Territory, district, dependency, or possession of the United States under the constitutional jurisdiction of Congress upon the presentation and proof of certain facts; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 760) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 761) to establish a drainage fund and to provide for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands in certain States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 762) to provide for the erection of memorials and the entombment of bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 763) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the National Military Park, Vicksburg, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; and

A bill (S. 764) to place Lieut. Col. Junius L. Powell on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 765) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to readjudicate the cases of Mattie W. Jackson, widow, and others against the United States, and Mattie E. Hughes against the United States;

A bill (S. 766) for the relief of the representative of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased;

A bill (S. 767) for the relief of the heirs of W. H. Sneed, deceased;

A bill (S. 768) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Sageville, Lauderdale County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 769) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Brabston and Roche H. Brabston;

A bill (S. 770) for the relief of the trustees of the Sageville Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Sageville, Lauderdale County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 771) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 772) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 773) for the relief of the trustees of Evergreen Lodge, No. 77, Free and Accepted Masons, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 774) for the relief of M. T. Sigrest;

A bill (S. 775) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Kuykendall;

A bill (S. 776) for the relief of James K. Hamblen;

A bill (S. 777) for the relief of the estate of Capt. John Belino, deceased;

A bill (S. 778) to authorize the Postmaster General to settle the accounts of Capt. J. H. Estes;

A bill (S. 779) for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Burnett;

A bill (S. 780) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and adjudicate claims for the destruction of private property and damage thereto as the result of the construction of levees along, and other improvements of, the Mississippi River; and

A bill (S. 781) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and adjudicate claims for the destruction of private property and damage thereto as the result of the construction of levees along, and other improvements of, the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 782) granting a pension to John H. Isiley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McElroy;

A bill (S. 784) granting a pension to Susan A. Strickler;

A bill (S. 785) granting a pension to Eva A. Trager;

A bill (S. 786) granting a pension to Elvis R. Street;

A bill (S. 787) granting an increase of pension to David W. Herriman;

A bill (S. 788) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Brooks;

A bill (S. 789) granting an increase of pension to Elie Jones Quinby;

A bill (S. 790) granting a pension to John E. Hall; and

A bill (S. 791) granting a pension to Robert Webb Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 792) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 793) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club;

A bill (S. 794) granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects;

A bill (S. 795) to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws, and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws;

A bill (S. 796) for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects;

A bill (S. 797) providing for noncontiguous homestead entries within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., of land of the character described in the enlarged homestead act of February 19, 1909;

A bill (S. 798) giving the right to an additional homestead to all persons who have exhausted or who shall exhaust their original right of entry through the purchase of Indian lands; and

A bill (S. 799) for the relief of private owners of lands within or near the Bitter Root, Lolo, or Missoula National Forests, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 800) to indemnify depositors in "member banks," as defined by the Federal reserve act, against loss in the event of the failure or suspension of business of such bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 801) to provide for carrying into effect of the agreement between the United States and the Muskogee (Creek) Nation of Indians ratified by act of Congress approved March 1, 1901, and supplemental agreement of June 30, 1902, and other laws and treaties with said tribe of Indians;

A bill (S. 802) to pay the balance due the loyal Creek Indians on the award made by the Senate on the 16th day of February, 1903;

A bill (S. 803) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee, Cherokee-Shawnees, and loyal Absentee Shawnee and Delaware Tribes of Indians;

A bill (S. 804) authorizing the Ponca Tribe of Indians, residing in the States of Oklahoma and Nebraska, to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

A bill (S. 805) to provide for a determination of heirship in cases of deceased members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, and conferring authority on the courts of said State in reference thereto, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 806) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Iowa Tribe of Indians against the United States;

A bill (S. 807) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee, Cherokee-Shawnees, and loyal Absentee Shawnee and Delaware Tribes of Indians; and

A bill (S. 808) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the Osage civilization fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 809) authorizing the licensing and control of corporations engaged in the storing of food products for interstate shipment; and

A bill (S. 810) to establish an interstate marketing system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce;

A bill (S. 811) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 812) to amend an act entitled "An act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1910, as amended by an act approved January 23, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 813) to establish a sanitary reserve corps for the Public Health Service; and

A bill (S. 814) to establish a department of health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 815) to revise, amend, and codify the laws relating to publicity of contributions and disbursements at elections at which candidates for the offices of United States Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States are nomi-

nated and elected, regulating and limiting the purposes and the amounts for which contributions and disbursements may be made, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 816) to provide for public education upon political questions and for the dissemination of information upon political issues and matters of a political nature of public interest by an authorized publicity pamphlet; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 817) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims for adjudging the rights of the Otoe and Missouria Tribes of Indians for compensation on a basis of guardian and ward, and conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjust the claims between the Otoe and Missouria Tribes of Indians and the Omaha Indians to certain moneys received by the Omaha Indians; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 818) to establish a United States court of patent appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 819) to create the department of education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 820) for the construction of a Federal building at Fillmore, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 821) granting a pension to Martin T. Knapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX:

A bill (S. 822) for the relief of James W. Cross; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 823) to donate a cannon to the city of Trafford, Pa.;

A bill (S. 824) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warren, Pa., six German cannons or fieldpieces;

A bill (S. 825) to donate a cannon to the city of Erie, Pa.; and

A bill (S. 826) to donate a piece of field artillery to Girard College, of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 827) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shaffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 828) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1913; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 829) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wheeling, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 830) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Martinsville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 831) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Parkersburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 832) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elkins, Randolph County, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 833) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grafton, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 834) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Martinsburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 835) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moundsville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 836) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairmont, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 837) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morgantown, Monongalia County, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 838) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bluefield, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 839) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 840) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 841) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Huntington, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 842) granting a pension to W. E. Crookshanks;

A bill (S. 843) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Lynch; and

A bill (S. 844) granting a pension to John Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to the Republic of Peru; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to the Congress certain suggestions; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MYERS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) to permit of the disposition of certain lands in Montana ceded by the Crow Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to supervise the issuance of securities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF REVENUE ACT.

Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) to repeal sections 630, 900, and 904 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That a committee, consisting of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with the four senior minority members of the four committees first named, shall be constituted a committee to be called "the committee on the budget," and shall be charged with the duty of making recommendations for the coordination of governmental expenditures and governmental revenues.

Resolved further, That all appropriation bills, all bills for the expenditures of money, and all bills raising revenue shall be submitted by the committees having jurisdiction to the committee on the budget for amendments suggested by it before being reported to the Senate for action.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. At the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 1200. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TREATY OF PEACE.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 12) submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California on the 20th instant, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and

Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they have been committed; and

Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the revised covenant of the league of nations has been laid before the country. In my opinion none of the grave objections to be found in the original document have been removed. Upon the contrary, in a number of instances the evils have been aggravated or those evils now for the first time fully disclosed.

A striking illustration is found in the fact that we are now for the first time informed what nations are to constitute the members of the league. It will be remembered that the original covenant, so far as published, mentioned by name as members of the league the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States, and that the names of the other members were referred to as being contained in a protocol, the contents of which was sedulously concealed from the American people and,

I presume, from the people of the world. Whatever motive led to this concealment, it is certain that the primal shock to American intelligence and patriotism would have been much greater had the people been at first frankly informed who were to be the partners of the United States in the world government about to be set up.

The names are now given. We know who are to sit about the council board of the international tribunal which is to undertake in many respects the government of the world. An examination of the character of this membership ought in itself to cause the instant rejection of the entire scheme. It brands the plan as futile and impossible and dooms it to ignominious failure.

If the proposed constitution of the league of nations were in fact what it is not, perfect in all its parts and capable, if wisely interpreted and justly enforced, of producing universal happiness and bringing unbroken peace to the world, still, if left to the interpretation and enforcement of the members of the proposed league, it would utterly fail in its object and bring misery rather than happiness to mankind. That assertion I now undertake to demonstrate.

It was Pope who said:

For forms of government let fools contest;
What're is best administered is best.

Making due allowance for poetic exaggeration, the couplet contains a great truth. Granted arbitrary powers, the wise, virtuous, and humane despot will nevertheless promote the happiness of his subjects. Upon the other hand, an enlightened constitution and code of laws in the hands of an ignorant, depraved, or cruel president have never afforded the people protection against outrage and wrong.

Numerous illustrations of this truth are found in the Governments of certain South American and Negro Republics which have copied the letter of the Constitution of the United States, but which have nevertheless been perpetually the victims of tyranny.

If the league were to be composed of the most enlightened nations of the world, it might be argued that we could consign to

them many questions of importance, trusting to their sense of justice and equity for fair decisions.

An examination, however, of the membership of this present league will first astonish and then arouse the indignation of every thoughtful man. It will come as a distinct shock, first, that this is a colored league of nations; that is to say, the majority of the nations composing the league do not belong to the white race of men. On the contrary, they are a conglomerate of the black, yellow, brown, and red races, frequently so intermixed and commingled as to constitute an unclassifiable mongrel breed.

The league is composed of 32 nations. I present them in two classifications—white and dark—including as white all those countries in which the white race predominates, and classifying as dark those nations in which the dark-skinned people are in the majority. To this there is in the list one exception—Cuba. I have placed it among the dark races because fully one-third of its people are of negro stock and for the further reason that in the island race equality is completely recognized and miscegenation is commonly practiced. On the other hand, I have placed Uruguay in the white column, although it has a large Indian population, together with an excessive immigrant population of undesirables. In these tables I also show, where figures are obtainable, the degree of illiteracy. It will be found that among the dark races illiteracy is astonishingly high. The figures as to population are the latest obtainable. But in some instances the nations have not reached the point of civilization where a reliable census has ever been taken. In such cases the best estimates available have been followed.

Mr. President, as I shall comment on each of the respective nations as I proceed, giving the population, I now at this time ask to print without reading the list of the dark nations, together with their populations and percentage of illiteracy, and the list of white nations, with populations and percentage of illiteracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Dark countries.					White countries.		
Country.	Year estimated.	Population.	Percentage of dark and mixed races.	Percentage of illiteracy.	Country.	Population.	Percentage of illiteracy.
1. Liberia	1916-17	2,000,000	100	98	1. United States	110,000,000	7.7
2. Haiti	1911	1,500,000	90	Very high.	2. Belgium	7,500,000	13.3
3. Hedjaz	1911	300,000	100	High.	3. British Isles	45,000,000	11
4. Panama	1916	450,000	90	High.	4. Canada	8,300,000	11
5. Honduras	1911	562,000	85	68	5. Australia	5,000,000	1.3
6. Nicaragua	1914	703,500	90	High.	6. New South Wales	2,900,000	2
7. Guatemala	1903	1,842,000	85	92	7. Czechoslovakia	13,000,000	—
8. Ecuador	1900	1,500,000	93	High.	8. France	39,500,000	3
9. Cuba	1907	2,048,000	33	44	9. Greece	2,750,000	57
10. Bolivia	1900	1,816,000	87	82	10. Italy	28,500,000	34
11. Peru	1908	4,500,000	86	Very high.	11. Poland	10,000,000	—
12. Brazil	1904	24,500,000	88	80	12. Portugal	6,000,000	68
13. South Africa		5,000,000	80	69	13. Roumania	7,500,000	41
14. Siam	1909	6,230,000	99	Very high.	14. Serbia	3,000,000	84
15. India	1911	294,361,000	95	95	15. Uruguay	1,378,000	—
16. China	1906	407,253,000	100	High.			
17. Japan	1917	56,860,000	99	Low.			
		811,425,500	89				
						289,428,000	

¹ Negro Yearbook.

² Statesman's Yearbook, 1169.

³ Average.

NOTE.—Figures are from Encyclopaedia Britannica and Statesman's Yearbook.

MR. REED. From the foregoing table it appears that when the members of the league of nations meet about the council table there will be 15 men representing white nations and 17 men representing black, brown, yellow, and red races; and that among the nations classified as dark the average of the dark-skinned people compared with the total population is nearly 9 to 1. It is also shown that among these races the degree of illiteracy is astonishingly high. Where figures are available the percentage runs from nearly 50 per cent in Cuba to 98 per cent in Liberia. The average is about 85 per cent. Thus we not only bring to the council board races which are dark skinned, but also those so low in civilization that they constitute the very dregs of ignorance. As I shall later show, they are the victims of superstition and are steeped in barbarism.

Even among the white races that are to sit in the council of the world and determine the fate of America we find nations so backward as to raise a serious question regarding their ability to perform the functions of civilized government. Witness Serbia, 84 per cent of whose people can not read or write; Portugal, with 68 per cent of illiteracy; Roumania, with 41 per cent; and

Greece, with 57 per cent. To the votes of a tribunal thus constituted it is proposed to submit for final decision questions which may involve the very life of the United States. By their votes we may be plunged into war; by their decision subjected to wrongs of the most grievous character; by their decree the very fate of the world may be determined.

Let us now a little more in detail examine the character of these new governors of the world, the exponents of the "new magic." That examination will disclose that in a large part they have in the past been unable to maintain anything approaching a decent or civilized government. Indeed, many of them could not have existed except as wards protected by the United States or other civilized nations. In this connection notice that the United States, with its population of 110,000,000, is given no greater voting strength than the smallest of the nations concerned. To this attention will hereafter be directed.

LIBERIA.

Let me now call your attention, O you men of the South, to Liberia—Liberia that is given a vote equal to the vote of the United States; Liberia that shall vote upon the fate of the

world. Its total population, according to the Negro Yearbook of 1916, was 2,000,000. The number of Afro-American Liberians is estimated at 12,000. About 50,000 of the coast negroes are classed as civilized or semicivilized. The rest are in their original state of African barbarism.

Here, then, we have a total population of 50,000 civilized or semicivilized negroes against which is to be balanced 1,950,000 savages. The Encyclopedia Britannica tells us that "*in the forest depths beyond 40 miles from the coast many of the indigenous races still practice cannibalism.*" The Republic from the first has been a joke nation. Negroes from America have refused to emigrate there. In 1910 America, acting in conjunction with Great Britain, France, and Germany, took over the administration of the finances, military organization, agricultural, and boundary questions. The customs were placed in charge of American officials and a loan of \$2,000,000 arranged. On top of this we have since the war, just after or just before Liberia declared war and "sent her serried hordes to battle at the front," loaned her 5,000,000 good, hard American dollars. The representatives of these 50,000 civilized and semicivilized negroes, not counting the cannibals, are now to be permitted to sit in the council of nations and help to settle the policies of the world and the destiny of the United States.

No better commentary on the absurdity of the right of such a nation to sit in the council of the world, cast a vote equal to that of the United States, can be found than the fact that, although the American negroes have been frequently importuned to emigrate to that country, they have consistently refused. Although in that land of liberty all are excluded from voting save persons of negro blood, still our American negroes are too progressive and too intelligent to cast their lot with such a nation in such a place. Men of the South, when you go back to your people, if you shall vote for this league of nations, answer to them and answer to the rest of the world how you justify excluding the negro from the ballot box in this country and at the same time propose to give to this negro nation, with only 50,000 civilized people, the right to cast a vote equal to the vote of the first nation of the earth. Take that question back and answer it. Answer it to your consciences here and answer it by your vote. Do not try to dodge it, for there is no dodging. Even in the North there has practically come a state of acquiescence in the custom of not allowing negroes to vote down South, upon the theory that white men would better control the affairs of those States. Now you propose to go to Africa, bring in a representative of 2,000,000 negroes, 1,950,000 of whom are savages, some of them cannibals, and give them a vote which will settle perhaps the fate of the United States or the destiny of the world. Of course, as it is in the league of nations, it is enshrined in the holy of the holies; accordingly many of you will shut your eyes and open your mouths and swallow, with the docility of those who have well learned the lesson of obedience.

That nation which is not fit to govern itself, for which the United States is to-day compelled to act as receiver, is to sit in a league of nations and vote. But, somebody will say, we will control their vote. Is that so? Then why are they there? Is this league of nations a fake, and are these people to be controlled as mere automatons? If so, we start out with a fraud upon the world; we seek to perpetrate a trick upon humanity; and we brand ourselves as unworthy of the confidence of men.

HAITI.

I now invite you to a change of scene, but not to change of environment or color. Haiti. What man is there in all the world who saw us a few months ago send our marines into Haiti to preserve order and stop murder and pillage and riot, and to compel obedience to the decencies of life—what man is there outside of the precincts of some building where the insane are cared for would have prophesied a year ago that it would now be solemnly proposed that Haiti shall sit in the councils of nations empowered to vote a decree that may settle the fate of the United States? Who but a man bereft of reason would have thought that the representatives of the United States would ever have consented to so monstrous a proposal?

Haiti: Total population, 1,500,000 in 1911. Practically 99 per cent of the people are negroes or of negro extraction. Illiteracy is the common condition. The Republic was established by assassination. In 1804 the blacks rose in revolt and massacred the French, man, woman, and child, almost to the last individual. From that time to this their Government has been a succession of petty tyrannies generally established in blood and usually extinguished by battle or murder. Their elections are generally held by a group of assassins who meet together and determine the exact moment at which they propose to kill the ruler and to put another one in his place.

I desire to read from the American Geographic Magazine of 1916, and I am inviting all the reformers there are here, and all the dreamers who dream dreams and see visions, and all of those who believe in the new magic, to follow me as I peruse these somber lines. Says this disinterested authority:

It was Dessalines who led these forces which defeated the French, massacred their women and children, and set up an independent Government. From that time, 1804, to the present they have had 28 rulers, including a king and an emperor. Of these, only 4 completed their terms of office, 2 died in power, 5 were assassinated, 10 were exiled, 1 committed suicide, and 1 abdicated under compulsion.

Of Christophe, the second ruler, Sir Frederick Treves gives us this glimpse:

To Dessalines succeeded Christophe, one of the most ludicrous figures in modern history. He was a mulatto slave who took upon himself the title of Henri I. He created a copious black aristocracy—

Which I presume now will be transformed into a modern democracy—

whereby the water-side porter became a duke and the footman a marquis. He drew up a code of laws, the Code Henri in imitation of the Code Napoleon. His court was as gorgeous as the court of an opera bouffe. More than that, he built the palace of Sans Souci, an unbelievable edifice, worthy of Arabian Nights. The ruins of this fantastic edifice still crown certain gracious heights near Cape Haitien. Henri I did one wise thing. He shot himself after a burlesque reign of some 13 years.

The author adds—

He, Sir Frederick Treves, might have added that the fastidious Christophe used a silver bullet. Lead was too plebian for his aristocratic brain.

Another ruler was Souloque, an illiterate and superstitious negro, who under the title of Emperor Faustin I established a nobility—

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will refrain from demonstrations.

Mr. REED. This author continues:

Among the recipients of his honors being His Grace the Duke of Limonade and His Highness Prince Bobo.

In 1912, when the Knox mission to Latin America visited Port au Prince, President Laconte was in power. The city then thoroughly fitted Ober's description of it when he wrote:

"As to Port au Prince, I can bear testimony respecting its utter filthiness and agree with a recent resident there that it may bear away the palm of being the most foul-smelling and consequently fever-stricken city in the world. Everyone throws his refuse before his door, so that the heaps of manure and every species of rubbish incumber the way. The gutters are open, pools of stagnant water obstruct the streets everywhere and receive constant accession from the inhabitants using them as cesspools and sewers."

But conditions were good then to what they became later. Laconte had set some of his generals to breaking stone for macadamizing the streets, and white residents said that the town was cleaner that year than it had been in their memory.

A REIGN OF TERROR.

But Laconte did not rule long. He was assassinated, the palace was burned down, and there was inaugurated a carnival of crime and an orgy of revolution such as history perhaps never before was called upon to record. Indeed, the four years that began with the assassination of Laconte and ended with the surrender of the last rebels to United States authority were a nightmare of terror.

In one case the body of a dead ruler was lying in state in the cathedral when a military company was drawn up and commanded to fire into the coffin, which they did with riddling effect. In still another case 110 leading citizens were shot and a reign of terror surpassing even past performances was inaugurated.

This in its turn resulted in the storming of the French legation, where President Guillaume Sam, who had ordered the execution of these people, had taken refuge. He was dragged out; his body was drawn in quarters and dragged through the streets.

Then follow some historical sketches of that country, which I do not pause to read, but I do pause long enough to read to these reformers who want to put the advanced peoples, who represent science and humanity and religion, in command of the bad—I pause long enough to read you this little sketch, and may it sink into your hearts:

Every authority on Haiti agrees that vaudoux or voodoo worship exists there and that it is probably a survival of African fetishism. It is agreed by all authorities that now and then in the frenzy of the snake dances the worshippers refuse to be content with anything less than a sacrifice of the "goat without horns"—a living child. When one of the recent presidents of the republic was assassinated he carried the emblems of vaudouism next to his heart, showing that the cult has existed even in the highest places.

So these baby murderers, these creatures of the forest who sacrifice children to their idols, are to have a place in the councils of the nations, and their vote is to be the equal of the vote of the United States. My friend from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] shakes his head in the negative. I say, "yes." It is time for misrepresentation to cease. Haiti sits as a member; every member has one vote, and but one vote. How, then, can it be denied that they have a vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to inquire of the Senator whether he has changed his opinion heretofore expressed in the Senate, that this league was to be dominated by the monarchs and kings of Europe and Asia?

Mr. REED. Yes; I changed my opinion, for then I thought that no sane man would ever propose that any but the leading nations of the world should sit in this council and vote. I

never dreamed that anybody would propose that the representative of Liberia, the representative of Haiti, and the representatives of other countries that constitute the dregs of civilization would be given a vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And has the Senator also changed his opinion heretofore expressed that this is a league which is going to be dominated by Great Britain and her dominions?

Mr. REED. I will answer that. I say that among the great nations Great Britain will have six votes, if not seven, to our one. That is expressly guaranteed in this league. When I discussed this question heretofore, I said she might at some time have five votes. I did not then know, and surely the Senator from Nebraska did not know, that she was already guaranteed six votes, for the Senator from Nebraska on the floor of the Senate denied that the British Empire would have five votes to our one, but she has six votes given to her.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska denies that statement. It was the Senator from Missouri who made the statement that this was a league which was to be dominated by the British Empire.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then he said it was going to be dominated by monarchs of Europe and of Asia. Now he says it is going to be dominated by the little half-baked countries that he is proceeding to name.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know which the Senator means.

Mr. REED. Well, I will tell the Senator where I stand, and he will find that I am standing upon the rock of truth and have nothing to take back; but I think before we get through this debate he will have to take back everything he has said.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Missouri admits he has changed his position two or three times.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to know which rock the Senator is standing on at the present time.

Mr. REED. Well, I am standing on one which is so solid that the Senator can not push me from it. He need not worry about that.

The first speech I made upon the league of nations was before the so-called constitution of the league had been given to the world, but had been discussed through the newspapers. All we had was news leaking out and obtained by the newspaper men as best they could. Upon that I discussed the question of what kind of league we would have to have if one possessing any real power were created. I therefore discussed what was in fact a hypothetical league.

The next speech I made on the league of nations was on the 22d day of February—Washington's Birthday. At that time we had been furnished with a copy of the original draft of the first league of nations as prepared and presented. That document gave us the names of but five member countries, and sedulously concealed from us the other countries that were to be admitted. I then discussed the question and said that that league, if it were organized, would probably be controlled by Great Britain, because it contained a clause which gave to the colonies and to the dominions of Great Britain the right to vote; and that, therefore, Great Britain might obtain, if she availed herself of the powers of the league, a vote for the dominion and for each of her four colonies; but whether they would obtain it or not seemed to be a matter for the future. But I said when Great Britain did obtain it, with her then power and influence with the other nations, she could dominate this league. Now we find that all the time it was written not that Great Britain may in the future obtain this advantage, but that all the time Australia and Canada and New Zealand and India and South Africa had been written in the league and given a vote. So Great Britain then, as now, was guaranteed 6 votes to the 1 vote of the United States.

Now, I come and say that on top of that infamy, that iniquity, that unjustifiable situation, it is proposed to fill this league up with the backward nations of the world, and that, if those nations were to unite, they could constitute a majority; and upon any race question they will, in all probability, constitute a majority.

The Senator from Nebraska can talk about abandoned positions. If I abandoned my position as often as the advocates of this league have changed theirs, I should move so fast that I would resemble the country acrobat whose neighbors boasted that he could spin on his heel so fast the observer could not tell whether the patch was in front or behind.

I propose to proceed with Haiti, and let my friend from Nebraska defend his position regarding Liberia; let him go to the people of Nebraska and tell them whether he believes that 50,000 semicivilized negroes along the coast of Africa should cast a vote

in the league of nations equal to that of the United States. I ask the Senator the question now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator this question—

Mr. REED. No; I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, unfortunately I have not the floor.

Mr. REED. Oh, I am giving it to the Senator to answer this question. Is the Senator willing or not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Willing to what?

Mr. REED. To give to 50,000 civilized or semicivilized negroes along the coast of Africa the right to cast a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of the 110,000,000 people of the United States?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My judgment is that if Great Britain and France do not object to these small nations, that are practically under the protection of the United States, being financed by the United States, and largely controlled by the United States, coming into the league, it is not likely that we will suffer very much from them.

Mr. REED. I am asking the Senator if he is willing to consent to the proposition? Can we not have a categorical answer? Is the Senator willing to put these 50,000 negroes up as the equals of the 110,000,000 people of the United States?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has named any country that is not practically under the protection of the United States?

Mr. REED. Why, certainly; I will name some.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And dominated by the United States at the present time?

Mr. REED. I will name some. Just abide in patience a wee bit; I am coming to that just as fast as my poor tongue can travel. I observe that I am unable to get an answer to my question. I therefore proceed.

Mr. President, let us see about this tutelage and guardianship. Again I say either these nations will sit there as free nations, with the right of self-determination, or else a monstrous fake and hoax and fraud is being put off on the world. How do you know you will vote the representatives of this race always? It is my opinion that you could buy the representative of Liberia at any time with a peck of potatoes if somebody did not bid a bushel; and the representative of Haiti for even a less sum unless somebody raised the "ante." But at any time we are likely to be outbid.

The Senator states that Liberia is under our protection. Just at present she is in the hands of this country financially as receiver; but the French influence there was, until recently, more than ours. But why is Liberia given a seat in the league of nations if, as you intimate, another country is to control its vote? What kind of logic are you employing, sir, when your only excuse for admitting into the league the depraved, the vicious, and the wicked is that they will not perform their functions as members but that they will be controlled as cats-paws and voted as automats by some other nation? Are we to establish voting mandatories in the league? And does the Senator insist that the United States is to act as vote mandatory for Liberia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the Senator made some such charge with relation to the dominions of Great Britain—that they would be controlled by Great Britain.

Mr. REED. I do; and I say it is monstrous to put them in. Now, I presume the Senator's plea will be that Great Britain is to have five or six votes, represented by these great colonies of hers, and we are to have as an offset these negro dominions, so that both the United States and England will each have a number of fake votes in the league of nations, that is to constitute the brotherhood of man and the high tribunal that is to usher in the millennium! The league is to be packed with fake votes, whose voices upon command shall proclaim the coming of God and the complete equality of the races of men! At such a proposition the gorge ought to rise, but it will not rise in the stomach of the Senator from Nebraska.

I was discussing Haiti when I was interrupted by the Senator from Nebraska. I then for a time returned to Liberia. I now read a little further about Haiti:

Marriage is neither frequent nor legally prescribed, since all children are considered legitimate. In the interior polygamy is frequent. On the whole, it must be owned that after a century of independence and self-government the Haitians have made little or no progress, if, indeed, they have not shown actual signs of retrogression. Justice is venal and the police are brutal.

Well, if down there they sell their decisions in their courts, I suppose their representative might sell his vote in the league of nations.

All classes seem to be permeated with a thinly disguised belief in voodooism (a devil worship imported with the slaves from Africa). (Encyclopedia Brit., 11th edition, 1911.)

I am going to give, for whatever pleasure he can get out of it, a seat between Haiti and Liberia—a seat of honor—to my distinguished friend from Nebraska.

HEDJAZ.

I pass to another country that will not be controlled by America, another country, that, if controlled at all, will be controlled by France or England; happily it may be, for if it is controlled by France or England we may at least conclude that its vote will not be worse for the world than France or England desires; but if it be cast on its own account then only the Infinite can tell how it may vote. I refer to Hedjaz. Few Americans ever heard of that blessed country until this war began. And yet its representative is to enjoy a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of this great Republic. It has a total population of 300,000—less than the population of one ward of certain American cities. One hundred and fifty thousand of these people are the wild Bedouins of the desert, wanderers, creatures who follow the camels and sleep under the skies, who live as their fathers lived 10,000 years ago, and who have not accumulated an idea since, except that they have adopted Mohammedanism. Who is going to vote them—America?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator explain what they can vote on? I think that would be interesting.

Mr. REED. On anything that America can vote on in the league of nations, and have an equal vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. REED. Ah, does the Senator claim the league of nations has nothing to do? Let us have it out—does it have nothing to do, or does it have something to do?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The league has very little to do.

Mr. REED. Then the league is a fake, is it not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Practically all of its powers, as the Senator well knows if he has studied the constitution of the proposed league, are in the hands of the executive council, and the only five permanent members of that executive council are the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan.

Mr. REED. Then you have not a league of nations; you have a quintuple alliance. Instead of having a league of nations of the world, as the President said he was going to have, you have five great nations that have united themselves to govern and dominate the world. You plead too much, my friend. You have stood declaring in this Chamber and on the public platforms of the United States, in substance and effect, that this league of nations was to be an assembly of the nations of the world, destined to become a great force, that would control the evil passions of men and of races and bring to the world peace, harmony, and good will, and now you stand here declaring, as your only excuse for its existence, that it is a powerless thing, that it is a thing without body, parts, passions, or anything else to constitute a governing body—you stand here and proclaim to the world that the whole thing is a fake, that it is a pitiable fraud, that it is a miserable pretense; and therefore it does not make any difference what you put into it, as nothing is to come out of it.

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

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am giving the Senator's statement. He has stated that the small nations which he has named will have as great a vote as the United States, when he knows, as a matter of fact, that no nation not one of the five permanent members of the executive council can have as much vote, influence, and power as the five members named on the executive council permanently; he knows that.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, I said that in the *league* they will have as much power as will the United States—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I should like to ask the Senator if the executive council is not the governing body of the league?

Mr. REED. Wait a moment—and when I said that I meant exactly what I said, that when it comes to a vote in the *league*—and everybody knows that there are two elements; there is the membership, and then there is an executive council, and I have been talking about the *membership*—as members in the league the nations to which I have referred have exactly the same vote as the United States, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know what questions can come before the membership? Can the Senator state them?

Mr. REED. Yes; I will. The Senator seems to have lost his temper, his poise, and his usual good nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will desist for a moment. In interrupting the Senator from Missouri the Senator from Nebraska and others will get either his consent or the recognition of the Chair.

Mr. REED. Although I am being diverted from my object, which was to make a close argument about the league member-

ship, I will depart from it at this point long enough to read this for the delectation of the Senator from Nebraska:

The assembly—

That is the league, is it not? That is the membership—*may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league, or affecting the peace of the world.*

Now, this assembly, of which Liberia is a member, of which Haiti is a member, and of which the United States is a member, are granted the authority to deal with *any question affecting the peace of the world*; and when they come to those questions Haiti and Liberia each have the same vote as the vote of the United States. A man who will deny that is simply dishonest, unfair, and unwilling to have the truth go before the American people.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. KNOX. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri will read that paragraph of the fifteenth section which says that any question which is carried to the council may be carried from the council to the assembly at the request of either party.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer that question?

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

Mr. REED. Let me read that first, and then I shall be glad to have the Senator answer it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand it, and I have an answer.

Mr. REED. Perhaps the Senator would prefer making the answer now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will make the answer. The Senator from Pennsylvania refers to disputes between two nations. They may be referred to the body of delegates instead of being heard by the executive council; but when heard by the body of delegates the same rules apply as in the executive council, and the vote must be unanimous except where specifically otherwise provided. That makes it impossible for any little countries like these to control the decision unless the great nations of the world are agreed.

Mr. REED. And it makes it impossible for a great nation like ours to control the decisions if even one of the little countries is not agreed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. So that you tie the hands of the United States by the vote of the gentleman from Liberia; and where do you come out? All you have argued thus far is that your league is an innocuous thing because it is powerless, and yet you tell us it is to save the world!

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. As the reply of the Senator from Nebraska was addressed to me, I should like to add that if you take the trouble to read this thing, you will find out what it says. There is so much of "it means thus and so because somebody says so, and he said so because somebody else said so." If you take up the twelfth section, you will find that it is the fundamental right of every member of the league to raise any question against a nation that, in its judgment, affects a good understanding between nations, or which is liable to disturb the peace of the world; and then if you turn to section 15 you will find that that matter goes to the council, and then either party may carry it from the council to the assembly; and it is just as the Senator from Missouri has said—that while, of course, these little nations could not put over an injustice in their own favor, yet they could, by their vote, prevent justice from being done to the greatest nations of the world.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from Pennsylvania and I am obliged to the Senator from Nebraska for these interruptions. I will attempt to discuss that particular phase at the proper time. I want to discuss now the personnel of the league. I am discussing the jury that is to try the great world causes; I am challenging the array. I am saying it is dishonestly drawn and outrageously brought together. I am going to pause long enough to challenge the lawyers of the Senate: Which one of you, having an important case to try, involving the life or the property of your friend or your client or yourself, would be willing to submit it to a jury composed—and I will put the good nations in with the bad—of an Englishman, a Frenchman, an Italian, an American, a Jap, a Chinaman, an Indian from India, a Siamese, a Negro from Liberia, a half-caste from Honduras, a Negro from Haiti, and an Arab from Hedjaz? Which one of you would submit the question of your own life or your own liberty or that of your friends to such a jury? And if you would not

submit matters of property of the individual to such a jury, which one of you dare submit the life of your Nation, the honor of your country, the glory of your flag to such a tribunal? And what a beggarly thing it is to stand and say, "Though we set up the league with all this blare of trumpets, though we proclaim it the guarantor of peace for all time, though we impiously assert that it is the greatest conception since Christ's Sermon on the Mount"—still the moment it is shown that its power may be abused we immediately assert that it has no power for harm, because it has no power at all! What a miserable argument to say that the United States can not be bound by the votes of these degenerate races of men, because everything must have unanimous consent, when you must at the same time admit that that rule enables any one of these degenerate nations to prevent the United States and all the other members from accomplishing any reform or bringing about any good result. For if the United States can cast a negative vote that can save it from control, then the Negro Republic of Haiti can cast a vote that will block the machinery of the league and will withhold every reform that others may seek to effect.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I call the Senator's attention now to the fact that he has again shifted his position.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He came into the Senate Chamber some weeks ago and said that the United States was going into a league in which it would be outvoted and ruined. Now he is condemning the league because it has not the power to do that thing.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, one has to shift his position when he has an antagonist who will not stand still three seconds. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator meet the issue.

Mr. REED. I will meet it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will desist for a moment. The occupants of the galleries must preserve order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator whether he did not complain on a former occasion that the United States was going into an enterprise in which a majority might decide against it?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And is not the Senator here now condemning the league because it requires a unanimous vote?

Mr. REED. Oh, no. I am using your own argument to eat up your own argument with; that is all. I did say on a former occasion that a majority vote could bind the United States, and the Senator from Nebraska said it could not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I did, and I insist on it now.

Mr. REED. And your friends over in Paris, knowing that you were wrong, wrote into the league a clause saying that except where it was specifically otherwise stated a unanimous vote should be had, thus saying that when you said to the American people, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that a decision by the league required a unanimous vote, you were utterly mistaken, and they repudiated you the first time they met.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator now will he come to the point? Has he shifted his ground or not?

Mr. REED. I have not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Did the Senator formerly condemn the league because a majority vote might control, and does he now condemn it because a unanimous vote is necessary?

Mr. REED. I condemn any league—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I guess that is right.

Mr. REED (continuing). That proposes to put the vital interests of the United States within the power of a majority of foreigners, or to put the United States into a position so that once an order has been made it never can escape from that, except by the unanimous vote of other nations. If the Senator will simply pause long enough to analyze that, he will see how logical it is.

I object, in the first place, to giving to the representatives of foreign countries, by a majority vote or by a unanimous vote, the right to bind this country on vital questions. Now, according to the Senator's construction, this league can not bind us without our consent having been given. Very well. It goes further than that. Our consent once having been given, we can never escape, unless we can get every one of the nations of the world that is a member of this league to grant its gracious consent. That leaves us utterly defenseless. The covenant as construed by the Senator is exactly like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Once a decree has been rendered, once an order has been made, it can not be changed, except by a unanimous vote.

That is almost the equivalent of saying no change can ever be made when the subject is one of serious dispute.

Let me take an illustration. Suppose that this league by unanimous consent were to fix the size of the American Army at 250,000 men, and suppose the United States were to vote for that decision, believing it to be a proper thing at that time. Suppose that subsequently we should conclude that we needed an army of 500,000 men. We could not have that army without the consent of the league. If Great Britain voted "No" we could not have it. If every nation voted "Aye" except Liberia, we could not have it. So we place our Nation in such a position that its fate may be determined adversely by the single vote of one degenerate race or by the vote of one of our enemies.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is confusing the duties of the league. The duties he refers to belong exclusively to the executive council.

Mr. REED. Very well. Do they require a unanimous vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They do not go before the league.

Mr. REED. I insist that they do; but I do not care to argue it. If you are going to put the matter before the executive council, does it require a unanimous vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It certainly does.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I object to the Senator saying that Liberia could object, because Liberia is not a member of the executive council.

Mr. REED. I do not care to discuss the question from that narrow basis. Liberia might not be a member of the council, but it is certain Japan will be, and eight or nine other countries may be, and any one might cast a vote as fatal to us. But even if I discuss the inconsequential, I pause to insist that we do not know whether Liberia may not finally get on even the executive council, although I think it unlikely. We did not believe Liberia would be in the league. We did not think any one would put it in, but you did put it in. I remember making a speech in Missouri, out at the State university. I was discussing the possibilities of this league, and went on to say that a lot of the smaller nations might have a vote equal to ours. I said, "It is even possible that Liberia may be given such a vote"; and then I said, "No; that is not fair; I withdraw that statement. It is possible, but no sane man would propose it"; and hence I apologized for having mentioned it. Imagine my consternation and astonishment three days afterwards when it was announced that Liberia was in the league, along with Haiti.

But now I am discussing our friend Hedjaz. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will desist for just a moment. The occupants of the galleries will abstain from that character of demonstration or the Chair will have to take such steps as are necessary to preserve order in the galleries.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Chair will not be too stern with the galleries. I am to blame. Besides, the Chair is interrupting me more than the occupants of the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not mean to interrupt any Senator.

Mr. REED. I know. I apologize if my remark seemed somewhat impolite. I did not so mean it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the Senator is well aware of the fact, of course, that the rules provide that it is the duty of the Chair to preserve order in the galleries.

Mr. REED. Oh, I understand, and I apologize if I have spoken in a way that was misunderstood. I meant no more than to indulge in a pleasantry.

The total population of Hedjaz is 300,000, but it is given a vote equal to the United States. One hundred and fifty thousand, as I said a moment ago, are wandering Bedouins of the desert. The Encyclopaedia Britannica has this to say:

Though physically the most desolate and uninviting Province in Arabia, it has a special interest and importance as containing the two sacred cities of Islam—Mecca and Medina—the birthplace and burial spot, respectively, of Mahomet, which are visited yearly by large numbers of Moslem pilgrims from all parts of the world.

Of the Bedouins, it says:

All these nomadic tribes receive money payments of large amounts from the Turkish Government to insure the safe conduct of the annual pilgrimage, otherwise they are practically independent of the Turkish administration.

As a matter of fact, they have for decades been the highwaymen of the desert, and have levied their tribute under the

guise of protection upon every pious soul who has come to weep over the ashes of Mahomet. One hundred and fifty thousand Bedouins wander the desert. One hundred and fifty thousand other Hedjazians live in the towns; all of them are Mohammedans who regard it a virtue to kill a Christian. All of them who can afford it fill their harems with slaves captured or purchased; and yet this body of men, under the control certainly of France or England, not of the United States, if they are controlled at all, are to cast a vote equal to the 110,000,000 sovereigns of the United States!

Let those who like that swallow it; but the man who can swallow it would agree to a proposition to give a vote to the inmates of every first-class lunatic asylum of the United States, or to grant a seat in the league to the naked Hottentots that remain uncaught in Africa.

PANAMA.

Again I present you with another one of these kindred spirits, just now embarking on the reform of the world and in the control of the evil passions of men. I refer to Panama.

Population, 450,000. That is not as many people as live in the city of Kansas City alone. Ninety per cent of these are a mixture of negroes and Spanish mulattoes. Yet, you men of the South, you lily-whites, you gentlemen who say that white men alone should control in your own States, are willing to allow this meagre population, 90 per cent of whom are negroes and mulattoes, living hundreds of miles from our shores, to have a vote equal to the total vote of the United States in the league of nations! Go back to your people and justify yourselves if you can. Tell them this is the new democracy, a magic democracy, in which one negro outside the United States has a vote substantially equal to 220 of the white citizens of this Republic! But perhaps they have been put in for the purpose of toning up the moral situation, for we are also to look after the morals of the world, I read.

The morals of these people are shown by this fact from the Statesman's Yearbook of 1918, which recites that—

In 1915 there were 12,040 births, of which 8,077 were illegitimate. The slothfulness of the inhabitants—

This author continues—

is illustrated by the fact that although the soil is of great fertility fully three-eighths of it is unoccupied.

And I suppose as they meet here in Washington to organize the league of nations the representative of Panama, bearing a milk-white banner emblematic of purity, and the representative of Hedjaz, at the head of his harem, will lead the procession, each appropriately adorned with rings in ears and nose.

HONDURAS.

Population, 562,000, estimated, because they have not advanced far enough to count the people. They have not had sense enough to take a census. Indeed, I presume the task would be difficult, for many of the natives are hard to catch. They have been running ever since the Spaniards came down there and murdered a lot of them. Total population, 562,000—a good deal less than the city of St. Louis. These are chiefly Mestizos and Indians. The Mestizo is a conglomerate. His blood is composed of that of the Spanish buccaneer and marauder, some negro, some Chinese, but principally it is Indian blood. It is said that over 200,000 inhabitants are of pure Indian blood, and 90,000 of these are mountain Indians, who are thoroughly wild and in their aboriginal state. The Encyclopaedia Britannica declares that a complete and accurate census can not be taken throughout the country, since the ignorant masses of the people, and especially the Indians, avoid a census as in some way connected with military conscription or taxation. Primary education is free, secular, and compulsory, but the percentage of illiterates is very high, especially among the Indians; and further information that I have from other sources is that while they have upon their statute books compulsory education, it is in fact practically not availed of at all.

Honduras's history, says the Encyclopaedia Britannica, has been one round of intrigues of aspiring revolutionists with other revolutionists of Guatemala, Nicaragua, and other neighboring States. They have had nothing like a stable government. They have had nothing like a government of sobriety and of law. And yet the representatives of these people, not far enough advanced to take their own census, not sufficiently stable so that a man elected to an office there knows whether he will hold it a day or a week—this country, where a revolution is a common method of election—is proposed now to be set up to govern the world and to bring order to the universe! Who is to cast that vote? Are we to own it also? If so, how much are we to pay for it? Who is to control the vote of that Indian who comes here, or that mulatto who comes here from Honduras?

By what system of logic will you justify giving to the inhabitants of a country that has a little over a half million population a vote equal to the United States, with its 110,000,000 people? One man in the United States, one country township in the most remote district of Mississippi or of Georgia or of Missouri is better entitled to a single vote than the entire country of Honduras. This is another member of your world jury. You may accept him. I object. I challenge his capacity. The average citizens of that State could not vote in Massachusetts, because he could not pass the educational qualifications. The average citizens of that State could not vote in Mississippi or Georgia or North Carolina, because of his color. Neither could he vote in many States, because of the provisions of their constitutions, as has just been suggested. No; they could not vote for constable, as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] states.

NICARAGUA.

Now I come to Nicaragua. The great mass of the population is a composite race, descended chiefly from the native Indians, their Spanish conquerors, and negro slaves introduced during the Spanish colonial period. I am reading from the Statesman's Yearbook, on page 1122. The total population of this country in 1914 was 703,500, not quite equal to the population of the single city of Boston. I believe Boston far outruns it now. Yet it is given a vote equal to the vote of the United States! Oh, my friends, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] shakes his head, because he holds that members of the league do not have anything to do; they are, he thinks, mere figureheads. He thinks that the executive council is going to run everything, by which he admits that his world league is a failure and a fake, that it can not be trusted; therefore he insists that it has been given nothing to do. But it does have much to do—a question that will be debated at another time. We have already gone far enough into it, and I have already read that there is consigned to this league—not to the council, *but to the league itself—every question affecting the peace of the world.* Any other construction makes the thing a fraud and a fake and a joke.

Due to a revolution in 1909 and subsequent annual insurrections, United States marines are now garrisoned in Bluefields and other principal coast towns. The immediate cause of this is found in the fact that the Government, always a mere succession of tyrants, finally for a time rested in the hands of Zelaya. This tyrant was overthrown, and the conversion of the country from an unspeakable despotism into one of ruinous anarchy resulted. I read from the National Geographic Magazine of 1916, page 151:

The rival factions—

Says this author—

issued fiat money as freely as tap water flows from a spigot. The treasury was bankrupt, interest was in default, foreign creditors were threatening—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Pardon me one moment—

foreign creditors were threatening, through their Governments, to collect their debts with gunboats and cruisers, and there was not enough money to be had by the party in power to pay salaries, much less soldiers' wages.

HELPING NICARAGUA ESCAPE THE THROES OF CHRONIC REVOLUTION.

In its insecure tenure under these conditions the party in power was only too willing to save itself and incidentally the country by appealing to the United States, and by offering to make itself an instrument in America's hands for the rejuvenation of the nation.

The United States accepted the offer and Nicaragua has been practically an American receiver, order being maintained by American marines. The United States was compelled to take these steps in Nicaragua or to be forced to abandon the Monroe doctrine. Now, this country, incapable of government, absolutely in such condition that our country had to interfere and act as its receiver, is to be placed in the league of nations to cast a vote equal to the vote of the United States! Its population of the dark and mixed races—that is, of Indians and Negroes and Mestizos—is 90 per cent of the total.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Has the Senator spoken about the neighboring State of Guatemala?

Mr. REED. I have not. I am coming to it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes. The conditions are quite similar, I dare say, as in Honduras and Nicaragua.

Mr. REED. I think they are.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Guatemala is represented in the present peace conference, is she not?

Mr. REED. I imagine she is.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Has the Senator learned that any disaster is likely to ensue to the world by reason of the representation of that State in the peace conference?

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, I want to be polite, but is not that begging the question? You might just as well say that because a thief had been at large for 10 days and had not yet stolen anything that is proof he never will and therefore that all citizens should receive him into their homes. If Guatemala has been over there, she has not been permitted to say anything yet. The Senator will doubtless reply, She is never going to be. If so, why is she given a seat in the league?

GUATEMALA.

I come now to Guatemala, for that is my next topic. The total population of Guatemala in 1903, which was the latest I could get, was 1,842,000. Eighty-five per cent are Indians and Mestizos and 92 per cent can not read or write. Of course, that qualifies them to sit in judgment upon the world and to pass their opinion with reference to all creation!

I have gone over the question of their illiteracy and I shall not repeat it. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says:

The condition of the Indians on the plantation is often akin to slavery, owing to the system adopted by some planters of making payments in advance, for the Indians spend their earnings and thus contract debts which can only be paid by long service. The inhabitants tend to increase rapidly, due to high birth rate and low morality. About one-half of the births among the Indians and one-third among the whites are illegitimate.

Mr. President, I do not care to stop to comment on a situation such as that as I pass along. I have already made comments that I think fairly well cover the case and will let it apply to this.

ECUADOR.

I come now to Ecuador. No general census has ever been taken. According to the official estimate of 1900, and it was only an estimate, the total population was 1,500,000, being 1,000,000 Indians, 300,000 Mestizos—a better word for them being “greasers”—100,000 whites, 44,000 Negroes, and 6,000 foreigners. The whites, although numbering only 100,000, form an exclusive governing caste, as in Chile. The territory of the Republic is divided among a few of them, and the government is in their hands. Of course, they are brought in here to increase the general average of democracy, and their vote necessarily would be cast in favor of the rights of man, this body that hold the lands and control all the people and runs the Government. The land is held by a few proprietors. The caste sentiment is strong among those who claim unmixed European descent. Consequently the Mestizos have a limited opportunity to improve their condition. During the years 1830 to 1909 Ecuador adopted no less than 11 constitutions.

I think I know why we have her in here. She is an expert on constitutions. She has written more than any country on earth and ought to know more about the experiments under them.

Although primary education is free and obligatory, a considerable part of the population is unprovided with schools and is indifferent to them. In 1900 there were only 94,500 pupils in the entire country. So we have there a governing population of 100,000, and that governing population that has enslaved the rest of their fellowmen, that governing population of 100,000, is to have a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of the United States! But, of course, that is all right; it is written in the league of nations.

BOLIVIA.

We come now to Bolivia. The total population in 1900, the last figures I could get that seemed reliable, was 1,766,451; Indians, 50.7 per cent; Mestizos, 26.8; whites, 12.8 per cent; Negroes, 0.3 per cent; and unknown, 9.4 per cent.

All the census returns and estimates in such a country are subject to many allowances—

Says the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

The Indian population (920,860) is largely composed of the so-called civilized tribes of the Andes, which once formed part of the nationality ruled by the Incas. * * * They are peaceable and industrious and form an important laboring element. They are addicted to the use of *chicha* (native rum), and have little or no ambition to improve their condition, but this may be attributed to their profound ignorance and to the state of peonage in which they are held.

And so they are to be put up to govern the world. I read on:

The white population (231,088) is descended in great part from the early Spanish adventurers who entered the country in search of mineral wealth. The percentage of whites does not increase, as in Argentina and Brazil, and can not until means are found to promote European immigration.

Mestizos (486,018) are less numerous than the Indians, but outnumber the whites by more than 2 to 1. *It has been said of the Mestizos that they inherit the vices of both races and the virtues of neither.* Yet with a decreasing Indian population, and with a white population wanting in energy, the future of Bolivia mainly depends on them. As a rule they are ignorant, unprogressive, and apathetic, intensely cruel, superstitious, and intemperate—

Outside of that, I suppose, they are all right.

It may be that education and experience will develop the Mestizo into a progressive nationality, but the first century of self-government can hardly be said to have given much promise of such a result.

The rest of this I reserve the right to print. I have been reading excerpts from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

Physically Bolivia is an inland Republic, intensely mountainous, with few good roads—communication is difficult—and she owns to only 430 miles of railroad.

Although Bolivia has a free and “compulsory” school system, education and the provision therefor have made little progress. Only a small percentage of the people can read and write. Although Spanish is the language of the dominant minority, Indian idioms are the languages of the natives, who form a majority of the population. A considerable percentage of the Indians do not understand Spanish at all and resist every effort to have it forced on them. Even the Mestizos are more familiar with the Indian language than with Spanish.

The school enrollment—1901—was only 1 to 43 of population.

Bolivia's right of suffrage is exercised by all male citizens over 21 years (if single) and over 18 (if married) who can read and write, and who own real estate or have an income of \$75 a year, said income not to be compensation for services as a servant.

The electoral body is therefore small, and is under the control of a political oligarchy which practically rules the country, no matter which party is in power. (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edition, 1911.)

Of course, that sort of education and environment ought to fit the gentlemen from Bolivia for a high position on the court of the world and intellectually ought to qualify him to teach the people of the United States how to run their business and manage their country.

PERU.

I come now to Peru. I ask you if there is a single one of these nations I have read up to this time to whose representative you dare refer a matter vital to the interests of the United States.

The population of Peru is a matter of highest doubt. According to some figures only a few years ago they had only 1,500,000 people. They now claim 4,500,000, but of these the percentage of the dark and mixed races to the white is 86. Education is exceedingly low.

I quote the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, 1911:

Like the other States of South America, its constitution (1860) provides for popular control of legislation and the execution of the laws through free elections and short terms of office, but in practice these safeguards are often set aside and dictatorial methods supersede all others. Nominally the people are free and sovereign, but the ignorance of the masses, their apathy, poverty, and dependence upon the great landowners and industrial corporations practically defeat these fundamental constitutional provisions.

No country is better provided with more or better safeguards against electoral and official abuse than Peru, yet few countries suffered more from political disorder during the nineteenth century. The independence of the Peruvian courts has not been maintained, and there has been much criticism of their character and decisions.

Notice how far they go in education with 4,500,000 people.

Primary education is free and “compulsory” since 1905. However, in 1906 the enrollment in the private schools outnumbered the public schools three to one and the private institutions claimed only 22,000—

A fact which certifies not only to the ignorance of those people, but to their willing ignorance, for they decline education that is made legal and offered to them.

BRAZIL.

Mr. President, of all the countries on this side of the Atlantic, with the exception of Canada, which is a part of the British Empire, and, of course, excepting our own Nation, Brazil occupies the best position, the best right to a seat in the council of nations; and yet the total population in 1904 being 24,500,000, there were of this population only 8,000,000 whites. There were 8,000,000 mulattoes or Mestizos, 4,000,000 Negroes, 2,500,000 Indians, and 2,000,000 unclassified. So the whites of that country constitute only one-third of the population. If we ever come to a time of self-determination it is reasonable to anticipate that the colored races will claim their own.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Now, Mr. President, I pass to a British possession, South Africa, the South African colony based upon the ruins of two South African republics. The first interesting question is that of population. The total population is 5,000,000, of whom 1,000,000 are whites and 4,000,000 are blacks. It is therefore proper to classify this nation as among the colored nations of the world.

Here is a question to which I challenge your thought. Either the races of South Africa were capable of self-government or they were not. If they were capable of self-government, having gone to that distant land and set themselves up as independent governments, their people should have been permitted to retain their liberty.

But, sir, Great Britain came to that country and, with fire and sword, devastated it and broke up the arms and the armies

of these Republics. Either Great Britain committed one of the monstrous crimes of history when she thus overwhelmed these Republics capable of self-government, or else they were incapable of self-government. If they were incapable of self-government and therefore England was justified, then they are incapable now of sitting on the league of nations and casting a vote that will help control the destinies of the world. If they could not control their own destiny, if they were so backward that Great Britain was impelled in the interests of civilization to take their government away from them and to control them by her armies and her fleets, then under what logic do you propose to set them up now to help govern the world? Great Britain insists that to-day they are incapable of self-government, and hence holds them enthralled. Will that vote be controlled, I ask the Senator from Nebraska—who happens to have vanished from the Chamber, I am sorry to say—by our country or will it be controlled by the armed forces of Great Britain and cast as Great Britain shall dictate?

But if not, and if it have a representative form of government, then why should not the blacks of that country be entitled to a black man to represent them upon the league of nations? Either we are to have democracy or we are not. We are to have self-determination or we are not to have it.

I pass now from that, and yet I do not want to pass from it without calling attention to the fact that in that country the degree of illiteracy is 80 per cent. Eighty per cent of the people can not read or write, and yet their representative is to vote to control the destiny of the United States. They are to be in the league of nations what they are outside of the league of nations, the chattel and the pawns and the dummy directors of Great Britain.

SIAM.

Again I call your attention to Siam—I have not any doubt this will appeal particularly to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]—as one of the nations that ought to sit on the league of nations and tell us how we shall run our affairs. Siam's population in 1909 was 6,230,000. Although it is one of the oldest countries claiming to be civilized, and although centuries ago it had a literature and an established form of government, only one out of a hundred of the people can read and write. It is steeped in ignorance and debased by superstition. Its government is a tyranny exercised by an hereditary monarch. It affords a most fitting illustration of a dying race. Its people are divided into castes overridden by Buddhist priests. The most ridiculous superstition and the vilest forms of fetish worship prevail.

I desire to print a list of the people as they are divided. Encyclopædia Britannica, eleventh edition, 1911, shows—

Total population (1909)-----	6,230,000
Siamese-----	3,000,000
Laos-----	2,000,000
Chinese-----	400,000
Malay-----	115,000
Cambodians-----	80,000
Europeans-----	1,300 to 1,500
English-----	500
Germans-----	190
Danes-----	160
Americans-----	150

Polygamy is permitted, but common only among the upper classes.

The Siamese are mild mannered—

Says the Encyclopædia Britannica, from which I am now reading—

patient, submissive to authority, kindly, and hospitable to foreigners.

Most of the industries are in the hands of the Chinese.

The Buddhist monasteries scattered throughout the country carry on almost the whole of the elementary education.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. REED. I yield for a question.

Mr. PHELAN. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the hereditary monarch of Siam is a graduate of Oxford University, that he is a man of large education and very intelligent, or would it affect his argument at all if aware of that fact?

Mr. REED. I would not care if a hereditary monarch graduated at all the schools or universities, it would not make me love a monarch. Nearly all monarchs are well educated. One of the very best educated monarchs I know of was a gentleman named William of Germany.

Incidentally, I should like to ask the Senator from California, since he seems to like the king, if speaking for the people of California he would like to open the doors of California for these Siamese people to immigrate and settle in his State? Let us have a real straight-out answer.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I did not raise the question for the purpose of discussing the merits of the people of Siam, but the hereditary monarch and the ruling classes, according to their form of government, are educated and well-informed persons,

like the Senator from Missouri. I think, therefore, that, representing their Government, they can speak with intelligence and knowledge of the world. But that he is a monarch does not interest me, nor should it interest us in the effort to create a league of nations. We must accept the nations as they are, and possibly under the inspiration of the league there will be a broader democracy in the future.

As to California, we, like the Australians, are bent upon preserving her for a white man's country, and therefore we do not want to transplant the Siamese to California, nor would it be good for the Siamese. Under a league of nations racial distinctions are observed as a cardinal feature, and where a race is permitted to develop along those lines it is best for that race and for the rest of the world.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator pardon me if I suggest that under a league of nations races are not preserved in the manner he states, but, on the contrary, that is a live, burning question yet undecided, as I shall show a little later on.

The Senator states that he is unwilling to have the Siamese come to California, because he does not want them to mingle with his people, and he would not let them vote there, either, would he?

Mr. PHELAN. I do not believe they are assimilable.

Mr. REED. And while they are not assimilable with the people living in California, if you take them and put them in the league of nations, it is perfectly proper to have them vote on the destiny of the United States. You are perfectly willing to have that done, are you not, Senator?

Mr. PHELAN. In so far as they are members of the league they will vote. I do not know how far it will affect the destinies of the United States; but very little, I imagine. They are civilized.

Mr. REED. They would affect it by their vote the same as any other nation. Are you willing to submit a question vital to the interests of the United States to the vote of men you are not even willing to have land on the sacred soil of California?

Mr. PHELAN. The gentleman is opening a large question as to the influence of the members of the league in affecting the destinies of particular States. I am of the opinion that the United States will have a very large voice in determining the destinies of foreign nations.

Mr. REED. The Senator argues that we let these people all in as equals and then we proceed to run the whole thing ourselves. That is usually the argument of the man who has no argument, because either these people come in as equals or else they might better not come in at all. If they come in as equals, then, of course, they are equals, and if we have a right to vote upon a question, they have the same right to vote upon that question.

Mr. PHELAN. There is no question of equality involved in the organization of the league, so far as control is concerned, because the larger nations, four or five of them, are established permanently in control.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; that is just where the Senator is mistaken. I argued that question while the Senator was out, and as I want to get through some time this evening, he will permit me to make a very brief reply to his point. If you argue that the league of nations has no authority—I am speaking now of the membership—then you argue yourself out of court, for that which can do nothing amounts to nothing and becomes a farce and a thing for laughter, sneers, and jeers, like the American aristocracy, as Tom Hood said.

If, on the other hand, there is any power vested in the league, then the representative of Siam has exactly the same power as the representative of Uncle Sam, and it is a pitiable thing to find men standing here proclaiming in one breath that we must have a league of nations as a salvation of the world and that it is to be a great tribunal of equality and democracy, and in the next breath asserting that it has no power and can not do anything. I would be ashamed to make that argument to a country justice of the peace.

But I proceed. I was discussing Siam. Since the question has been raised, if my friends will take the pains to read they will find that among the most honored people of that country are those who have disfigured themselves in superstitious rites. They will learn that the country is divided into castes and classes, so that if one of the lower classes shall but touch the garment of one of the upper class he is unclean and must bathe himself seven or eight times before he feels that he is purified.

I have not time to dwell on these monstrous things. It is because of their debasement and their defilement that this degenerate and dying race has to have sent to it Christian ministers and Christian missionaries, and yet it clings to its old faith; it follows its old dogmas; it wanders amongst the shadows of ignorance; it cringes in the caves of fear; it crouches

before the coiled serpent of superstition. In the heart of every one of them are found those monsters of the mind that are only possible where the mind is but half civilized or half developed.

Here is another author on the subject:

[Quotation from *The World's Peoples*, by Keane, 1908, p. 203.]

Slavery or serfdom was not restricted, as mostly elsewhere, to a particular class, but extending to all the King's subjects. So that the sense of personal dignity was lost, and anyone from the highest to the lowest citizen might at any moment lapse into bondage. Like most Mongoloid peoples they are incurable gamblers, and before the recent reforms a Freeman of any rank might stake all his effects, his wives, children, and self on the hazard of the die. * * * But beneath it all spirit or devil worship is still rife, and in many districts Animism is the only religion. Even temples have been raised to the countless gods of land and water, woods, mountains, hamlets, and households. To these gods are credited all evils, and to prevent them from getting into the bodies of the dead these are brought out, not through door or window, but through a breach in the wall, which is afterwards carefully built up.

And they are to be at the council table of the nations. Of course, it is all right. If it had been proposed by an inmate of an asylum who was seeking relief, you would have voted him an incurable, but since it is written in the league of nations, we shall cry, "Holy! Holy! Holy!" and bow our heads in meek submission.

INDIA.

I can give you a picture of India in a word. She has a population of 294,361,056. She has been held in thralldom by a little English army, and has not had the spirit to rise and break her chains. Such a people mark and brand themselves at once as not only unfit for the government of others, but as almost unfit for their own government; yet I would not deny that right to the lowest of God's creatures if he lived off with others like himself and wanted a government of his own.

Amongst those 294,000,000 people there is no excess of superstition to which they have not gone; there is no shadow of intellectual night so black that they have not wrapped their souls in its sable folds; there is no species of caste by which men have sought to divide themselves and to keep oppressed by power and priesthood their fellow men that has not been rife in India for centuries of time.

Again, a dying race, a country in which there are 147 distinct languages, where in religion there are 207,000,000 Hindus, 62,000,000 Mohammedans, 9,000,000 Buddhists, 2,195,000 Sikhs, and various other religions.

A singular fact in relation to them is that the chief article of their revenue is a duty laid upon opium, and in the fumes of that drug what is left of the living soul of India is expiring. This little chattel of Great Britain, this pawn of the British Empire, is brought in here and given a vote equal to the vote of the United States. Yet here, when some of her people emigrated to California, the people of California protested, and when they emigrated to Canada the people of Canada rose and drove them out as a polluted and dangerous people—dangerous to their civilization and ruinous to the wages of labor. Now, it is proposed that this nation, that Great Britain says can not rule herself, shall sit in the council, with her chains upon her wrists, a slave to Great Britain's power, and shall cast her vote equal to the vote of the United States! But it is written in the league of nations, and hence it is a sacred thing.

CHINA.

Then we come to China, and how shall I discuss her? Of all the ironies of history there has never been a thing like this. As we induct China into the league of nations, as she takes a seat in the charmed circle of the brotherhood of man, as she enters upon that reign of justice where all international outrage shall cease and when the power of armies shall no longer control—as she takes her seat she is handed a decree ratifying the ravishment of her Provinces by Japan—the theft of 44,000,000 of her citizens—and is told that, as a member of the league, she must sign a ratification and sanctification of that international outrage which has been perpetrated only within the last few months. China, that has been the one nation in all the world that for centuries of time has proclaimed the doctrine of peace; China, that has said the world is too civilized, or ought to be too civilized, to settle questions by the arbitrament of arms, is brought to the council table, and her sentence is that the sword that cut from her heart 44,000,000 of her people shall be sanctified by the league of nations, and shall be made holy by the primary decree of this congregation of saints! But it is written in the league of nations, and it is, therefore, a sacred thing.

If a Republican President had brought the league here; if Roosevelt had brought it here, there is not a Democrat who would not have been standing by my side fighting to the last ditch to rescue the country from the threatened danger, and all these eloquent voices would have been raised, and from your brains would have come those sparks of eloquent fire that would have set a conflagration in the hearts of all the Democrats in

this country and brought them with burning haste to your side to save this country from so monstrous and so cruel a fate.

Oh, but says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*:

If the Chinese character is inferior to the European, its inferiority lies in the fact that the Chinaman's whole philosophy of life disinclines him to change or to energetic action. He is industrious, but his industry is nominally along the lines marked out by authority and tradition. He is brave, but his courage does not naturally seek an outlet in war.

He ought to be brought here and sainted as the original pacifist of the world. That nation should be enshrined and made almost an object of adoration by those who now preach the doctrine of pacifism.

He is brave, but his courage does not naturally seek an outlet in war. The jealously exclusive Empire into which in the nineteenth century the nations of the West forced an entrance was organized for peace; the arts of war had been all but forgotten, and soldiers of all classes were the most despised.

The highest class in China (since the republic) is that forming the civil service.

And yet, Mr. President, this race, with this history and with these attributes, the Senators from California and other Senators from the West would exclude from our shores. They would say to the individual Chinaman, "You can not have citizenship in this country even though your vote shall be only as one to many thousands of Americans"; but they will consent, and they will insist, that China shall cast her vote as a member of the league of nations and that that vote shall be counted as equal to the vote of the United States!

JAPAN.

Now I come to Japan. Japan has a population of 56,860,000. Over 90 per cent of them belong to the dark or mixed races. It is said that the percentage of illiteracy is low, but so little is known regarding large parts of the Empire that the statement must be open to question. Nevertheless and notwithstanding all that may be claimed to the contrary, this country is not only a monarchy but it is a monarchy exercising a tyranny over both mind and body. For more than 2,000 years the reigning house of Japan has held undisputed sway. The recent slight changes in this Government are merely on the surface. The Japanese citizen remains unchanged.

I quote from *The World's Peoples*, by Keane, page 170, for the year 1908:

In Japan Shintoism, as reformed in recent times and almost merged in the Bushidoism now affected by the educated classes, has become much more a political institution than a religious system. The Kami-No-Michi, or "The Way of the Gods" or "Spirits," is inseparably bound up with the political interests of the reigning dynasty sprung from the sun goddess; hence its three cardinal virtues are:

1. Honor the Kami (spirits), of whom the Emperor is the chief representative on earth.
2. Revere him as thy sovereign.
3. Obey his will, and that is the only duty of man.

There is a fine representative to help establish a world democracy and to make the world safe for democracy!

There is no moral code—

Continues this author—

and loyal expositors have declared that the Mikado's will is the supreme or only test of right and wrong.

I now desire to put two questions, and to two classes of American Senators.

First. How will Senators from the South who represent States which have contended that the white race alone is fit to control the destiny of the States of America, who have, therefore, contended that the black man of the South should not be permitted to cast his individual ballot to be counted against the ballot of the white man—how can they contend that Liberia, Haiti, and other negro or seminero nations should be permitted to sit at the council table of the world and each cast a vote equal to that of the United States?

NEGRO QUESTION AND THE LEAGUE.

And, Senators, you will have that question to answer to your people; and at that point, to show you that it is a living question and that you are playing with fire, I call your attention to The Crisis, a negro publication, which I understand is a paper of wide influence and power. I read an editorial from the May number:

A league of nations is absolutely necessary to the salvation of the negro race. Unless we have some supernatural power to curb the anti-negro policy of the United States and South Africa, we are doomed eventually to fight for our rights. The proposed internation will have overwhelming influences around it which will oppose the doctrines of "race" antagonism and inferiority. *It will from the beginning recognize negro nations.*

How shrewdly this man had looked into the situation! I venture to say that the majority of the men in this room did not anticipate that truth.

It will from the beginning recognize negro nations. It will be open to the larger influences of civilization and culture which are ineffective in the United States because of the prevailing barbarism of the ruling

classes in the South and their overwhelming political power. What we can not accomplish before the choked conscience of America we have an infinitely better chance to accomplish before the organized public opinion of the world. Peace for us is not simply relief from wars like the past, but relief from the specter of the great war of races, which will be absolutely inevitable unless the selfish nations of white civilization are curbed by a great world congress, in which black and white and yellow sit and speak and act. The refusal to adopt the Japanese race equality amendment is deplorable, but it is an argument for and not against a nation of nations. It is the beginning of a mighty end.

Chew on that quid in your reflective moments, you men of the South!

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator once more?

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

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I wish to inquire of the Senator why he did not protest against Japan participating in the present conference that is settling these great world problems which are of such transcendent importance to this country, and having the same voice there that she will have in any assemblage of the league of nations?

Mr. REED. Because I was not asked my opinion, and was given the same opportunity to protest that the rest of the Senate has been given to advise or consent, which is simply nothing at all.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But if the Senator had been asked whether Japan should be invited to participate in the present peace conference, what would he have said?

Mr. REED. If I had been asked whether Japan was to be invited to take part in the present peace conference with reference to the terms of peace, I would have to say that, as Japan had in some measure helped to win the war, she would have the right to have something to say about making the terms of peace, but I would insist upon that being settled as a separate proposition. I am not discussing the question of the terms of peace; I am discussing the question of a world government which it is proposed to set up, in which Japan shall be the equal of the United States, and now, even before that covenant comes here in an official form, I am protesting.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understand the Senator is protesting against Japan's occupying a position in the world's conference of the league of nations and dealing with questions of vital importance to the United States. I am calling attention to the fact that she is even to-day doing so without any protest upon the part of anybody, and, of course, nobody could in decency protest against her action.

Mr. REED. Of course, if Japan, going in with England, France, and Italy, becomes a participant in a war against Germany and Austria and Turkey, and if thereafter we enter that war, we must recognize that fact that when the war comes to be settled all of the belligerents must be consulted. But that is not the question I am discussing. I am discussing the question of making arrangements by which a part of the governing control of the United States shall be permanently transferred to an international tribunal, on which Japan shall have a right to cast a vote concerning the destiny of this country. Against that I protest and shall continue to protest. The monstrous thing that is presented is this: We went into this war because our sovereignty had been offended against by Germany, because Germany had sunk some of our ships and had killed some of our people; and now it is proposed, although we went in for that reason, that we shall end by setting up a European, Asiatic, and African tribunal, in which we shall be a minority stockholder, and shall give to it the right to control the fate of America.

Mr. POINDEXTER and Mr. WALSH of Montana addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment in order that I may finish my inquiry?

Mr. REED. Perhaps I had better yield first to the Senator from Montana in order that he may finish his inquiry, and then I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely desire to inquire of the Senator if he can now anticipate any question that may be presented to the league of nations of more profound importance than the question that drove us into the present war, the issues of which we invite Japan to join with us in solving?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; I can imagine any number of questions. The question that drove us into this war was an infringement of our rights upon the sea. What has that got to do with the future government of America? Of course, we have helped whip Germany, and, having helped whip Germany, it stands to reason that the representatives of the United States will make Germany admit her wrong, make Germany agree not to do it any

more, and we ought to make her pay, and pay dearly, for every ship she sank, for every life that she took, and for every insult she put upon us.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can not refrain from suggesting, in answer to the question of the Senator from Montana, that there is nothing that Japan can do at the peace conference, however important those matters are, that will have any validity whatever upon the United States until it receives the approval of the Senate of the United States, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring. Furthermore, I apprehend that neither the Senator from Missouri nor any opponent of the league of nations has any objection to conferring and negotiating upon international matters in the future with Japan, with China, or even with the King of Hedjaz. Nobody proposes that we shall live an isolated life. What we object to is changing the principle upon which these negotiations are being carried on at the present time, in which each nation reserves its independence to ratify or to reject, and to submit the future of the world, as the Senator from Missouri has just said, to the decision of a different entity, from whom there lies no appeal.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, recurring to my topic—and I wish to say that I should have concluded this address in less than 60 minutes if I had not been interrupted, and I am very near the close—I now ask the second question:

"RACIAL EQUALITY."

How can the representatives of the Pacific Coast States who have contended and who still contend that neither Japanese nor Chinamen shall land upon their shores, and that both are totally unfit for citizenship, justify their conduct if they now vote that in the council of the world Japan and China shall each cast a vote equal to the vote of the United States? That question will have to be answered. It is a living question.

The shrewdest diplomats, next to those of England, appearing at the council now being held in Europe are unquestionably the representatives of Japan. Compared with them, I think that the American diplomat who is over there—well, they had better not be compared; let it go at that. It will be remembered that the representative of Japan offered an amendment declaring for racial equality. I read now from the New York Times Current History for May:

The commission rejected an amendment offered by the Japanese delegates for incorporating into the preamble a declaration on "racial equality." It failed to receive unanimous approval, and hence was declared rejected—

Evidently there were a good many votes for it when it only failed because the vote was not unanimous.

The official statement on this subject, issued April 12, said:

At a meeting of the league of nations commission on Friday, April 11, the Japanese delegation proposed an amendment to the preamble of the covenant as follows: To insert after the words "by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations" an additional clause, to read: "By the indorsement of the principle of the equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals."

The amendment was admirably presented by Baron Makino. In the course of his speech he emphasized the great desire of the Japanese Government and of the Japanese people that such a principle be recognized in the covenant. His argument was supported with great force by Viscount Chinda.

A discussion followed, in which practically all of the members of the commission participated. The discussion was marked by breadth of thought, free and sympathetic exchange of opinion, and a complete appreciation by the members of the commission of the difficulties which lay in the way of either accepting or rejecting the amendment.

The commission was impressed by the justice of the Japanese claim and by the spirit in which it was presented.

This is the official report, à la Creel, although I believe he did not make it; somebody else was issuing official reports; then,

Therefore the commission was reluctantly unable to give to the amendment that unanimous approval which is necessary for its adoption.

My understanding is that at the last the one man who stood out was the representative of Australia. Australia has declared for a white man's government from the first, and to all intents and purposes they do not allow anybody else to emigrate there. The Japanese amendment came that near to being adopted.

The Japanese delegates announced that they reserved the right to bring the amendment before a plenary session of the conference. The chief opposition to the Japanese proposal came from Australia.

So, my friends from California and from the great golden States of the West, you have a proposition to confront. When you organize this league of nations, and when that league of nations undertakes to pass upon this question of race equality, remember that, according to this official report, substantially the only opposition at the last to a declaration of race equality came from Mr. Hughes, representing Australia; and remember that pressure can be easily brought to bear upon Great Britain by Japan because of their mutual interests in the Orient and

because of their intertreaties which bind them together; and remember that apparently our own representatives did not protest. Now, I put it to you, how can you stand, how dare you stand and protest against Chinese and Japanese landing on your shores, or Chinese and Japanese children having places in your schools beside your children, while at the same time you vote to erect a league of nations that will have the right—the members of the league itself will have the right—to determine whether a question in dispute between Japan and the United States is likely to create war, and thereupon to assume jurisdiction to settle that question? How dare you vote to erect a league of nations and confer this power upon Japan and China, give them the backing of a majority of other races not of the white blood, and yet ask the people of this country to stand by you in your action to exclude Chinese and Japanese from your own sacred soil?

Mr. President, I call the attention of men of the South and men of the West, and I am making my argument to them because these particular questions presented to-day have a particular interest to them. I put the question to you to remember history. You may think you can control the votes of these black races, and maybe they can be controlled upon many important questions, but you will never control them on a question where race equality is to be decided. Men of the South, you raised the negro; you lived among him; and notwithstanding all that has been said, you have always claimed, and claimed with much truth, that you were his friend and his benefactor, although you were his master. You love to boast that the old negro stayed at home with your wife or your mother while the husband or the father stood on the red line of battle. You love to tell how to-day they are still faithful in their hearts; and yet there has never been a time when you could control their votes, and why? Because they said that the Republican Party had given them equality in the world; that the Republican Party had declared that they were men; and no amount of persuasion, nothing short of something that looked very much like sheer force, has been evoked to keep them from the polls. The best you have been able to do is to keep them from having the vote; and I warn you, men of the South, I warn you that when the representatives of these black races—and they are in the majority—assemble around the council table of the league of nations, when the question of race equality comes up, they will vote for race equality, because it has been the dream of their hearts; it has been the hope of their souls; it has been the star toward which they have turned their longing eyes; it has been the one great desire of soul and body and heart and all that makes them men.

My countrymen, I say to you that if you erect a league of nations you will have taken a long step toward the declaration that America's doors shall be opened to the people of all lands; and we shall have Chinese and Japanese knocking at our gates, and along with them all of the races of Asia and of Africa that desire to enter the golden gates of this great country. We may laugh at it to-day, but it is before us. The controversy is on, and it will be seized by this body of men and will be employed by them.

So I pause now to challenge your thought only to this one thing:

Why is it that these nations, most of them the dregs of civilization, most of them the most backward of men, some of them to-day held in a condition of peace by the arms of other nations—why is it that they are selected to sit about a council board that is to determine the creed of the world and that is to evolve something superior to American civilization itself?

I tell you, sirs, that I will never consent to take one single atom of power from the American citizen and confer that power upon the representative of any of these backward races, upon the representative of any of these yellow or brown races. *More than that, I will not consent to grant any governing power over this country to any race of men on earth save the citizens of our own Republic.* He who shall do it under the pretext that as he does it he does nothing, and yet claiming at the same time that he has produced some organization here that is to change the world, who talks with a forked tongue, who looks in two directions at the same time, who assumes contrary positions—the man who does that, and by that kind of policy fastens on this country a league that shall in any respect control this country, betrays the Republic, betrays its Constitution, betrays his oath of office, betrays the cause of justice and the cause of man.

Permit me to say in conclusion that I have no prejudice against races because of color. I do not want to stir against them any rancor or distrust. I speak as I have only because we are presented with a great practical question. In face of such a situation we can not afford to disregard the facts of history. We must not close our eyes to the stern realities of life.

I hope these races may advance, but I am unwilling they shall control the destiny of the United States now or hereafter.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, with the understanding that it will not displace the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution that I send to the desk. I do not think anybody will object to it. It will not take any time for its consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. It is with the understanding that it does not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment to make a statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a motion pending before the Senate. The resolution of the Senator from New York can be taken up only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALDER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. I am sure no one will object. It deals with the treatment of the Jews in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia, and is a matter in which they are particularly interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas object?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection. I merely desire to make an announcement. Inasmuch as it is expected that the Senate will adjourn in a few moments, I desire to state that if the business of the Senate permits, on the next meeting day, which will be Wednesday, according to the order heretofore adopted, I shall address the Senate on the subject of a league of nations.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] offers a resolution, which will be read by the Secretary.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that innocent men, women, and children, particularly of the Jewish faith, are being outraged and massacred in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of State be, and hereby is, directed to communicate such reports to the President of the United States, and request that he confer with the representatives at the peace conference of the countries where such outrages and massacres are reported to occur and inform them that this body and the American people generally deeply deplore acts of violence and cruelty committed against men, women, and children because of race or religion.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. At the request of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I move that the Senate adjourn, the adjournment being until Wednesday next under the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 28, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 26, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Ever blessed God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the day that has passed, with its quiet, rest, reflections, and spiritual uplift.

May it strengthen us for the duties of the hour, that with clean minds and pure hearts we may do whatever we are called to do willingly, conscientiously, efficiently. After the similitude of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 24, 1919, was read and approved.

SWARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. OLNEY, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. CALDWELL, are both here and desire to have the oath of office administered to them.

Mr. OLNEY and Mr. CALDWELL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Accounts, this May 26, 1919.

BEN JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a correction of the Journal and the RECORD as of May 19, with respect to House joint resolution No. 2, terminating Government supervision, possession, control, and operation of the telephone and telegraph systems of the United States, introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON]. According to the Journal and the RECORD this resolution was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. As I understand it, according to the notation on the resolution itself, reference was made to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The resolution contained an indorsement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] for reference to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. In the printing of that day's proceedings the resolution was printed as having been referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, notwithstanding the official reference to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask, therefore, that the correction of the RECORD and the Journal be made in accordance with the direction of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction of the Journal and the RECORD will be made in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin—

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there is no dispute about that. At the proper time in the order of business, after the approval of the Journal, I desire to make a motion in respect to this.

The SPEAKER. That will always be in order, but this is not a question of a change of reference.

Mr. GARRETT. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the resolution to which he refers was in fact officially referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ESCH. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT. But through some error in delivering it by messenger, it went to the wrong committee?

Mr. ESCH. It was printed in the RECORD and in the Journal as having been referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. GARRETT. This is not in fact a change of reference?

Mr. ESCH. No.

The SPEAKER. It is a mere correction of the Journal and the RECORD. Without objection, the correction will be made in the Journal and in the RECORD, in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand now, the next business in order is the correction of the reference of public bills.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that reference of House joint resolution No. 2, terminating Government supervision, possession, control, and operation of the telephone and telegraph systems of the United States, be taken from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and given to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and in that connection I ask unanimous consent to make a short statement with reference to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves a change of reference and asks unanimous consent for how long?

Mr. STEENERSON. Three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Three minutes in which to discuss it. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the gentleman from Minnesota does not do this by direction of the committee.

Mr. STEENERSON. No; the rules do not require that.

Mr. GARRETT. The minority members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads have not been elected, but will be within the next hour. Would not the gentleman be willing to withhold his motion until to-morrow?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

ADDITIONAL MEMBER ON COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without changing the rules, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] be permitted to sit this session as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather unusual request. I am not certain that ordinarily we would be justified in granting it. We have already agreed to an increase in the

Committee on Ways and Means in order to accommodate the minority. This is a request not to increase the Committee on Foreign Affairs but to allow the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] to serve as an additional member of the committee during this session. As I said, this is an unusual request, but after consideration it has been deemed proper to grant this courtesy to the minority, as I understand it will be very helpful to them in making up their organization.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I nominate the gentlemen named in the list which I now send to the desk as additional members of the committees therein named, and move their election.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to have the list read at this time?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think we should save time and do what was done the other day in the election of the majority members—dispense with the reading of the list and have it printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if the members of the Committee on Ways and Means are included in that list?

Mr. GARNER. No; they were elected the other day.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the authority of the gentleman from Texas for that statement.

Mr. GARNER. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; the gentleman from Texas does not need to have authority; it is in the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to question the gentleman's statement to this extent: I do not think the gentleman from North Carolina is a member of the Ways and Means Committee—

Mr. GARNER. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the next morning showed the gentleman was appointed. The gentleman did not happen to be in the Hall when it was done—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then it is all right. I wanted to see that a motion for the gentleman's election was offered if it had not been.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the list of these names be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the list of names be printed in the RECORD without reading. Are there any other nominations? If not, the question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

The list is as follows:

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

Accounts: Ewin L. Davis, of Tennessee.
Agriculture: Asbury F. Lever, of South Carolina; Gordon Lee, of Georgia; Ezekiel S. Candler, of Mississippi; J. Thomas Heflin, of Alabama; Thomas L. Rubey, of Missouri; James Young, of Texas; Henderson M. Jacobay, of Arkansas; John V. Leshner, of Pennsylvania.

Alcoholic Liquor Traffic: William D. Upshaw, of Georgia; John C. Box, of Texas.

Banking and Currency: Michael F. Phelan, of Massachusetts; Joe H. Eagle, of Texas; Otis Wingo, of Arkansas; Henry B. Steagall, of Alabama; James A. Hamill, of New Jersey; Augustine Lonergan, of Connecticut; Charles H. Brand, of Georgia; W. F. Stevenson, of South Carolina.

Census: James B. Aswell, of Louisiana; Joshua W. Alexander, of Missouri; William W. Larsen, of Georgia; Hubert D. Stephens, of Mississippi; Carlos Bee, of Texas; Samuel M. Brinson, of North Carolina.

Claims: Henry B. Steagall, of Alabama; Milton A. Romjue, of Missouri; John J. Babka, of Ohio; Richard F. McKiniry, of New York; Carlos Bee, of Texas; Daniel F. Minahan, of New Jersey.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: William A. Ashbrook, of Ohio; William L. Nelson, of Missouri; Daniel F. Minahan, of New Jersey; Samuel M. Brinson, of North Carolina; Clay S. Briggs, of Texas; Hugh S. Hersman, of California.

District of Columbia: Ben Johnson, of Kentucky; Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Milton A. Romjue, of Missouri; Herbert J. Drane, of Florida; James W. Overstreet, of Georgia; Carville D. Benson, of Maryland; James P. Woods, of Virginia; Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas.

Education: William J. Sears, of Florida; William B. Bankhead, of Alabama; Charles H. Brand, of Georgia; Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas; Jerome F. Donovan, of New York; William L. Nelson, of Missouri.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: William W. Rucker, of Missouri; Fred H. Dominick, of South Carolina; William C. Wright, of Georgia; Herbert C. Pell, of New York; Clay Stone Briggs, of Texas.

Elections No. 1: Joe H. Eagle, of Texas; Leonidas D. Robinson, of North Carolina.

Elections No. 2: James W. Overstreet, of Georgia; John B. Johnston, of New York; Cornelius J. McGlenon, of New Jersey.

Elections No. 3: Joseph Rowan, of New York; C. B. Hudspeth, of Texas.

Enrolled Bills: Ladislas Lazaro, of Louisiana; Samuel C. Major, of Missouri; Paul B. Johnson, of Mississippi.

Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture: Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina; David H. Kincheloe, of Kentucky.

Expenditures in the Department of Commerce: Michael F. Phelan, of Massachusetts; William E. Cleary, of New York.

Expenditures in the Interior Department: William F. Stevenson, of South Carolina; E. B. Howard, of Oklahoma.

Expenditures in the Department of Justice: James P. Buchanan, of Texas; James M. Mead, of New York.

Expenditures in the Department of Labor: John J. Casey, of Pennsylvania; James V. Ganly, of New York.

Expenditures in the Navy Department: Rufus Hardy, of Texas; Thomas H. Cullen, of New York.

Expenditures in the Post Office Department: Benjamin G. Humphreys, of Mississippi; James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina.

Expenditures in the State Department: Clement Brumbaugh, of Ohio; William S. Goodwin, of Arkansas.

Expenditures in the Treasury Department: Charles D. Carter, of Oklahoma.

Expenditures in the War Department: Jerome F. Donovan, of New York; Henry D. Flood, of Virginia.

Expenditures on Public Buildings: Ezekiel S. Candler, of Mississippi; Herbert C. Pell, of New York.

Flood Control: Benjamin G. Humphreys, of Mississippi; Riley J. Wilson, of Louisiana; Joseph J. Mansfield, of Texas; Guy E. Campbell, of Pennsylvania; William T. Bland, of Missouri; John McDuffie, of Alabama.

Foreign Affairs: Henry D. Flood, of Virginia; J. Charles Linthicum, of Maryland; William S. Goodwin, of Arkansas; Charles M. Stedman, of North Carolina; Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois; J. Willard Ragsdale, of South Carolina; George Huddleston, of Alabama; Tom Connally, of Texas; Thomas F. Smith, of New York.

Immigration and Naturalization: Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois; John E. Raker, of California; Riley J. Wilson, of Louisiana; Benjamin F. Welty, of Ohio; Joseph B. Thompson, of Oklahoma; John C. Box, of Texas.

Indian Affairs: Charles D. Carter, of Oklahoma; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; William J. Sears, of Florida; John N. Tillman, of Arkansas; Harry L. Gandy, of South Dakota; William W. Hastings, of Oklahoma; Zebulon V. Weaver, of North Carolina; Richard F. McKiniry, of New York.

Industrial Arts and Expositions: Isaac R. Sherwood, of Ohio; Martin L. Davey, of Ohio; James V. Ganly of New York; Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas; William C. Lankford, of Georgia; John H. Smithwick, of Florida.

Insular Affairs: Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee; Clement Brumbaugh, of Ohio; Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Tom D. McKeown, of Oklahoma; Leonidas D. Robinson, of North Carolina; Marvin Jones, of Texas; Fred H. Dominick, of South Carolina; Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Thetus W. Sims, of Tennessee; Frank E. Doremus, of Michigan; Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Sam Rayburn, of Texas; Andrew J. Montague, of Virginia; Charles P. Coady, of Maryland; Arthur G. Dewalt, of Pennsylvania; Jared Y. Sanders, of Louisiana.

Invalid Pensions: Isaac R. Sherwood, of Ohio; William A. Ashbrook, of Ohio; Augustine Lonergan, of Connecticut; David J. O'Connell, of New York; William T. Bland, of Missouri; Patrick McLane, of Pennsylvania.

Irrigation of Arid Lands: Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Milton H. Welling, of Utah; Charles R. Evans, of Nevada; Claude Hudspeth, of Texas.

Judiciary: Edwin Y. Webb, of North Carolina; Robert Y. Thomas, Jr., of Kentucky; William L. Igoe, of Missouri; Warren Gard, of Ohio; Richard S. Whaley, of South Carolina; Thaddeus H. Caraway, of Arkansas; M. M. Neely, of West Virginia; Henry J. Steele, of Pennsylvania.

Labor: James P. Maher, of New York; Walter A. Watson, of Virginia; John J. Casey, of Pennsylvania; W. L. Cars, of Minnesota; Samuel C. Major, of Missouri.

Library: Ben Johnson, of Kentucky; Joseph B. Thompson, of Oklahoma.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Joshua W. Alexander, of Missouri; Rufus Hardy, of Texas; Edward W. Saunders, of Virginia; Peter J. Dooling, of New York; Ladislas Lazaro, of Louisiana; David H. Kincheloe, of Kentucky; William B. Bankhead, of Alabama; William C. Wright, of Georgia.

Military Affairs: S. Hubert Dent, Jr., of Alabama; William J. Fields, of Kentucky; Percy E. Quin, of Mississippi; Chas. Pope Caldwell, of New York; James W. Wise, of Georgia; Richard Olney, of Massachusetts; Thomas W. Harrison, of Virginia; Hubert F. Fisher, of Tennessee.

Mines and Mining: Otis Wingo, of Arkansas; Milton H. Welling, of Utah; Peter J. Dooling, of New York; Lucien W. Parrish, of Texas; Everett B. Howard, of Oklahoma.

Naval Affairs: Lemuel P. Padgett, of Tennessee; Daniel J. Riordan, of New York; William B. Oliver, of Alabama; William W. Venable, of Mississippi; Carl Vinson, of Georgia; William Kettner, of California; William A. Ayres, of Kansas; Samuel J. Nicholls, of South Carolina.

Patents: Guy E. Campbell, of Pennsylvania; John B. Johnston, of New York; John J. Babka, of Ohio; E. L. Davis, of Tennessee; John McDuffie, of Alabama.

Pensions: James V. McClinton, of Oklahoma; James M. Mead, of New York; Cornelius A. McGinnon, of New Jersey; John H. Wilson, of Pennsylvania; John H. Smithwick, of Florida; William D. Upshaw, of Georgia; William L. Cars, of Minnesota.

Post Office and Post Roads: John A. Moon, of Tennessee; Thomas M. Bell, of Georgia; Arthur B. Rouse, of Kentucky; Fred L. Blackmon, of Alabama; Edward E. Holland, of Virginia; Eugene Black, of Texas; Charles H. Randall, of California; Henry M. Goldfogel, of New York.

Printing: James V. McClinton, of Oklahoma.

Public Buildings and Grounds: Frank Clark, of Florida; James C. Cantrell, of Kentucky; Fran Park, of Georgia; William W. Rucker, of Missouri; Joseph J. Mansfield, of Texas; Anthony J. Griffin, of New York; John W. Rainey, of Illinois; John F. Fitzgerald, of Massachusetts.

Public Lands: Scott Ferris, of Oklahoma; Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado; John E. Raker, of California; James H. Mays, of Utah; John N. Tillman, of Arkansas; Harry L. Gandy, of South Dakota; Hugh S. Hersman, of California; Paul B. Johnson, of Mississippi.

Railways and Canals: Benjamin F. Welty, of Ohio; Herbert J. Drane, of Florida; Hannibal L. Godwin, of North Carolina; Thomas H. Cullen, of New York; Patrick McLane, of Pennsylvania.

Reform in the Civil Service: Hannibal L. Godwin, of North Carolina; James A. Hamill, of New Jersey; Charles A. Mooney, of Ohio; Joseph Rowan, of New York.

Revision of the Laws: John T. Watkins, of Louisiana; James H. Mays, of Utah; Edward B. Almon, of Alabama; Anthony J. Griffin, of New York.

Rivers and Harbors: John H. Small, of North Carolina; Charles F. Booher, of Missouri; Thomas Gallagher, of Illinois; Thomas J. Scully, of New Jersey; Samuel M. Taylor, of Arkansas; H. Garland Dupré, of Louisiana; Clarence F. Lea, of California; William E. Cleary, of New York.

Roads: Edward W. Saunders, of Virginia; Hubert D. Stephens, of Mississippi; Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina; James B. Aswell, of Louisiana; Edward B. Almon, of Alabama; Marvin Jones, of Texas; William W. Larsen, of Georgia; Tom D. McKeown, of Oklahoma.

Territories: John T. Watkins, of Louisiana; Scott Ferris, of Oklahoma; Walter A. Watson, of Virginia; Zebulon V. Weaver, of North Carolina; William C. Lankford, of Georgia; Martin L. Davey, of Ohio.

War Claims: Frank Clark, of Florida; John W. Rainey, of Illinois; Charles A. Mooney, of Ohio; John H. Wilson, of Pennsylvania; David J. O'Connell, of New York.

Woman Suffrage: John E. Raker, of California; Frank Clark, of Florida; James H. Mays, of Utah; Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the consideration of the concurrent resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk—House concurrent resolution 4.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 4.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That an edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress be prepared and published, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, as provided for in section 73 of the printing act approved January 12, 1895, and that the sum of \$800 be paid for preparing, compiling, and indexing said edition, one-half of the said sum to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

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

P. W. BURNETT.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration for the privileged resolution which I now send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 47.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to P. W. Burnett, clerk to the late Hon. John L. Burnett, a Representative in Congress from Alabama at the time of his death, May 13, 1919, the sum of \$166.66, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Representative in Congress.

Mr. IRELAND. I move its adoption.

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

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House further for the consideration of the privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 30.

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, allowed an assistant clerk at a salary at the rate of \$1,500 per annum from May 17, 1919, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise authorized by law.

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

LEAVE TO SIT, COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 53.

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or such subcommittees as it may designate, shall have leave to sit during sessions of the House during the Sixty-sixth Congress and during the recesses of that Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. I move its adoption.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

THANKS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, our country and its people were during the period of the last Congress, in cooperation with the gallant Allies, engaged to the utmost of their strength and energy and patriotic purpose in prosecuting a great war against the evil designs and sinister purposes of military autocracy. The active hostilities of that great war are happily ended, and our gallant forces are returning from their service, wherever duty called, to their homes or home stations. In this situation it is fitting that the Congress should, at an appropriate time and in a proper form, express its thanks and appreciation to those who served and those who sacrificed in connection with this great enterprise of righteous war. With this thought in mind, and at the suggestion of several Members, I have drawn a resolution designed to accomplish this purpose, and reminded of the near approach of Memorial Day it seemed that this would be an appropriate time for the consideration and adoption of such a resolution as has been suggested. I therefore present a resolution to be read for the information of the House, and shall ask unanimous consent that Friday, May 30, Memorial Day, be set aside for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) tendering the thanks of Congress to those who served, or gave others to the service of, the country in the Great War.

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served in the armed forces of the United States in the war against the Imperial German Government, and who, through their patriotic sacrifice, steadfast fidelity, brilliant strategy, and courageous service, secured a victorious peace, gave to the world a new insight into the high ideals and lofty purposes of America, and left to future generations a splendid heritage of heroic achievement and noble devotion to duty. That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to those who served in the various auxiliary forces, whose humane and benevolent work at home and on the field of battle contributed so greatly to the comfort and support of our valiant warriors. That the thanks of Congress are hereby extended to the mothers, wives, and relatives, who, patriotic and uncomplaining, gave their nearest and their dearest in the hour of the Nation's need, and its deep and heartfelt sympathy to those disabled in the great struggle. That Congress reverently expresses its profound appreciation of the sublime act of those who made the supreme sacrifice by giving their lives for their country and their country's cause.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion? I notice the gentleman refers to those who were in the war against the Imperial German Government. Now, America declared war against the Austrian Government, and some of our soldiers were fighting only against the Austrians in that war.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I have given a good deal of thought to the preparation of the resolution and have asked the opinion of many Members of the House in regard to it. I have no pride of opinion in regard to the phraseology other than I have tried to express the fact and view of those with whom I have conferred. I suppose that no resolution could possibly be drawn that might not be drawn in some different phraseology. The title of the resolution refers to it as the "Great War."

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield. Of course, the resolution will be subject to amendment when taken up.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman does not propose to take it up to-day?

Mr. MONDELL. I propose to ask that Friday be set apart for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield further? I have a kind of hazy remembrance that the rule of the House in reference to the thanks of Congress being given to individuals gives them the privilege of the floor, and I was a little anxious—

Mr. MONDELL. This does not give anyone the privileges of the floor.

Mr. GARNER. But the very fact that the thanks of Congress are extended to an individual under the rules of the House gives him the privilege of the floor of the House, and if you extend this to a great mass of people, including mothers, and so forth, I am not so certain but that, under the rules of the House—

Mr. MONDELL. I have sought the advice of those who ought to know and have experience in regard to the matter and they all say under the phraseology of the resolution it would not have that effect.

Mr. GARNER. I have no objection to the resolution at all, but merely wanted to direct the gentleman's attention to that so as to be sure.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I think the gentleman from Texas will find the rule says that is where the thanks are extended by name, and the names are not mentioned here.

Mr. MONDELL. Just a moment. There were many suggestions with regard to the form of this resolution. Some suggested the naming of certain officers. It seemed to those I conferred with on both sides that a general resolution, which would express the thanks and appreciation of the Congress, would be the best possible form.

Mr. TILSON. I suggest that just one phrase would accomplish what I am trying to, and that is "the Imperial German Government and its allies."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there would be serious objection to adding after the words "Imperial German Government" the words "and its allies."

The SPEAKER. It is simply before the House for information. It can be changed.

Mr. MONDELL. The suggestion is to modify my resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit? I apprehend there will be—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think I am sometimes rather too good-natured. After thinking about it further, I am not inclined to modify the resolution. The resolution was given very careful consideration. It may not be just what it ought to be. If it is not, let us amend it when we take it up on Friday.

Mr. GARRETT. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. Doubtless there will be a large number of Members who will desire time upon this resolution. Has the gentleman thought anything about the question of time?

Mr. MONDELL. My thought was we would consume the entire day or such portion of the day as the Members desire to speak, and, of course, give equal opportunity to Members on either side.

Mr. GARRETT. I had this thought in mind, if the gentleman will permit: Of course, under the rules of the House, any man who got the privilege of the floor would be entitled to an hour. Would it not be better to have an agreement made now or then—possibly then would be better—for the control of the time, or let us understand in advance that, despite the general rules of the House, Members would be limited to a certain time?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, what I have in mind is this, that Members would have in mind the fact that the resolution would be taken up Friday. Between now and then we could have a consultation and on Friday a formal agreement as to what should be done in the matter of time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming that this resolution be in order for next Friday?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the printing of the resolution in the usual form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], according to a previous order of the House, is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, to properly tell the story of America's participation in the war would require more time than I have been allotted to speak and a man of greater ability to present the case, for it is a marvelous story and one which will live in history.

UNPREPAREDNESS AND EXPENDITURES.

At the declaration of war we had no Army and our Navy was not at its best, and the details of organizing an army and a navy to meet the problems that confronted us was a gigantic task. The size of the task will be better realized when it is understood that the total expenditures of the National Government during the first 143 years of the Republic amounted to but twenty-five and one-half billions of dollars, while the appropriations made during the period of the war have aggregated fifty-one and one-half billions.

On July 1, 1913, the country's interest-bearing obligations amounted to nine hundred and sixty-five millions, the annual interest charge on which was twenty-two and three-quarters millions. The interest-bearing debt, exclusive of certificates of indebtedness, when the obligations due to the settlement of unfinished contracts are met, will be in the neighborhood of \$30,000,000,000 and the annual interest and sinking-fund charges will amount to approximately one and one-half billions.

The annual cost of maintaining the Government before 1913 was about one and one-half billion dollars. It is fair to assume that the annual cost for some years to come will not be less than five billions. From this it will be seen that the war has imposed financial obligations upon the American people which will call for a high rate of taxation.

AMERICA'S OBLIGATIONS.

In assuming the obligations imposed upon the country by the declaration of war the people were called upon to make many sacrifices. They made these sacrifices cheerfully. The

draft law as originally passed and afterwards modified brought responses from 23,000,000 men of military age, who registered a vow to serve their country. Young men everywhere throughout the Nation responded to the call to arms. Mothers, fathers, sisters, and wives encouraged the men of their families who were fit for military service to join the colors. The result was that 3,700,000 men wore the uniform of the Army, 200,000 the uniform of the Marines, and 560,000 the uniform of the Navy, or a total of 4,500,000. Of this number, the Army sent 1,949,000 men abroad; 22,500 were on the sea when the armistice was signed, and 1,390,000 of the men abroad were engaged in the conflict; 288,000 of them were either killed or wounded; 70,000 of them were buried in the soil of France; 1,700,000 were held in American camps awaiting orders; but whether in camps in America or on the battle fronts in France, they were all ready to respond to any emergency and are equally entitled to credit, no matter where they served. They were the most wonderful aggregation of men that ever assembled under a flag. That is conceded on every hand. They are entitled to the undying gratitude of the American people. Their patriotism will be recorded in the history of their country. Distinguished-service medals and crosses have been given to many men for deeds of valor on the fields of battle during the war. Many of these have been given to men who were wounded, and others have been wounded to whom no insignia of distinction has been given; but what greater insignia of distinction can a man have than that which marks the scar of battle on his person?

Most of these wounded men are at home; they are happy to be alive, and we are happy to have them with us. They have earned America's gratitude. Every time I meet one of these men I feel like walking up and kissing him [applause], but he wants none of that; he is proud of his participation in the war, and he wants no hero worship; no American does.

The American people, however, should not forget these men; they should be the special wards of the Nation to the extent that it may be necessary. They should never be permitted to want, and all Americans in and out of the Government should see that they are held in grateful remembrance. They carry the story of their achievements and their sacrifices with them, and it should be the pleasure, to say nothing of the duty, of every American to make them feel proud of the sacrifices they have made for their country.

The Navy should not be forgotten. It was the outpost that protected the Nation against invasion from the beginning of the war to the end. Its achievements are deserving of high praise. In the lonely vigil of the night, on the trackless oceans, the men of the Navy protected the ships carrying our troops abroad. They braved every danger; they sought no publicity. Their only purpose was the achievement of the object of the Nation and the protection of its honor and the preservation of its institutions. They did it well. They have earned the confidence of the American people. The Nation is prouder of its Navy to-day than ever before. [Applause.]

The achievements of the Marine Corps will always stand out in bold relief in the history of the great conflict. No man was admitted to the Marine Corps unless he passed a standard test of physical and mental superiority, and all of these qualifications were manifest in the battle line, where they crowned America with glory at Chateau-Thierry, in which battle 5,700 were killed or wounded out of a force of 8,000.

When one comes in contact with the men who composed the Army and Navy and Marine Corps one must admit that a higher order of intelligence existed in these three great bodies of men than ever existed in such organizations before. The college man, the artisan, the mechanic, the engineer, the electrician, the chemist, the teamster, the doctor, the lawyer, the merchant, the laborer, all joined together in a single whole. The rich, the poor, the high, the low met on the same level, slept in the same bunks, ate at the same mess, drilled in the same line, and fought in the same battles. They learned to know each other as they never had the opportunity to do before. They are coming back better men, with a better understanding, a broader vision, and a more comprehensive view of the Nation and its needs; they will be glad to tell the story of liberty under the American flag as they never knew it before. They will take part, as they should, in the Nation's activities; they will help to stabilize conditions here, and they will give the people the benefit of their experience abroad. They understand now, better than ever before, what America means, what government of the people consists of, and they will be glad to use this understanding to good advantage for the improvement of the Nation.

AMERICA'S WOMEN.

We must not forget the sacrifices made by the women of the Nation—the Red Cross nurse, the Army nurse, the Salvation Army, and the Young Women's Christian Association workers—

who braved every danger of war to relieve the suffering of the soldiers. Wonderful women these, unselfish, devoted, kind-hearted, painstaking, and generous. They, too, have earned the right of participation in shaping the future policies of the Nation. [Applause.]

ORGANIZATION.

To assemble this vast Army and Navy and Marine Corps was an enormous task; to supply them with clothing, equipment, and food a problem more difficult than one can imagine. Expenditures on a large scale were necessary to meet the needs of the hour and to prepare our men and women for the duties which the obligation they took imposed upon them. Ships were required, transportation facilities needed. It was necessary to transform factories of all kinds from peace to war activities. The genius of the American business man with his faculty for organization was brought into play. Many of them unselfishly gave their time and devoted themselves to the task. Thirty per cent of our people were engaged in war activities. Nearly all of the people were interested. There were but few who were not loyal, and of this few but an infinitesimal number publicly expressed their disloyalty. A marvelous exhibition of unity was displayed throughout the country. A determination on the part of the people to give all they had in men and money for success was manifest everywhere. The Congress acted upon an American basis. There was no question of politics involved in any action Congress took. [Applause.] The demands of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy were promptly met. Everything that he suggested as a means of winning the war was granted without hesitation. Money was placed at his disposal without question; he was given more power than that of any other ruler in all the world. In the exercise of that power and the expenditure of the fabulous sums of money appropriated it is but natural that mistakes should have been made. Money was wasted, extravagance was indulged in, contracts were let at figures frequently unjustified, but no complaint was heard from any source. The winning of the war was the only object to which everyone who believed in the Nation's welfare applied himself. Efficiency was not always obtained; economies were rarely ever practiced. We had to have ships to carry supplies. They were built or requisitioned at extravagant prices, but no one found fault. Ships that cost before the war \$75 a ton were built at as high as \$200 a ton. The powder factories, the ordnance works, the aeroplane plants, all were erected without thought of cost, and sometimes without results. It is said that America never had on the battle line a fieldpiece that was made in an American ordnance factory, except a few guns from the battleships; that no American shell had ever been fired in the course of the war, though vast sums of money were expended in the erection of plants for the creation of ordnance. Our Army had the guns, however, with which to fight the battles in which they were engaged. French 75's and 155's were supplied to the Army in quantity sufficient to meet every need, and our soldiers who were abroad gave high praise to the efficiency of these guns.

Among the things the President wanted was the railroads, which he took over. During the Government operation of the roads they collected \$1,100,000,000 the first year from excess freight and passenger charges. Congress gave them \$500,000,000 as a revolving fund to operate the roads, and they lost \$250,000,000 besides, and are asking for \$750,000,000 now, and probably a billion; they will collect another \$1,100,000,000 in additional freight and passenger rates, and will probably lose another \$250,000,000, which will make \$3,950,000,000, which is more on that one extravagance than it has cost to run the Government for a similar period in times of peace.

And they are before the Committee on Appropriations to-day asking \$1,200,000,000 as a working fund. These two items together will make \$2,300,000,000; and if we assume it will all be expended at the end of the next year's administration of the railroads, we will have before us the spectacle of Government operation of railroads for a period of two years at a cost of \$4,150,000,000 to the American people, or \$1,150,000,000 more in the single item of operating the railroads by the Government of the United States than it cost for an equal period to run every activity of the Government before the war began.

They also took the wires over, and the first thing the Postmaster General did was to issue an order to require a \$15 installation fee for a telephone. This was finally reduced so that now it ranges from \$3.50 to \$7, depending on conditions.

And I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that prior to the Government control and operation no installation charge was ever made by any telephone company in the United States.

On the pretense of reducing the long-distance telephone rate he fixed a person to person call, which, compared with the

person to person call prior to the Government control of the wires, is 144 per cent higher; and he also increased the commercial telegraph rates 20 per cent.

IMPRESSIONS OF EUROPEAN CONDITIONS.

It was my privilege to go abroad to visit the battle fields after the close of the Congress on the 4th of March. I was accorded every facility possible to see what had been done over there. I saw the wonderful achievements of the allied forces, and paid particular attention to what had been done by the American Army. I visited Brest and examined the camp against which so much criticism has been leveled. I was happy to find that although in its early stages the camp was untenable it had been so improved that no complaint was found from any source. Gen. Butler, of the marines, son of the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [applause], who was in direct command of the camp, which has facilities for 81,000 men, had cleaned it up and made it habitable and attractive. He in company with 5,000 men went to Brest and carried the lumber on their backs to the camp to make the sidewalks necessary to admit of passage through the grounds. When one remembers that it rains every day at Brest, and that the surface is a turf-like soil for a depth of 3 feet, underlaid with clay, it will readily be seen how impossible it was to meet the demands of the hour until sidewalks and tent floors had been laid. I ate with the troops at the camp. Their food was good and the sleeping quarters clean. Facilities are afforded for the feeding of 50,000 men within an hour. Nothing more is to be desired.

I next visited Le Mans, a replacement camp, where provisions are made for 260,000 men. In the early stages of the war Le Mans was used as a replacement camp entirely. From this camp units at the front were supplied with men to take the place of those who had fallen in battle. To-day Le Mans is used as a delousing camp, a reequipment camp, and troops are sent there to be cleaned up before starting back home.

From Le Mans my trip led me to Tours, the headquarters of the service of supplies, a wonderful organization in charge of the movement of all supplies for the Army. Here I found a great salvage plant, in which the worn-out clothing was being restored to usefulness; shoes were made over, rubber boots repaired, dirty clothes fumigated, everything that could be done to utilize the fragments of what had been at one time complete equipment. At this point I visited the German prison camp, where America has a number of its prisoners of war. I found them well housed, well fed, well treated, and with every indication that they were happy.

From Tours I went to Gierves, where I found a marvelous storage plant, with 180 warehouses, aggregating four and one-half million feet of storage space, with 145 miles of railroad track, 135 locomotives, and a billion dollars' worth of supplies on hand—everything from a needle to an anchor. Here also was a great cold-storage plant, in which all the meat supplied to the Army was kept for shipment to the front. Twenty-one thousand men were employed in loading and unloading and storing supplies. The supplies were sent forward from here to Is-sur-Tel, the great distributing point, from which all the supplies to every front were sent. The remarkable thing about Gierves is that it was not known to the Germans as the great supply center of the American Army, and it is said that never at any time from the beginning of the war to the end was any request made for any supplies from this depot which did not meet with prompt response.

The feeding and equipping of an army such as America had abroad requires the supervision of men experienced in the movement of supplies, and, from what I could see, the service of supplies of the American Army in France was beyond criticism.

I next visited Bourges, the service of records headquarters. At this place there are 5,000 men and women employed, 600 of them being English girls, keeping the records of each soldier, recording each one wounded, each death, each burial, and every assignment and order, general or special. In fact, a complete record of every man from the time he reaches France until he leaves for home or is buried is kept here. The record of undelivered mail is kept here also, and every effort possible seems to be made to learn the location of missing soldiers, so that the mail can be delivered to them, but I am impressed with the fact that the mail section of the records division had not accomplished the purpose for which it was organized. That in a large measure, I think, was due to the fact that our system of organizing units of the Army made it impossible to trace the men. For example, in the English Army when a man enlists he enlists for a given regiment, and his mail address is always with that regiment; no matter where he may be his regiment knows where he is. Our organization gave a man no particular mail address. He was not necessarily attached to any special

unit. He was sent to a replacement camp, no matter what unit he went over with, and when any division at the front needed men they were sent from the replacement camps to a unit where men were wounded, and they lost their identity as a member of the unit to which they originally belonged. If he was wounded or went to a hospital, his record went to the hospital with him, so that his company commander was unable to trace where he was, and the people at the hospital were interested in his recovery more than they were in his receiving his mail, so altogether the delivery of mail was a mixed-up mess.

Much complaint was made among the people of America that the casualties were not reported more promptly after the casualties occurred. Upon inquiry from the Records Division I found that when men were wounded and sent back from the front they were taken to a field hospital and from there to a hospital farther back from the line, and finally taken to a base hospital, where it frequently happened that the base hospital was so full that another transfer had to be made and the record would not show the transfer. And then, too, it was not always possible to tell who was killed or wounded; there were so many missing after each battle. They had to be traced, and that took a long time. Others were shot so badly that identification was impossible, but I was convinced that every effort possible was being made not only to make prompt reports but to identify every missing man, and I was told by the commander of the Records Division that he had traced the entire missing forces of the American Army with the exception of 4,351, and the next day when I saw him that had been reduced to 4,124, while the records of the French Army show 280,000 missing and the English 174,000 missing. Our people hope to reduce our number of missing to 2,000.

Mr. FERRIS. Would it disturb the gentleman if I interrupted him for information purely?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely not.

Mr. FERRIS. Are they marking those graves so that they can be identified and visited by their friends later on?

Mr. MADDEN. They are establishing national cemeteries now, and I will get to that.

My next visit was to the battle fields, and in this I was fortunate in having accompany me Capt. Harper, who was in command of a battery of the Seventeenth Artillery at the Battle of Belleau Wood. He directed the fire of 1,040 shells in a single day into the village of Vaux. Capt. Harper had made a special study of every battle and knew all of the troops engaged in each and the strategic importance of each engagement.

The first battle field visited was Belleau Wood. Belleau Wood is a small forest one mile long and a half mile wide, standing on the top of a large hill. It was in the possession of the Germans until the American troops drove the Germans out and took possession of the wood and the town of Vaux, which was entirely destroyed by American shell fire.

The day's trip took us to Chateau-Thierry, where the Americans won such undying glory and turned the tide of the war. [Applause.] It was at this point where the French were retreating as the Americans came in, and the French officer who was in command of the retreating forces said to the American commander who was leading his forces into the battle, "We are retreating; why are you going in?" To which the American commander replied, "That is why we are going in." [Applause.]

After leaving Chateau-Thierry I visited Romaine. On that day they were establishing a national cemetery for American soldiers. This will answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. The cemetery was all laid out, trenches were dug, and several companies of soldiers with motor trucks were removing bodies from the cemeteries in that vicinity and placing them in easkets and taking them to the national cemetery, where they are to lie in soil to be owned by America, and there forever to be enshrined in the hearts of the American people.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman mind telling the House how the graves in the temporary cemeteries are marked?

Mr. MADDEN. The graves are marked with wooden crosses, marked in each case with the name of the man and the regiment to which he belonged, and also with the identification tag of the man who is buried there. Of course, the identification tag might possibly be removed, and thereby the identity of the man might be lost; but the records of the office at Bourges are so complete that the burial place of every soldier who is known and the grave in which he lies is recorded. I saw the heart-rending scene where they were taking up 26,000 bodies of our boys. It was possible, even while I was there, to identify the men. But they were buried in shallow trenches, with their uniforms on,

not covered with a casket of any kind, and their bodies had become so heavy on account of their clothing being saturated with rain that four husky soldiers were required, while they were carrying a single body on a stretcher, to rest every 25 feet. The work that these men are doing is one of the works which I believe is a distinguished service, and if any class of men who have served in the American Army deserve and should receive the distinguished-service cross those men who are doing this work of love certainly ought to receive it. [Applause.]

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ROSE. Only recently I received a letter from a relative of mine, in which it is said that the remains of Pvt. Deckert had been removed and buried in an isolated grave at an isolated cemetery, the name of which I do not now recall to mind. Does it mean that that grave can not be located?

Mr. MADDEN. No. As one travels over the area over which the battles were fought, individual graves can be seen here and there and everywhere, but every grave is properly marked. Sometimes you find a grave on the roadside, on a hill made by dirt taken from a ditch alongside the road. Next you will see a grave or two in the distance, a few feet away from the roadside. Then you may see a hundred graves, all surrounded by a fence. But the national cemetery at Romagne is to care for 26,000 American soldiers who were killed in that locality, and I believe that to-day every one of these soldiers is buried there. There is to be another American cemetery established in France, but just where I do not know.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. It might be interesting if the gentleman from Illinois would compare the care that has been shown in the collection and preservation of the bodies of American soldiers, as contrasted with that of the French and British.

Mr. MADDEN. I would be delighted to do that, but I do not think that I am qualified to do it. But I will say one thing, that the men who had the care of the men who were killed in the American Army have seen to it that their comrades' graves were marked so that they can be located.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some American families are very anxious to have the remains of their soldier dead returned for Christian burial in the United States. Does the gentleman know whether any effort was made to preserve these remains so that they can be brought back?

Mr. MADDEN. It would not have been possible to preserve the remains. They had to be buried as quickly as possible on the battle field. It was not possible to have scientifically prepared the bodies, and my judgment is that no family in America should ever ask to have the body of their boy brought back, because they are to be laid away in the cemeteries to be owned by the Nation, devoted to the care of the remains of those who fell in the country's defense, and properly cared for in a shrine to which every American can go. My own judgment is that it would not be possible to bring them back with any degree of satisfaction, and I hope the American people will not attempt to have them brought back.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some efforts have been made to bring them back, and it has been intimated that the War Department, in due course, will permit the return of certain of those remains.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand the War Department will bring back the remains of any boy whose parents or friends wish to have them brought back; but if my advice were sought, I would say what I have already said, "Do not do it."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I do not want to disturb the line of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MADDEN. It will not disturb me at all.

Mr. GARD. Is the gentleman going to advise us about the burial of American soldiers in German territory and at Brest?

Mr. MADDEN. All the bodies of American soldiers buried anywhere in France are to be removed to the cemeteries to be established.

Mr. GARD. I refer particularly to the army of occupation and as to the men who died on German soil.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not familiar with any plans of the War Department as to that, but I might assume that any men who have died in the occupied territory on German soil will either be removed to America or removed to the national cemeteries located in France.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MADDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I might perhaps supplement the statement of the gentleman by a statement of fact, that I was advised that the bodies of such soldiers as had died in hospitals were embalmed and placed in caskets.

Mr. MADDEN. That may be true.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That is true. Only such men as died on the battle field were buried at once.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. There was a movement to create what they called a field of honor, in which it was proposed that the Government was to accept the gift of something like a thousand acres of land in some beautiful portion of France, and then a hall of records to be erected and a chapel, and the bodies be brought there and buried in the one place, and the Government represented there by a garrison, and later on the place to be beautified and embellished from funds to be received by the Government through donations.

Mr. MADDEN. That would be a beautiful idea, and one which I think ought to receive serious consideration; and since we have established these national cemeteries, to which all the bodies that we have been able to find have been removed, it would be very easy to move them from these cemeteries to the central place indicated by the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to have the gentleman's indorsement of that, because I think it is becoming a matter of nation-wide interest.

Mr. MADDEN. It ought to.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Do I understand my colleague to say that he thinks it would be a good idea to have the bodies of these patriots turned over to some individual corporation or society, rather than taken care of by the Government?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. The plan contemplated in the question of the gentleman from Ohio is based on the understanding that it is to be a cemetery owned by the Government of the United States. Nobody would think for a moment of the other plan.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. SNYDER. Is it the understanding that the men are to be buried over there if their parents desire to have them brought back to this country?

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that it will be the policy of the War Department to have every soldier brought back whose parents wish it.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. How many of these national cemeteries are contemplated?

Mr. MADDEN. Only two are in contemplation now, one at Romagne, where 26,000 American soldiers are to be buried. Undoubtedly they are already buried there, because the trenches were all dug when I was there. It is a beautifully situated spot on the side of a hill, and large enough to provide for all of the 26,000 bodies that were being removed from the adjoining cemeteries.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Has that land been donated by the French Government?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know exactly how it was acquired, whether it was donated or purchased, but we are to own it.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. Does not the gentleman think it would be wise for our Government to make known to the parents of all these dead soldiers what the Government intends to do, so that the parents can come to a definite understanding about it?

Mr. MADDEN. I think it would be a good idea. I think it might be wise for the Secretary of War to send broadcast some kind of a communication indicating what the policy of the Government is to be with respect to the care of the remains of the soldiers who are buried in France.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. I have the impression that that has been done already.

Mr. MADDEN. Perhaps it has.

Mr. GARRETT. I know it has been done in some instances.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I asked the gentleman that question a little while ago, and I am not sure whether he indicated that the War Department had announced a policy.

Mr. MADDEN. I said the Secretary of War said that in any case where the family requested it he would have the bodies brought back.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But not at the present time?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at the present time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would give to every soldier's family the right to have the soldier's body returned in case it was desired?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That ought to be done.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I should like to know whether he knows if the War Department has determined that it will enter immediately upon the work of returning the bodies of soldiers who were killed in France?

Mr. MADDEN. My understanding is that the Secretary of War has indicated that he would rather not begin the returning of the bodies until the war is over and the proclamation of peace has been issued.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I want to say that I have had several cases where I have made requests for the return of bodies, and that was the advice I received.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that information is correct.

Mr. LUFKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LUFKIN. I want to say that this morning I called at the War Department on an errand of that kind, and they told me that this matter will not be taken up until the American Army has practically all been returned to this country.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I thought.

ARGONNE-MEUSE BATTLE.

It seems proper at this point to call special attention to the achievements of the American Army at the Argonne-Meuse Battle. Here the difficulties seemed to be so insurmountable as to make success doubtful, but a visit to the place confirms one in the opinion that every American has—that no soldier is the equal of the American soldier. [Applause.]

The Argonne Forest is about 30 miles long and 3 miles wide, with a great canyon about 1,000 feet wide running through the center, north and south. On one side of this canyon the French were entrenched in dugouts all up and down the mountain side. The Germans were entrenched on the other side of the canyon. The two armies were able to look each other in the face. They remained in this position for four years, with an occasional skirmish from the front-line trenches, with no indication that any effort would be made by either side to come out and fight for supremacy.

The difficulty of the situation was such that one is obliged to conclude that if the demands of the Allies, that the American Army should be merged with the French and English and Italian Armies and fight without identity, had not been denied the war would still be on if Germany had not succeeded in mastering the allied forces; and it is to the persistent and determined efforts of Gen. Pershing that the credit is due for insisting that an all-American army, fighting as an American army, should be organized, and to the fact that the American Army was assigned to the Argonne Forest sector, in my judgment, is due the successful conclusion of the war. When one stops to think that the French and German Armies remained in their trenches within a thousand feet of each other in the Argonne region for four years and that the American Army marched through the ravine between the two armies and drove the Germans into the open across the valley through which the Meuse River runs, into an open plain where Gen. Pershing assembled 810,000 American soldiers of all armies facing the Germans on the hills across the valley, which seemed impregnable; that the American engineers succeeded in building bridges across the Meuse River for the passage of the American soldiers, which were finished under the heaviest possible German shell fire from the amphitheater of hills that surrounded the plain, it will be seen that without the valor and daring and genius and courage of the Americans and the matchless leadership of their commander in chief the war would still be on if the Allies were able to hold out at all. At Mount Faucon, one of the high points of vantage on this battle ground, was the headquarters of the Crown Prince of Germany.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The general statement that the gentleman made a short time ago, that the American troops turned the tide, is fully borne out in an article I read in the afternoon paper purporting to be a statement by Gen. Ludendorff:

France and England would have been beaten in 1918 but for America.

And then he goes on to say:

America proved to be the deciding military factor in the war.

Gen. Ludendorff ought to know something about it.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and I made up my own mind about it from my own observations as I went over the different battle fields.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Ohio has stated what the afternoon paper says Gen. Ludendorff said. In the same paper they say that Field Marshal Haig, in his final report of the war, failed to give America any credit for the winning of the war.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and that is the reason I am telling the truth, because nobody over there will.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. What was the character of the Argonne Forest?

Mr. MADDEN. The forest is dense; it is mountainous, broken by the ravine I spoke of, with almost perpendicular sides looking over into the valley, 5 miles across, and surrounded by an amphitheater of hills several miles in length down the valley.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. I have visited the Argonne Forest, and I am very much interested in the gentleman's address. Will not the gentleman tell the House something about the German dugouts, so that Members who have not had an opportunity of visiting there may know what the American boys were up against?

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield before he answers the gentleman from Louisiana, I want to say that Mrs. Humphrey Ward, a famous writer, has called attention to the fact that we lost only a few thousand, while the British loss was many, and France about 2,000,000, making a contrast that is perhaps not unfriendly, but indicates that they are being twitted a little by our statement that we turned the tide. Will not the gentleman indicate by something, of a statement of the short time we were in action, in contrast with the long time that they were in action, that there was a much briefer service on our part than on theirs?

Mr. MADDEN. I will answer both gentlemen. I wish to say that on the side of these hills, known as the Argonne Forest, the sides of the hills across the valley formed an amphitheater like the galleries around this Chamber; that myriads of Germans were in concrete dugouts and in tunnels, from which it would seem that it was impossible that they could be dislodged.

When the Seventy-seventh Division of the American Army marched up through the highway that passes along the ravine in the Argonne Forest, in the face of the fortified positions of the Germans, they did the most daring thing that was ever done by men anywhere in all the world. [Applause.] There was the Crown Prince of Germany in his concrete building at Montfaucon, the highest point of vantage from which he could see every movement along the battle field for miles. The Crown Prince of Bavaria was in a dugout in palatial form, with tunnels 50 feet below the ground to save him in case of danger. There was every facility for the protection of the German Army, and yet, realizing the importance of the situation, and knowing that the American Army was not expected to succeed, Gen. Pershing took the bull by the horns, ordered the movement, and successfully carried it out; he lined his men up on the valley, with the guns of the Germans pointed toward 810,000 men from the hillsides everywhere, with thousands of our men killed and wounded as they marched forward, and yet they marched up the hillsides of that amphitheater with the guns playing on them from every side, front and back, and drove the Germans into retreat. No greater losses were made in any other army than were made by the American Army for the period that we were engaged in active conflict. And we would have been engaged in an active conflict longer if it had not been for the courage, valor, bravery, and daring of our men. It was only because they had that that we were not in it longer; it was because they had it that the war ended. [Applause.]

I realize that we are not going to get any credit from any of the Allies abroad for what we did. They were glad to have us there when we went; but they did not want us to be conspicuous, except to fill the gaps, under their direction, and I am proud that Gen. Pershing had the courage to insist that we should fight as Americans under the command of Americans.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, is it possible that the nations that have received so much from us as did the Allies would give us no credit for what we did—would show us no gratitude at all?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think they have.

Mr. FERRIS. What philosophy can create such a condition of mind as that?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know; I am going to try to tell about it a little as I go along, if the gentleman will excuse me for a moment. My time is about out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed until he concludes his address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MADDEN. I shall get through very quickly if they do not ask me too many questions.

Mr. SNYDER. The Indian Affairs appropriation bill is supposed to come on when the gentleman finishes. I will concede a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. MADDEN. Thirty minutes would do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I renew my request for unanimous consent, that the gentleman may be permitted to conclude his address, which will take 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may be allowed to conclude his address, not to exceed 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I was saying that at Montfaucon, one of the highest points of vantage on this battle field, was situated the Crown Prince of Germany. I happened to be able to get into his tower of observation, and while there I was glad to know that it was no longer the headquarters of the Crown Prince of Germany.

It was Gen. Pershing's idea that the only way to win the war was by driving the Germans into the open, and any person can see that it was impossible to win the war with the armies entrenched in dugouts and living in tunnels away from each other, although looking into each other's faces, and his daring and dash and initiative and the daring and dash and initiative and the valor and courage of the American soldier, who willingly faced the cannon from every hillside that surrounded the valley, must indicate that nothing in the world except such initiative could have won the war.

It was not my good fortune to go into Belgium, and hence I am unable to say what the conditions there are, but the towns that were destroyed in northern France were of no real consequence; they had no place of any general importance in the make-up of the country in which they were situated. The country itself, except here and there a fertile valley, is barren land, hills, rocks, and sand, not even good for grazing, and so I consider the damage done by the destruction of these towns is nothing that needs to be called to the special attention of the world for the purpose of reconstruction. The people who originally lived in these towns have gone to other places, settled down in the community life of the place to which they have gone, and they have no desire to return, as there is nothing to attract them to the places where they formerly lived. The good people here who are raising millions of dollars to reconstruct these towns are, in my judgment, mistaken. The French people themselves are not anxious to have the towns reconstructed. They do not want anybody's help.

If you get an idea that you want to reconstruct a town where nobody lives, without any population to go into the town, it would seem to be foolish to spend the money for that purpose. Most of the towns were located at places where they ought not to have been located. They never had any purpose in life, and the destruction of the town itself is of really no consequence whatever in the domestic policy of the French people.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he refers in that statement to such towns as Bapaume and Arras?

Mr. MADDEN. I was not there.

Mr. HASTINGS. Those are French towns.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman refer to Rheims and Montdidier and such places?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But Rheims is a place of 90,000 people, and another town, Noyon, was much destroyed.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no use of quarreling about it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I can not understand the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman ought to. I have said it plainly enough.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the coal lands at Lens.

Mr. MADDEN. That is all at the other end.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is right in France; it is the Pittsburgh of France.

Mr. MADDEN. It is on the border.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did the gentleman go over the battle fields north of Paris—Cambrai, in the northern part of France?

Mr. MADDEN. I started at Belleau Woods.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is east of Paris. Did the gentleman visit those cities north of Paris, along the British battle front?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I just went on the American battle fronts.

Mr. HASTINGS. That includes Lens and Arras and those towns. Does the gentleman mean that some of them are entirely destroyed, where there were 25,000 population before the war?

Mr. MADDEN. I know; but there is nobody who wants the towns. I have talked with the French people about that, and they say that if anybody wants to go there they will build a house; but you do not want to build a whole town for one family, and as the families go there and their needs are shown, they will build a sufficient number of houses to take care of them.

GEN. PERSHING.

I suppose Gen. Pershing could easily have made himself popular with the Army. He probably could have made himself more popular with the American people than he has if he had organized a better system for the delivery of mails; but his only thought was victory. He devoted himself as a soldier to the task and he played no favorites, as far as I am able to see. He selected the men who, in his judgment, were best qualified to meet the demands of the case at the time. Generals were dismissed ruthlessly, others were promoted to take their places. Courage, initiative, and military genius seemed to be the object of his campaign; he was not looking for the plaudits of the people. I believe he is every inch a soldier. I believe he was eminently qualified for the task he had to perform. I think he performed it with wisdom and courage and unselfish devotion. I think that history will give him the place to which he is entitled when the story of his achievements are written by men of unprejudiced minds.

BATTLE OF VERDUN.

The battle of Verdun is one that ought not to be forgotten. It cost more lives perhaps than any other battle in the war.

Verdun is surrounded by great mountains leading out onto an expansive plain. These mountains are fortified almost impregnably, and how the Germans ever expected to take Verdun is more than I can see. In the city of Verdun there is a great citadel, known as the fort of Verdun. It is the back of the mountain facing the plain. In this citadel there is room for 10,000 reserve soldiers. They slept there and fed them and held them there during all the battle. Those who were brought in from the front to rest were taken to the citadel and new forces were supplied from the citadel to the front. The road leading from Verdun to Bar le Duc was the only road through which supplies could come. It is known as the Holy Road. The German and French lost an equal number of men in the battle of Verdun, and it is said that about 1,000,000 men on both sides were killed or wounded.

It looked to me as if there was no strategic importance to Verdun. I think the French themselves say that, but there is a feeling of reverence that surrounds Verdun which made the French fight to retain it. They said it helped to maintain the morale of the army.

My trip led me up to Diekirch, where the Thirty-third Division was quartered. There I met Gen. Pershing and Gen. Bell and witnessed the review of the Thirty-third Division. This is an all-Illinois division. It was a wonderful sight. This division had the right of the line in the Argonne-Meuse battle and captured the hill across the river from the forest.

And I want to tell the story of what I saw on the day of this review. There were 107 men lined up to receive the distinguished-service medal and the distinguished-service cross. I walked down the line and I saw Gen. Pershing as he presented these trophies of war, if that is what you want to call them, and here is what I saw: One sergeant was given the distinguished-service medal for killing 10 Germans. Another one was given the distinguished-service medal for killing 2 Germans and capturing 30. Another man was given the distinguished-service cross for killing 8 Germans, taking all the machine guns of a battery, and taking all the officers of the battery. Another man, a private, was given the distinguished-service cross for volunteering and successfully delivering messages through the enemy's line after five of his comrades had been killed in the attempt. Another man was given the service cross for going 400 yards in advance of his command and drawing the Germans' gunfire in order that they might be able to locate the guns. These are the acts of bravery that we can not realize; we can not realize what prompts men to do such service as this, and one had to be proud when one witnessed the recognition which they received for the service. I tell you it made tears

come to my eyes as I witnessed the presentation of these distinguished-service medals and crosses, and America has thousands and thousands of boys who have done similar things to this in the Army on the other side. [Applause.]

Luxemburg is a beautiful country and I am happy that the Germans did not decide to stand in Luxemburg and fight the allied forces, for it seems to me that with the hills pointing in every direction the troops would not be able to pass successfully through the valleys surrounded by these hills.

From Luxemburg I went into Germany, and the thing that impressed me most there was the uniformly well-dressed people. I could not help but reach the conclusion when I saw the hundreds of Germans on the highways, in the fields, in the villages, and in the cities so uniformly well dressed that they must be in a good physical condition, because people do not generally put all they have on their backs.

Germany seemed to be at work. The fields were well tilled; great piles of chemical fertilizer were to be found everywhere, and it was being spread upon the fields. The mills were smoking. The merchants seemed to be prosperous, and though the value of the mark had fallen to 8½ cents men seemed to be able to find employment everywhere at from 8 to 12 marks a day.

It is said that Germany is short on fats, but in the country districts I think it is fair to say that they are not short of food.

Another thing that impressed me in Germany is the feeling they have that we are not in possession of Germany as victors, but that we are there under contract; that the armistice was signed as the result of the President's 14-point suggestion.

The mills in France are idle; the machinery has been taken out by the Germans, but in eastern and western and southern France, which has not been occupied by the armies in battle, everything seems prosperous and beautiful, and that territory through which the war was fought being of less value no special harm was done except in the coal regions where the French coal was taken, and the loss of life and the terrible suffering.

One thing in France that is noticeable is that every woman is in mourning, and the thing to be most regretted, as I see it, is the unfriendly feeling which exists between the French people and the American soldier. It does not apply merely to the rank and file of the American soldier but it reaches up.

I noticed as I went through eastern, western, and southern France where our armies never fought that we have a large number of soldiers building roads, and I wondered whether it was entirely proper that our men should be employed in these activities, but in conversation with Gen. Pershing he assured me that it was necessary under our arrangement with France to maintain the roads wherever our armies were quartered, because we were using them extensively with our trucks to move supplies. My criticism of this is not so much on the fact that we are building the roads as that we are buying the material from the French people at a price just double what we pay in this country for the same material.

PEACE TERMS.

It seems a pity that the peace terms have not been agreed upon earlier. The failure to agree upon terms of peace leaves a measure of doubt in the minds of all the people abroad. I am more convinced than ever after a survey of the situation there that America should stand aloof from entangling alliances abroad. [Applause on Republican side.] It can not be possible for our people to mingle with the people there on equal terms; they do not think like we do. Invisible border lines make it necessary for them to be watchful of each other. They are suspicious, one nation of another. You can not make them otherwise. Their internal political hatreds are unchangeable.

The league of nations, which provides, if it should be approved here, for the defense of the political integrity and geographical boundaries of foreign nations, is likely to lead us into trouble. The nations that are being created are now at war with each other. They are likely to continue. They are fighting every day. It seems impossible to reconcile the conditions between them. The Balkan States must be recognized as the cradle of wars. Nobody could maintain their political integrity or geographical boundaries. My judgment is that America should not send her boys on to foreign territory for the purpose of maintaining their political integrity. [Applause on Republican side.] If the occasion arises when the honor of America is at stake at any time in the future, we should defend that honor in any way that is necessary [applause], and for that purpose I favor the universal military training of the youth of the land [applause], and the maintenance of a reserve from among the officers who went into this war from civil life, and the creation of a Navy commensurate with the importance of America's commerce, with but a reasonably small Army.

I think if we had fought the war to a finish and had not agreed upon an armistice upon promises that seem to be misunderstood, the peace terms would have been agreed to before this, and the world's safety would have been assured.

I am for peace, everlasting peace, and I think the way to obtain it, so far as America is concerned, is to meet our obligations as Americans by being prepared to meet the issue when it arises, and to refrain from entering into any contract in advance that will almost certainly involve us in war. [Applause.]

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. In the temporary absence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MADDEN). The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2480, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, before commencing the reading, I desire to say that there were several typographical errors found in the bill which we were reading on Saturday. We have had made what is known as a star print, and anyone who is reading the bill which we had on Saturday had better get a new one from the desk, as the Clerk will read from the new print of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that would be in order.

Mr. SNYDER. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk when he begins to read, read from the new print.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may read from the new print of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that would be a little irregular, to enact part of this bill from one print and part from another, and I trust the gentleman will not press his request. The star print, of course, will be all right to use to refer to—

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, there were several slight typographical errors only, which have been corrected, and no corrections have been made in any part of the bill which we have gone by; it is only in the part which we are about to read now, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection and let us go ahead.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I shall not object, but the gentleman is liable to get into deep water on that.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LONGWORTH). The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph last read, which was reserved at the time it was read on Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserved a point of order on the paragraph read.

Mr. WALSH. Beginning line 22, page 46, and ending line 4, page 48.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman understands that the section is subject to the point of order, and he does not desire to argue the point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts make the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

Sec. 18. For expenses of administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, and the compensation of employees, \$205,000, of which sum \$20,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress by the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes, through the Secretary of the Interior, showing in detail the expenditure of all moneys appropriated by this provision: *Provided further*, That hereafter no part of said appropriation shall be used in forwarding the undisputed claims to be paid from individual moneys of restricted allottees, or their heirs, or in forwarding uncontested agricultural and mineral leases made by individual restricted Indian allottees, or their heirs, to the Secretary of the Interior for approval, but all such undisputed claims or uncontested leases now required to be approved under existing law by the Secretary of the

Interior shall be paid, approved, rejected, or disapproved by the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma: *Provided, however.* That any party aggrieved by any decision or order of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma may appeal from the same to the Secretary of the Interior within 30 days from the date of said decision or order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order on the proviso beginning in line 13, on page 48, to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. CARTER. The item is clearly subject to the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question but it is subject to the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the words, "of which sum \$20,000 shall be immediately available," lines 8 and 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to the chairman not to make that point of order. The superintendent down there has very earnestly appealed to the members of the Oklahoma delegation, Mr. CARTER, and myself for this appropriation, and it was incorporated in an amendment offered in the Senate before. The truth about the matter is they had 265 employees in this office. A great many of them have had to be laid off and others will be unless this appropriation is passed before June 30, which will disorganize the force, and I sincerely trust the gentleman will not make that point of order against it, so that if this appropriation is finally passed it may properly be approved by, say, June 15, so that they will have 15 days between that time and June 30.

At any rate, if the appropriation is made, and it passes both Houses, and the superintendent down there knows that it is going to be available, he will make his arrangements accordingly. They have appealed to the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs and to the Oklahoma delegation in the most urgent manner, asking that this appropriation be made immediately available. And let me say now to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it was upon my motion, as the chairman of the committee will remember, in the committee, that these "immediately availables," generally speaking, were cut out from this bill before. And I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that these appropriations, generally speaking, ought not to be made immediately available. But I appeal to him that in this particular case this money ought to be immediately available. A good many of those clerks now have been laid off, because they have not sufficient funds with which to pay them.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; I will be pleased to do so.

Mr. SNYDER. Do I understand that simply if we pass this amendment here and leave the funds immediately available, they can immediately resume expenditure of the funds? Does not this bill have to be signed by the President?

Mr. HASTINGS. It has to be signed.

Mr. SNYDER. There is not any possibility of the President's signing this bill before the 1st of July.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think so. That is the hope, anyway, and if not, it does not hurt anything.

Here is what I want to say: That if this bill passes both Houses and the superintendent there has assurance that the President is going to sign it, he can make arrangements with his employees who are laid off to come back at some future day and go to work some 10 or 12 days before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. WALSH. Of course when this measure was considered in the House last January the same sum was sought to be made immediately available. I think it was in January, if I mistake not, and it was sought to have \$20,000 immediately available then. Now, this measure will certainly not become a law until some time next month, and they certainly will not need \$20,000 to be immediately available at that time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think that is a larger sum than is absolutely necessary to be made available before June 30, but it will not hurt anything. I thought some money ought to be available, but I would not know just the exact amount to state in the bill in lieu of the \$20,000.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit me, this language was stricken out by the committee, and we did not press it on the floor of the House. That was placed in in the Senate afterwards, and we agreed to it in conference.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the urgency of the situation, but I do not think by this sort of legislation upon an appropriation bill we ought to encourage—I do not know as it is misuse of public appropriations—but we ought to see to it that the various superintendents and bureaus and divisions of the Indian Office, in view of the enormous increase which we are making in these various items, confine themselves to the amount in this proviso. I do not believe, in view of the lateness of the passage of this bill and the short time that will intervene between the time when the entire sum will be available, we should differentiate between any of these items and make part of them immediately available, or any small proportion of them. That is the chief reason I am objecting to making it immediately available. If this is left in here we will undoubtedly have strong arguments brought to bear in the next Indian appropriation bill why part of this appropriation and others should be immediately available. And I therefore insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, has the Chair disposed of the point of order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair sustained the point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Then I have an amendment I want to offer to the section, if the point of order has been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARTER proposes the following amendment: Page 48, line 13, insert:

*"Provided further, That no part of said appropriation shall be used in forwarding the undisputed claims to be paid from individual moneys of restricted allottees, or their heirs, or in forwarding uncontested agricultural and mineral leases (excluding oil and gas leases) made by individual restricted Indian allottees, or their heirs, to the Secretary of the Interior for approval, but all such undisputed claims or uncontested leases (except oil and gas leases) now required to be approved under existing law by the Secretary of the Interior shall (hereafter) be paid, approved, rejected, or disapproved by the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma: *Provided, however,* That any party aggrieved by any decision or order of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma may appeal from the same to the Secretary of the Interior within 30 days from the date of said decision or order."*

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, I understand that the amendment which the gentleman from Oklahoma now offers puts this matter in a form that is acceptable to him and also to his colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. CARTER. I have discussed it with my colleague, and he says this is acceptable.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is proceeding out of order. I have no objection whatever, so far as I am concerned, that he should proceed out of order, but I think the rules of the House ought to be observed. If the gentleman will ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is that necessary?

Mr. SNYDER. I did not understand the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I move to strike out the last word. It is customary in the committee.

Mr. SNYDER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we are trying to get through with this bill to-night, and I should like very much if we could confine the discussion to matters particularly connected with the measure. And I think if the gentleman does not desire to speak to the measure we will have to object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] the point was brought out, or I believe the doubt was raised in the minds of a good many Members, that when the Meuse-Argonne offensive was commenced a hope was entertained that it would not be successful. I hope that no Member here really has that impression. I certainly desire to make it clear that if the gentleman from Illinois desired to convey such an impression he is entirely in error. Can you imagine an offensive of that magnitude and that importance, vital as it was to the success of this war, to have been commenced with the hope that it would not be successful? The Meuse-Argonne offensive was considered by the General Staff, by Gen. Foch; it was planned and prepared, and the sector of the Meuse-Argonne was given over to the American Army with the confident expectation that they would make good. [Applause.] They did make good.

Now, then, gentlemen, there is another matter which the gentleman from Illinois brought up, which I hope will not leave any erroneous impression, and that is as to the gratitude of the people of our allies. I do not know what the experience of the gentleman from Illinois has been in his short visit to France, but anyone who was there during the war, or anyone who was familiar with conditions, knows that this country has the eternal gratitude of the people of England, France, Belgium, Italy, and the rest of our allies. [Applause.]

Another thing which the gentleman from Illinois mentioned, which I desire to make clear, is the comparative achievements of the various armies of the Allies. The valor and the courage and the ability of the American soldier are so well known that they need not be repeated here day after day. It is unsoldierly, it is un-American, to boast and to make odious comparisons; and when you compare the activities of our Army with those of the armies of our Allies, you must take into consideration the fact that the armies of the Allies had been in those trenches for four years, and that our Army was young, fresh, and in better condition as to morale and strength; and in this connection I will say—and I believe I am voicing the sentiment of every man who took an active part in this war—that the American Army pays tribute to and respects the courage and the valor of the British, the French, the Belgians, and the Italian armies that fought at their side. [Applause.] It seems to me that it comes with rather bad taste for us here on the floor of this House to make any comparison of that kind.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman states that the armies of the Allies had been in the trenches for four years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. As a matter of fact, they would have been there four years more if it had not been for American assistance?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Absolutely; and it is bad taste for us to make any comparisons here on the floor of this House. You will not hear an American soldier do it. That is the impression I wish to leave with you.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. In the face of the widely published statement of Lloyd-George, that America did come into the war in the nick of time and helped to save the day, is it not conceivable that if there is anywhere any jealousy, it is but a petty military jealousy, which is not shared by the real leaders of England and France?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can tell the gentleman that that jealousy does not exist, even in the military service; not even there.

Mr. UPSHAW. Another question—will the gentleman permit it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. Does not the gentleman think that if it was right for America to enter into a league of war with those great nations for her own safety and for the freedom and civilization of the world, would it not be right and sane for America to enter into a league of peace with these same nations and all other nations of like ideals to guarantee the fruits of the victory we have won?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Absolutely; and we are going to do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized to pay to the enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribes, or to their lawful heirs, out of any moneys belonging to said tribes in the United States Treasury, or deposited in any bank or held by any official under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed \$150 per capita, said payment to be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may pre-

scribe: *Provided*, That in cases where such enrolled members, or their heirs, are Indians who by reason of their degree of Indian blood belong to the restricted class, the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, withhold such payments and use the same for the benefit of such restricted Indians: *Provided further*, That the money paid to the enrolled members or their heirs, as provided herein, shall be exempt from any lien for attorneys' fees or other debt contracted prior to the passage of this act, except that the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, within 30 days after the passage of this act, to investigate the claim, not to exceed \$200, growing out of a contract between John Calvin Gray as an enrolled member of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations and Henry W. Blair as attorney, and in case such claim is found to be valid and the contract approved in accordance with existing law, the said Secretary may, in his discretion, apply any amount that may be found due under this paragraph, or from any funds standing to the credit of said John Calvin Gray as an enrolled member of the Choctaw Nation to the payment of such fee, but the amounts due hereunder to other enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations shall not be held in abeyance to this claim, but shall be paid promptly without reference thereto: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use not to exceed \$8,000 out of the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribal funds for the expenses and the compensation of all necessary employees for the distribution of the said per capita payments.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Page 49, line 11, strike out "\$150" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a short statement in regard to that. At the time of the hearings, when this bill was drawn, as gentlemen will note on page 269 of the hearings, it was believed that there was not sufficient money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of both these nations to pay \$200 per capita and retain sufficient necessary funds. There being some question as to whether there would be a sufficient sum, we made the amount \$150. But since then we have been advised that there has been an addition to the amount in the Treasury to the credit of those nations, so that \$200 per capita can be safely paid. And acting on the policy that the committee is endeavoring to follow, of getting the money which belongs to the Indians into the hands of the Indians as quickly as possible, and also to get the Indian free as quickly as possible, we offered that amendment.

In further support of it I desire to have two letters read, received from Commissioner Sells this morning, referring to this matter, and also referring to the matter of making citizens of Indians.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman has those letters read, I hope he will permit me to make a statement.

Mr. SNYDER. I would rather have the letters read first, and then the gentleman can be heard, if he desires.

Mr. CARTER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letters referred to will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioner Sells on March 7 sent the following letter to all reservation superintendents having jurisdiction over allotted Indians. This broadens "the new declaration of policy" so as to include those of one-half Indian blood, and will greatly increase the number of Indians having full control of their property:

"DEAR MR. _____: You are requested to submit to this office at the earliest practicable date a list of all Indians of one-half or less Indian blood who are able-bodied and mentally competent, 21 years of age or over, together with a description of the land allotted to said Indians and the number of the allotment. It is intended to issue patents in fee simple to such Indians. Advise the office at once the approximate date when this list can be furnished.

"Sincerely yours,

"CATO SELLS,
"Commissioner.

"Approved.

"FRANKLIN K. LANE,
"Secretary."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, April 17, 1917.

DECLARATION OF POLICY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

During the past four years the efforts of the administration of Indian affairs have been largely concentrated on the following fundamental activities: The betterment of health conditions of Indians, the suppression of the liquor traffic among them, the improvement of their industrial conditions, the further development of vocational training in their schools, and the protection of the Indians' property. Rapid progress has been made along all these lines, and the work thus reorganized and revitalized will go on with increased energy. With these activities and accomplishments well under way, we are now ready to take the next step in our administrative program.

The time has come for discontinuing guardianship of all competent Indians and giving even closer attention to the incompetent, that they may more speedily achieve competency.

Broadly speaking, a policy of greater liberalism will henceforth prevail in Indian administration, to the end that every Indian, as soon as he has been determined to be as competent to transact his own

business as the average white man, shall be given full control of his property and have all his lands and moneys turned over to him, after which he will no longer be a ward of the Government.

Pursuant to this policy, the following rules shall be observed:

1. Patents in fee: To all able-bodied adult Indians of less than one-half Indian blood there will be given, as far as may be under the law, full and complete control of all their property. Patents in fee shall be issued to all adult Indians of one-half or more Indian blood who may, after careful investigation, be found competent, provided that where deemed advisable patents in fee shall be withheld for not to exceed 40 acres as a home.

Indian students, when they are 21 years of age or over, who complete the full course of instruction in the Government schools, receive diplomas, and have demonstrated competency, will be so declared.

2. Sale of lands: A liberal ruling will be adopted in the matter of passing upon applications for the sale of inherited Indian lands where the applicants retain other lands, and the proceeds are to be used to improve the homesteads or for other equally good purposes. A more liberal ruling than has hitherto prevailed will hereafter be followed with regard to the applications of noncompetent Indians for the sale of their lands where they are old and feeble and need the proceeds for their support.

3. Certificates of competency: The rules which are made to apply in the granting of patents in fee and the sale of lands will be made equally applicable in the matter of issuing certificates of competency.

4. Individual Indian moneys: Indians will be given unrestricted control of all their individual Indian moneys upon issuance of patents in fee or certificates of competency. Strict limitations will not be placed upon the use of funds of the old, the indigent, and the invalid.

5. Pro rata shares—trust funds: As speedily as possible their pro rata shares in tribal trust or other funds shall be paid to all Indians who have been declared competent, unless the legal status of such funds prevents. Where practicable the pro rata shares of incompetent Indians will be withdrawn from the Treasury and placed in banks to their individual credit.

6. Elimination of ineligible pupils from the Government Indian schools: In many of our boarding schools Indian children are being educated at Government expense whose parents are amply able to pay for their education and have public school facilities at or near their homes. Such children shall not hereafter be enrolled in Government Indian schools supported by gratuity appropriations, except on payment of actual per capita cost and transportation.

These rules are hereby made effective, and all Indian Bureau administrative officers at Washington and in the field will be governed accordingly.

This is a new and far-reaching declaration of policy. It means the dawn of a new era in Indian administration. It means that the competent Indian will no longer be treated as half ward and half citizen. It means reduced appropriations by the Government and more self-respect and independence for the Indian. It means the ultimate absorption of the Indian race into the body politic of the Nation. It means, in short, the beginning of the end of the Indian problem.

In carrying out this policy I cherish the hope that all real friends of the Indian race will lend their aid and hearty cooperation.

CATO SELLS,
Commissioner.

Approved:

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, with further reference to the amendment I have offered and to the communications which I received this morning—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. I beg to say that these letters are simply reproductions of statements which have been made to the committee, at least for the past four years, when the commissioner or assistant commissioner has been pressed to bring about a situation such as he says he is now ready to adopt, and my experience in the past has caused me to believe that nothing more will come of this than has come from the promises heretofore made unless we take some action to force the situation. About a year ago the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], who was then chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, introduced a bill which would force this situation, and that bill has been before the commissioner for at least a year. That bill has been reintroduced at this session, and it will correct this situation; and if the membership of this House will support the gentleman from Oklahoma in that endeavor we shall not have to receive promises of this character in the future.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARD. Is it necessary to pass legislation to carry these recommendations into effect, or has the Department of the Interior the power now to do it?

Mr. SNYDER. The Department of the Interior has the power to do it, but it also has the power not to do it. We want to fix it so that the department will have the power to do it, and we want to take away from it the power not to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. In reference to this particular amendment, it seeks to increase the per capita from \$150 to \$200.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. There are sufficient funds for this—

Mr. SNYDER. I explained that.

Mr. HASTINGS. And if we find there are not sufficient funds, the language is "not to exceed \$200"; but there are sufficient funds to make these payments.

Mr. SNYDER. My amendment has nothing to do with the letters which I presented in the time that I was discussing the amendment. The gentleman has correctly stated the fact, that there is a sufficient fund, and it should be distributed, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In reference to the policy announced, there was contention the other day about whether a graduate of an Indian school could be graduated into citizenship and get rid of the status of a ward, and about the attitude of the Government toward an Indian who had property and the ability to take care of it, as to why he should be kept as a ward. Are we not to understand from this letter that the policy of the bureau is to do that?

Mr. SNYDER. That is what the commissioner says, but he has said it so many times before and has failed to do it that we have not much faith in the statement now.

Mr. FESS. I should think a statement like that—that a policy is being announced and yet is being ignored—ought to receive some drastic attention from Congress.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to call your attention to the fact that neither one of these letters was received by any Member of this House, even though the letters are dated April 17.

Mr. FESS. It looks as though there is something wrong.

Mr. SNYDER. I received the letters to-day by special messenger from the department with the request that in view of the debate on Saturday the letters be read to-day.

Mr. FESS. Is the head of the bureau making an effort to ignore the Congress?

Mr. SNYDER. I think at present he is making an effort to recognize the Congress.

Mr. FESS. If he does that, then he will carry the policy into effect, will he not?

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I think the commissioner's letter, as I heard it read from the desk, announced the policy of removal of restrictions and the issuance of certificates of competency to Indians of half or less than half Indian blood "where found to be competent."

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. That is the bug under the chip. [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. Who is the judge of the competency of the Indians?

Mr. CARTER. The commissioner and his agents. The commissioner may perhaps be pursuing what he deems to be a policy that is consistent with his pronouncement, but such action has not seemed to be sufficiently liberal to meet the views of committee members. The Committee on Indian Affairs have found many Indians who came before them who, to all intents and appearances, were perfectly competent, but who complained that they were still laboring under restrictions and under the effect of having trust patents rather than fee patents.

Mr. FESS. Why does not Congress cure the situation?

Mr. CARTER. That is what we are attempting to do with this bill I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask recognition in my own right. I want to say something about the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], and then I will have a few more words on this.

At the time that the Indian bill was reported last year the funds on hand would just about make a \$200 per capita payment to the Choctaws and Chickasaws, and it was thought advisable by the committee to retain a portion of those funds for expenses that might be incurred in sales of land and collections of rentals, accounting, schools, and so forth. Since that time a part of the coal and asphalt deposits have been sold, and that has brought in large sums of money, which the commissioner this morning advised me were adequate to insure the payment of \$200 per capita. Anyway the language says "not to exceed \$200," so he can make a per capita payment of \$100, \$150, or \$200, as the funds will warrant.

Now, with relation to this matter about which we have been having some discussion here, I think I have stated as plainly as I can the facts in the case. The bill that has passed to remove the restriction from certain Indians of less than half Indian blood should not be optional with anyone. It ought either to do the business or not do it, otherwise it may not be done. As I explained Saturday, if a man is of less than half Indian blood, that means that he must have had a mother

and a father both with white blood in their veins, otherwise he would not be of less than half Indian blood. If he had a mother and father both with white blood in their veins, then necessarily he must have been raised as a white person and not as an Indian. If he was half Indian, his mother might have been a full-blood Indian and his father a white man who deserted the mother soon after the child was born, and he might then have been raised as a full-blood Indian; but if he has less than half Indian blood—and I want to insist on that point and make it plain to the members of the committee—if a person is of less than half Indian blood the mother who raised him must have had white blood in her veins, and he must have had the civilizing influence of the Anglo-Saxon in his raising, and, of course, must have been educated. Therefore we ought not to leave the question of determining that man's competency to the discretion of anyone, especially after the Indians have done what they have in the war. They have furnished, mostly as volunteers in the recent war, a great deal larger per cent of soldiers than the white man furnished, and they have bought more Liberty bonds and contributed more to Red Cross and other war activities.

Therefore he is entitled to full citizenship. If he has less than half blood, he is entitled to have the restrictions removed, and I think the House will do no violence in going that far. When it comes to the Indian with more than half blood, I am content that some discretion shall be lodged in the Interior Department as to the competency; but when he has been raised as a white man I think he ought to be given full citizenship and all the rights of other American citizens.

The gentleman from Ohio asked me if there was any legislation. I repeat, I introduced a bill in the last session of Congress a year before that Congress adjourned. The bill was sent to the Indian Bureau, but up until we adjourned I received no report from the Indian Office. My bill provided for citizenship for all Indians, removing all restrictions of all Indians less than half blood and providing a competency commission, with one man of Indian blood, to investigate the competency of those of more than half blood. It is no new order, except that the bill made it mandatory on the commissioner to issue a certificate of competency to those with less than half blood.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will yield, that is the law now with reference to the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; a law that has worked successfully.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I understood when the letter was read that this wonderful, marvelous, far-reaching policy soon to be adopted is to reduce the appropriations necessary for the Indian Bureau. Has there been any communication along that line heretofore?

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit, this is not a marvelous new policy.

Mr. WALSH. That was my characterization.

Mr. CARTER. It has been the avowed policy of the Indian Bureau for many years, but many mixed-blood Indians still complain of inability to get relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. The commissioner and assistant commissioner have stated that this was their policy for several years, and I think every member of the Indian Committee would agree that that has been their statement. The difficulty is that members of the Indian Committee who live on and near Indian reservations and those who have made trips of investigation do not agree that competent Indians have been given proper relief in the issuance of fee patents and certificates of competency. Replying specifically to inquiries made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I will say that the gentleman in charge of this bill this morning and I immediately took notice of this paragraph in the letter with reference to reduction of expenditures. We agreed that this matter must be called to the attention of the department when their officials come before our committee to justify appropriations in the future. We will not fail to do this, and in order that our case may be strengthened as much as possible we should pass at this session my bill granting competency to all Indians of less than one-half Indian blood. If this is done, then we know we will turn loose and be rid of all that class without further ado.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My State has no appropriation and no special interest

in this bill. I have heard that there is or was a few years ago one lone Indian of full blood living in my State. He was of the Schaghtacoke Tribe and lived somewhere near the border line between the districts of my colleagues, Mr. GLYNN and Mr. MERRITT. He may have long since passed on to the happy hunting grounds. Connecticut is, however, interested in this matter as every other State in the Union is interested.

We who live off the Indian reservations have been watching this bill from year to year with some degree of alarm, as we have seen its total gradually creeping upward year after year. The amounts to be expended have been growing until in this bill they aggregate about a half a million dollars more than the current law. The reason for it, so far as I have heard stated, is the increase in prices, although this is a year after the war. The appropriations for the current year were made during the war.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, the gentleman will not attempt to say that anything in the line of material that they have to purchase has been reduced in price.

Mr. TILSON. That may be true; but it seems to be a rather large percentage of increase. We have just heard a statement from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs read here that would seem to indicate the policy of the Indian Bureau to be to give full citizenship to the Indians and decrease appropriations. It seems to me that when the former very able chairman of this committee and the present very able chairman of the committee, representing the two sides of this Chamber, agree with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs something ought to be done.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to say that I am so afraid the Commissioner of Indian Affairs does not agree. Let me read a paragraph of his letter:

To all able-bodied adult Indians of less than one-half Indian blood there will be given, as far as may be under the law, full and complete control of their property. Patents in fee shall be issued to all adult Indians of one-half or more Indian blood who may, after careful investigation, be found competent, provided that where deemed advisable patents in fee shall be withheld, not to exceed 40 acres, as a home.

This letter is dated April 17, 1917. It took it two years and two months to get it here. If they only would carry out these recommendations it would result in good all around. No one objects to administering on real Indians, but these so-called Indians that are white neither desire nor deserve to be administered upon. They very much prefer to be let alone. If we are ever to have an end of the Indian problem the Government ought to want them let alone. I only hope it will be done.

Mr. HASTINGS. That letter was given to the press at the time all over the country.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, after all it seems that there is quite an agreement on both sides of this Chamber as to what ought to be done. If there is some inertia in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or if some camouflage has been attempted in this communication, still if we agree about it here, and the other body and the Executive agree with us, we ought to be able to accomplish something.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me right there to read from a letter which I addressed the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs? I wrote this letter to him after having heard him make an address at a church in this city on April 3, 1919. The letter is as follows:

APRIL 4, 1919.

Hon. E. B. MERITT,
Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I was very agreeably surprised last night when you committed yourself and the Indian Bureau as favorable to the bill providing full citizenship to all American Indians.

You complained, however, that the Indian Bureau had no jurisdiction over legislation and therefore no responsibility in connection with the failure up to this date to enact this bill. You closed your remarks on this subject with a statement, which I think I quote verbatim, as follows:

"If Mr. CARTER will only have his bill passed which he introduced giving citizenship to all Indians, he will receive the unanimous plaudits of every member of the Indian Bureau."

Now, the facts in the case, as you are well aware, are that the Indian Bureau is responsible for Indian legislation to the extent that the Interior Department, by its agency, the said Indian Bureau, has for years assumed, and been accorded by Congress, jurisdiction to make recommendations for necessary Indian legislation. So far as the tenure of my chairmanship of this committee is concerned, no bill of any consequence has ever been favorably reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House without first submitting the measure to the Indian Bureau for report and recommendation. As a matter of fact, the very bill in question, H. R. 9253, was personally by me filed with the Indian Bureau for such report and recommendation on January 26, 1918, more than 13 months before the adjournment of the recent Congress. Another formal filing of this bill with the Indian Bureau was made by letter on February 28, 1918, more than 12 months before such adjournment, but up to this good hour no tidings have been received by this committee from the Indian Bureau, and no intimation of the position of the bureau on this subject has been disclosed to any member of the Committee on Indian Affairs until the statement made in your address last night.

Since none of the speakers at this meeting prior to the time of your address had made any attack on the Indian Bureau I hope it can certainly be assumed that your statement was not made as a political defense of the bureau, but represented the sincere sentiment of the Indian Bureau from the head thereof on down, and that as Acting Commissioner you would not give vent to such utterance unless you were, as it were, "speaking from the book."

I repeat, that after this long lapse of 15 months, I rejoice to be advised of the position of the bureau in connection with this matter. I shall reintroduce the bill on the day the next session of Congress convenes and on that same day will ask to have the measure again submitted to the Indian Bureau for report and recommendation, with an abiding faith that your asseveration will be made good and a favorable report on all the provisions of the measure immediately returned for the consideration of Congress.

Very respectfully yours,

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. I desire to say that that bill was introduced on that day, and that my good friend, the chairman of the committee, has been good enough to refer the bill to the Indian Bureau, as I stated it would be, so I presume we may expect some action on the measure at an early day.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, these two facts stand out: This bill has been growing in amount from year to year, and it carries this year and every year a large number of items for attorneys' fees. Yes, and a part of many items of appropriation are for the payment of employees. I suspect that in these items of the bill lies a good deal of the cause for the inertia. There is always great difficulty in eliminating items carrying appropriations for the payment of attorneys' fees and employees' salaries. This Congress ought not to be so much interested either in employees' salaries or in attorneys' fees as in meeting and solving this problem along rational lines. I hope that in the not too distant future we shall have a real solution of the Indian problem, putting the Indian in the way of becoming a useful citizen instead of a ward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and expenses of such attorneys and other employees as the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, deem necessary in probate matters affecting restricted allottees or their heirs in the Five Civilized Tribes and in the several tribes of the Quapaw Agency, and for the costs and other necessary expenses incident to suits instituted or conducted by such attorneys, \$85,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of having read in my time an item from a newspaper under the date of Minneapolis, which seems rather apropos at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS.

Charges that the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs is "squeezing the blood" from the Indians whose affairs it administers, destroying the old high idealistic morals of the race, were made by Dr. Charles A. Eastman, president of the Society of American Indians, in an address at the "Little Theater" at the University of Minnesota last night.

Dr. Eastman, himself a full-blooded Sioux and a Dartmouth College man, is in Minneapolis to arrange for the meeting next fall of the national intertribal convention of the society.

The convention, Dr. Eastman said, will be a protest meeting and will call on Congress to abolish the bureau. The administration set up by treaty while the race was "serving an apprenticeship to civilization" has become maladministration that in another generation will make the Indians absolute anarchists, he asserted.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman of the committee whether it is the purpose of the gentleman to strike out this item of \$85,000, after having had read the newspaper article?

Mr. SNYDER. No; it is not.

Mr. GARD. Then what purpose is sought to be advanced?

Mr. SNYDER. Simply as an illumination of the discussion that is going on along the same line.

Mr. GARD. Do I understand the gentleman having charge of the bill agrees with the statement made in the newspaper?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not by any means.

Mr. GARD. Then what benefit is there in having it read?

Mr. SNYDER. I do, however, believe in a tremendous modification of the activities of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. GARD. But this is a drastic revocation, not a modification.

Mr. SNYDER. I appreciate that, that it is an elimination, which I would not approve of.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman does not approve of the article which he himself submitted to be read?

Mr. SNYDER. It is not necessary that I should approve an article that I send to the desk to have read which has appeared in the public print. That is not the rule here.

Mr. GARD. But the gentleman gives it a certain approval by its presentation.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think I gave any such idea at all.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just to make the observation that I happen to know Dr. Eastman. He has been at our institution of learning twice, and I have had the opportunity of sitting under the teaching of his philosophy and studying him at close range. I doubt very much whether this distinguished Indian, a graduate of an eastern college, who married a Caucasian girl, who has a great standing in the world, not only as an Indian but as a citizen of the country, would make a statement on his own authority that could not have substantial backing in facts. Therefore I think that much ought to be said on the floor of the House in regard to Dr. Eastman's statement.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to use not exceeding \$10,000 of the proceeds of sales of unallotted lands and other tribal property belonging to any of the Five Civilized Tribes, for payment of salaries of employees and other expenses of advertising and sale in connection with the further sales of such tribal lands and property, including the advertising and sale of the land within the segregated coal and asphalt area of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations or of the surface thereof as provided for in the act approved February 19, 1912, entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and for other purposes" (37 U. S. Stat. L., p. 67), and of the improvements thereon, which is hereby expressly authorized, and for other work necessary to a final settlement of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 of such amount may be used in connection with the collection of rents of unallotted lands and tribal buildings: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, no moneys shall be expended from tribal funds belonging to the Five Civilized Tribes, without specific appropriation by Congress, except as follows: Equalization of allotments, per capita and other payments authorized by law to individual members of the respective tribes, tribal and other Indian schools for the current fiscal year under existing law, salaries and contingent expenses of governors, chiefs, assistant chiefs, secretaries, interpreters, and mining trustees of the tribes for the current fiscal year at salaries at the rate heretofore paid, and one attorney each for the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Creek Tribes employed under contract approved by the President, under existing law, for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to continue during the ensuing fiscal year the tribal and other schools among the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes from the tribal funds of those nations, within his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby empowered, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, to expend funds of the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole Nations available for school purposes under existing law for such repairs, improvements, or new buildings as he may deem essential for the proper conduct of the several schools of said tribes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, simply to ask a question. Perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma can state, as he is familiar with these tribes, how many attorneys act for them now.

Mr. CARTER. Attorneys?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I did not catch the item.

Mr. WALSH. I see you make a change in the law by providing that the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Creek Tribes shall have one attorney each. The current law just says, "attorneys of the tribes."

Mr. CARTER. Well, the Choctaws have one and the Chickasaws have one and the Creeks have one, and the Cherokees and the Seminoles have none. The Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Creeks have one attorney each, and the Seminoles and Cherokees have none. In the past, I think, the Creeks have had several men working under this appropriation as attorneys, but I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma who is from that district.

Mr. HASTINGS. It was the purpose of the legislation that each of those tribes may have one attorney who is employed by the chief and approved by the President of the United States. We felt like that was abused; they would make a contract with one attorney, and he would make a subcontract with others, so there were in fact some two or three or more employed, and this particular language was put in this bill so that they would be restricted to the employment of only one attorney. Now, let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. WALSH. This is a restriction.

Mr. HASTINGS. I was the last Cherokee tribal attorney and went out in 1914. The Cherokees do not have any tribal attorney. The other three tribes mentioned in the bill have tribal attorneys, and this bill provides for one each for them and they are to be employed as attorneys have in the past under existing law.

Mr. WALSH. This is restrictive in its nature?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; it is restrictive.

Mr. CARTER. I may say the Choctaws and Chickasaws have not for some years had more than one attorney. The Creeks are the only tribe that have had more.

Mr. WALSH. You are now restricting them to one?

Mr. CARTER. One.

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me say to the gentleman the abuse that this amendment seeks to correct was that the Creeks complained that too much was paid out one year for expenses of the tribal attorney, which we thought ought to be cut down, and so it is restricted.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the point of order, I desire to make inquiry of those in charge of the bill relative to the tribal schools among the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Seminole Tribe entirely for my own information. What is the extent of the so-called tribal schools and how are they distinguished between schools which are recognized to be for the education of white children?

Mr. CARTER. The schools of the Five Civilized Tribes were taken over by section 10 of the act of April 26, 1906. Prior to that time the Five Civilized Tribes had operated their own schools with their own officials, mostly with their own teachers, paid out of their own funds, but under that act all the tribal schools were taken over by the Federal Government, and for a while all were kept in full swing. They have been reduced now until there are only two or three in the Choctaw Nation, if I remember correctly, and one in the Chickasaw Nation, and I believe one still in the Seminole—

Mr. HASTINGS. And three in the Creek Nation.

Mr. CARTER. But none in the Cherokee, so that is the extent of the tribal schools now. When the school proposition was first taken over by the Federal Government I think there was something more than \$500,000 a year spent for tribal schools and now perhaps there is not exceeding \$100,000.

Mr. GARD. Is the course of study similar to that pursued in schools for white children?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; but only a few of the boarding schools are still being continued, and the bureau attempts to confine them as much as possible to the full-blooded Indian, who is not yet sufficiently advanced to go to the public school.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct the attention of the chairman to the evident misspelling, on page 53, line 5, of the star print, of the word "Chickasaw."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the correction.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Ohio asked me yesterday something about the number of schools. I asked the department regarding it this morning, and was given these figures. There are 35 non-reservation boarding schools, 75 reservation schools, and 225 day schools at which Indian scholars are taught. They either belong to the Government or to the towns adjacent to where the Indians reside and for which the Government pays a per diem for the teaching of the Indian scholar.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman's information indicate the proportion of children that have school facilities?

Mr. SNYDER. It does not, but there are ample facilities in the boarding schools for all those who apply and for more. There are one or two exceptions. There is plenty of room to the extent that last year when the Carlisle School was taken over by the Government there was no difficulty whatever in placing those pupils at that school in boarding schools throughout the country.

Mr. FESS. There are Indian children, however, who do not have school facilities?

Mr. SNYDER. Oh, yes; plenty of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States belonging to the Creek Nation, the sum of \$7,000, being in full settlement of the claim of the said Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford against the said Creek Nation for legal services rendered the said Creek Nation employed by authority of an act of the national council of the Creek Nation, approved January 7, 1898, the said sum of \$7,000 having been appropriated in payment of said services by an act of the national council of the Creek Nation approved October 18, 1900.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HASTINGS. I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order for a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve it. If the gentleman will permit, before he begins I will ask him if this is not the subject of a special bill?

Mr. HASTINGS. And passed the House.

Mr. WALSH. Passed on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar in the last Congress?

Mr. HASTINGS. It passed the House in the Sixty-fourth Congress, but it did not pass the Senate. It failed because of want of time over there. But it has been favorably reported some two or three times from the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the committee a moment. I want to say this: That the Five Civilized Tribes, of which the Creek Nation is one, went from the Southern States west of the Mississippi and located in what was then the Indian Territory, now the eastern part of Oklahoma, between 1830 and 1840. For 60 years the Government of the United States had no supervision whatever over the expenditures of the Five Civilized Tribes. I want to make that as an unqualified statement. The Cherokees, Creeks, Seminoles, Choctaws, and Chickasaws had their own governor, their own legislature, their own tribal schools. They divided up each country into counties; they elected their own officers, including county officers, and they paid the expenses without any supervision from the Government of the United States for 60 years, the same as the State of Delaware, the State of Connecticut, or the State of Massachusetts. I make that as an unqualified statement.

Let me say to the Members of the House that I am carried on the Cherokee tribal roll; that I am an Indian by blood; that I went to the tribal schools and to the Indian boarding schools, and that I have taught in the schools, and that I represented them, and therefore feel qualified to make the statement in reference to the Five Civilized Tribes.

I know that the Creeks appropriated during that time millions upon millions of dollars. And my friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who has been on the committee for years and lives in an adjoining State, knows what I say is true. The Cherokees did the same thing. In 1894, for instance, we appropriated \$6,000,000 and paid it out per capita. There is not a bit of question about that. Finally railroads were built through the country, cities and towns were located there, and finally the Government of the United States, by the act of March 3, 1893, sent a commission down to the Five Civilized Tribes to attempt to induce them to allot their lands and divide up the country in severally and become citizens of the United States, with a view of bringing the Indian Territory in as a State of the Union. The commission was there for a number of years trying to negotiate with these tribes and had great difficulty in doing it. Finally the Creeks made an agreement, in 1897, which was ratified by the act of Congress of June 28, 1898. Then for the first time the Congress of the United States, with reference to these Five Civilized Tribes, put a clause into the law requiring the acts of the Creek councils to be approved by the President of the United States, and I have that law here before me.

Prior to the passage of that act in 1898 and during the time the commission was down there trying to negotiate this agreement there was a good deal of friction between the Government of the United States and those tribes, both before and after the agreement was made. Now, because of that Creek council, by an act of its legislature, when it had a right to do it, on January 7, 1898, when it could appropriate millions and millions of dollars without any restriction at all, authorized the employment of this firm of attorneys. It had the right to do it. It had employed attorneys for 60 years. They employed a firm of the most eminent lawyers in that part of the country. Judge Stuart, former partner of ex-Senator Bailey, was on the Federal bench of the Indian country, and Mr. Lewis was on the Federal bench of the Indian country, and Mr. Gordon is one of the leading lawyers in eastern Oklahoma, as is also Mr. Rutherford. None stand higher in their professions. They employed them to represent them before the courts and the commission down there. It resulted in a good many injunction suits being brought, and they had to try these suits. Now, as a matter of fact, they had to antagonize the department in some cases. No attorney could have properly represented them without doing it. It so happened that the Secretary of the Interior was Mr. Hitchcock at that time. After this firm of attorneys performed these services under legal contract the Creek council, after the attorneys had completed their work, passed an appropriation bill to pay them in accordance with the terms of the contract. It happened to be that that appropriation was after this act of Congress, namely, after June 27, 1898. The contract, mind you, was made under the act of the Creek council in January, 1898, when they had a right to enact it. And the council a year or two after this, after the services had been performed and the Creeks being entirely satisfied, appropriated the money.

As I have said, there had been some friction between these attorneys and the Secretary of the Interior. They went into

court and obtained injunctions in certain cases. But, anyhow, they afterwards went back to the Creek council, and the Creek council appropriated this amount; it then had to come up here for approval. I want to make this clear to the Members of the House. At the time this original act of the Creek Legislature was passed it had the right to enact it, and when they made the contract it was a legal one. And at the time there was no approval necessary by the President of the United States to the act. My good friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who is very familiar with this question, will bear out what I say about it. This firm of attorneys, composed of the most eminent men in the country, was legally employed. It performed the services, the council appropriated the money, but because of this friction and because of the disagreement with the Secretary of the Interior, he recommended its disapproval, and it was disapproved.

Those are all the facts about the matter. I have brought the matter repeatedly to the attention of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and every time that committee has favorably reported it, and when it came up on the floor of the House and attention of the minority leader [Mr. MANN] was directed to it, he agreed that it should be passed, and it was passed in this House, but it was sent over to the Senate too late, and no action was taken there, so that it was not considered there, although I may say I believe it was favorably reported over there a time or two. In fact, it was added to this bill as an amendment in the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will be glad to.

Mr. WALSH. Was this the scheme that was submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, and he failed to approve its payment?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. The present Secretary?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; not the present Secretary. When we introduced a bill the present Secretary disapproved it on the ground that a Secretary 10 or 12 years ago had refused to approve it. The present Secretary said it had been disapproved by the department, and the department simply adhered to the old ruling previously made.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has a number of claims relating to Indian matters, one of which is specifically disapproved in the report filed, in a letter disapproving the favorable reporting of the bill. Is this the claim?

Mr. HASTINGS. No, sir. It is another bill.

Mr. WALSH. Then I will withdraw the reservation.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the gentleman. It is a meritorious claim.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the sum of \$1,666.65 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the possession of the United States belonging to the Choctaw Tribe of Indians not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse William R. McIntosh for services rendered as coal and asphalt mining trustee for the Choctaw Nation during the months of October, November, and December, 1915, and January and February, 1916: *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be payable to William R. McIntosh for which disbursement there is any authorization by existing law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I do so in order to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question with respect to this item. How does it come that Mr. McIntosh rendered these services as a trustee and received no compensation?

Mr. CARTER. William R. McIntosh is a Choctaw Indian, appointed under the act of July 1, 1902, which required the appointment of a Choctaw Indian. He was in the service at the time of the beginning of the first date set out in the item here, and his commission expired, but the commissioner failed to reappoint him until the later date. During all that time, however, William R. McIntosh served right along as mining trustee of the Choctaw Nation, and his reports were accepted by the department, but the comptroller ruled that because his commission for reappointment had not reached him during this period he could not be paid for that time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the sum of \$392.60 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in possession of the United States belonging to the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Jacob B. Moore, of Ardmore, Okla., for probate expenses incurred and paid by him in the performance of his duty as attorney for the Chickasaws under a contract between him and Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, approved by the President of the United States December 1, 1913.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCKEOWN: On page 56, after the period in line 6, insert new paragraph, to read as follows:

"Whenever requested by any restricted allottee of the Five Civilized Tribes or his legal guardian, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to offer for sale to the highest bidder at public auction, after due advertisement of the same, such parcels of land described in said request, under such rules and regulations as he may promulgate: *Provided*, That there shall be retained not less than 40 acres of the best tillable land, to be designated by said allottees or their legal guardians and approved by the Secretary of the Interior as a permanent homestead, which shall be inalienable and nontaxable in perpetuity so long as the same is retained as a homestead by said allottee or his descendants: *Provided*, That soldiers of the war of 1917 and persons who become bona fide residents of said lands may purchase the same upon installments of interest and principal, payable annually, for a period not less than 5 years nor to exceed 20 years: *Provided*, That the money accruing from the sale of said lands of the said restricted Indians be paid to and be under the control of the Secretary of the Interior, to be disbursed in his discretion in making permanent improvements upon the homestead and equipping the same for occupancy and cultivation and for such other use and benefit of such restricted Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may deem best: *Provided further*, That said moneys when paid to said restricted Indians or their heirs shall be exempted from any lien for attorneys' fee or other debt contracted prior to the disbursing of the same."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma will no doubt concede the point of order.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order on the amendment, and the Chair sustains it.

Mr. MCKEOWN. I will be glad if the gentleman from Massachusetts would withhold it for a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold it.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment covers a matter that I discussed in the committee during the general debate. If this amendment is put on this bill, it will open up in the State of Oklahoma many thousands of acres of land that will enable bona fide farmers and soldiers of 1917 to buy for homes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MCKEOWN. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. I notice the gentleman says "soldiers of 1917." I suppose he means American soldiers?

Mr. MCKEOWN. Yes; of course I meant that by that designation.

Now, the Secretary of the Interior has advocated a plan by which homes or lands can be secured for returning soldiers. As I stated in general debate, in the eastern side of Oklahoma there are Indians who have as high as 320 acres of land for themselves and 320 for their wives and 320 acres for each of their children. A man with a wife and eight children has approximately 3,000 acres of land. This land makes him absolutely land poor. He can not do anything with it. The Secretary of the Interior ties him up under the law until he can not lease it except for agricultural purposes for one year; that is, 160 acres of it known as his homestead. It is not taxable. The men who live in that country and who want to buy farms or land can not buy it. If you give these Indians 40 acres of land and selected, as provided in this amendment, out of the tillable land, and remove the restrictions from the Indians, the land can on their application be put up at auction to the highest bidder, so that a man who wants to own that land to live on it can buy it on terms, and you will thereby do much to relieve the conditions in that country and also give the soldier who wants to own his own home an opportunity to acquire it. It will enable him to own a home in a new and progressive State, that is progressing every day, and will one day be one of the leading States of the Union, and that can be done without a cent of cost to the United States Government, because the land is there, and all they have to do is to make the application.

I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that in view of the constitutional right of these Indians who have already received their allotments it will only be on their application. What harm can be done to the country if the Indian comes in and asks the Government to sell his surplus land for him and build up a homestead, and give an opportunity to those men who have for years wanted a home to obtain it, and give opportunity to these soldiers who are anxious to obtain homes to acquire them? Let us do it in a practical way and without cost. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will withdraw his objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this is too comprehensive a scheme to be taken up in this way. It should be carefully considered by the committee. I therefore renew my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent to go back to page 45 and offer the following amendment, which I think can be disposed of in a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to return to page 45 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TILLMAN: Page 45, line 16, after the word "pupl," insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"That the council of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma be authorized to elect or appoint a general tribal attorney to represent them in all legal matters affecting said tribe: *Provided*, That the salary of said attorney, to be paid out of the tribal funds, shall not exceed \$10,000 per year: *And provided further*, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall be denied the right to approve or override the election of said attorney."

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order. I desire to ask the gentleman if this has received consideration of the members of the committee?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes; and the committee are unanimously in favor of it. A like provision was in the bill as originally drawn, which bill was considered at the regular session. I think it went out on a point of order, and is subject now to a point of order if the gentleman insists upon it; but if the gentleman will kindly allow me a few minutes to argue the matter I desire to say that the council for the Osage people have for many years wanted to employ an attorney, and have elected an attorney two or three times to represent them, but the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for some reason has declined to approve this attorney.

The Osage Indians are the richest people per capita in the world. They participate in big business like the Steel Trust does. The Steel Trust no doubt, for the purpose of having a like amount of its business looked after by a legal adviser, would pay him \$100,000 a year for doing no more and for assuming no more responsibility than would the attorney for the Osage Indians. There are about 2,200 of these Indians and their average family income is \$20,000 a year. They have large holdings in oil and in gas and they are not permitted the privilege of employing an attorney to represent them annually. No other people in the wide world as wealthy as are these Indians are denied the right of employing a permanent legal counselor to look after their business generally and specially. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs insists that there is a superintendent at Pawhuska who gets \$3,500 a year, as well as other bureau attorneys and agents, and asserts that they can look after intricate, delicate, and important legal matters that, I think, should be looked after by a high-priced and able attorney regularly employed by the Osages themselves and compensated by them out of their abundant tribal funds.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. Is it not a fact that the Indians consider that at times their interests conflict with the views of the superintendent of Indian affairs, and rather than an attorney, is he not a tribunal before whom these matters are settled?

Mr. TILLMAN. That is very true; in fact, they are in conflict frequently as to what should be done.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We are at the end of the Oklahoma items, and I want to talk about the amendment that was offered limiting the authority of the superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

There has been a good deal of discussion about the Oklahoma Indians and about the Five Civilized Tribes, and I only want to take up a moment or two to discuss it this afternoon.

The statement was made by my colleague, which was correct in so far as it went, that the amendment that was offered was agreeable to me. It is in the sense that I can not get any more and therefore have to take it. Everybody in Oklahoma knows, and I want to put it in the Record here, that I am earnestly in favor of the bill as originally reported. Now, let me talk to the House about that provision. In the Five Civilized Tribes there are 101,519 Indians. There are 41,823 Cherokees, 20,799 Choctaws, 6,304 Chickasaws, a little more than 18,800 Creeks, and about 3,200 Seminoles. Out of the 101,519 members of these tribes who are enrolled there are about 75,000 of them who are Indians by blood, and of the 75,000 Indians by blood there are 37,000 known as restricted Indians. In other words,

they are Indians over whom the Government exercises some supervision. They have one-half or more Indian blood. It has been my contention and the contention of the Indians in Oklahoma that so far as their tribal affairs are concerned the department ought to retain supervision, because it ought to determine questions of general policy with reference to those tribes; but it has been our contention down there all the time that with reference to their individual moneys and their individual allotments that they ought to be approved by the superintendent to the Five Civilized Tribes. A good many Members of the House here do not know that we have a superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate; that he has employees numbering about 265 under him. They are all civil-service employees; they are all efficient, honest, able, competent men and women, and what we advocate, what the Indians of Oklahoma want and what the delegation contends for, and what I ask is that so far as the approval of contracts relating to individual Indians down there is concerned, that they go before the superintendent to the Five Civilized Tribes, with the right of appeal in contested matters. When I came to Congress if you bought out of a restricted Indian's money a pair of trace chains the transaction had to go before the local representative down there in Oklahoma and had to come from him up through the superintendent to the Five Civilized Tribes, and from the superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs up to the Secretary of the Interior, so that it took about six months to buy a set of chain harness for an Indian.

Another thing: If you wanted to lease a tract of agricultural land for more than one year, the homestead of one of these Indians, you had to go through exactly the same process. Now, when it comes up here the department has nothing other than the record that has been sent up by the local man down there. Suppose it is an agricultural lease. The land may be on the top of a hill, it may be uncleared land, it may be fertile land, it may be 40 miles from the railroad, or it may be near a railroad. The local man would know all that. Now, what we are contending for is that that matter ought to go before the local man down in Oklahoma, who is a civil-service employee, who is honest, capable, and efficient, and let him pass on it with the right of appeal to the Secretary of the Interior in case of contest. We think that ought to apply to oil leasing. Let me say to the Members of the House that I want to protect the Indians. I want to say that every single Indian in Oklahoma not under the influence of the department, not employed by the department, agrees with the Oklahoma delegation without any exception.

Now let me call attention to a few things—my friend thinks that he is protecting them. I want to say without fear of any contradiction that every one of the restricted leases by reason of the fact of these delays in going before the local superintendent and forwarding it to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior for approval is a detriment to the Indian. It is well known throughout Oklahoma that restricted leases in every case sell for less than a commercial lease. There is no doubt about it, because the Indian lessor suffers by reason of the delay and uncertainty. You are not helping the Indian by having it come up here because we appropriated \$205,000 for the use of the superintendent, and out of that money he employs experts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Out of this money he employs oil experts and legal experts. Oil leases are made on the form prescribed by the Interior Department, and they use a form just like a notary uses for mortgages. The superintendent has oil experts scattered all through Oklahoma, and they report to the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes as to the bonus value of any lease and all other facts with reference to it. So when it comes to Washington the Secretary of the Interior has no additional information, and he can not protect the Indians. I defy any man to successfully contradict that. Every time an Indian lease is put up against a commercial lease, on tracts of land side by side, the commercial lease brings more than the restricted lease.

Now, I am an Indian by blood. I went to their tribal schools and to their higher boarding school. I have represented them from 1892 to the time I came to Congress in 1914. I have represented them before the commission. I have tried their lawsuits the best I could in tribal courts, in the Federal courts, and up here in the courts in Washington. I have repre-

sented them under President Roosevelt, under President Taft, and under the present administration. God knows that I would suffer my right arm to be cut off before I would recommend any legislation I thought was detrimental to my own tribe. [Applause.] This legislation is in the interest of the Indians.

I know what these Indians want, I know what is best for them, and I never will vote while I am on the floor of this House for any legislation which I think is against the interests of my own flesh and blood. My family are of Indian blood, all carried on the rolls. I have done little else in all my life than to represent them. They have honored me much more than I deserve, and I would be an ingrate if I stood on the floor of this Congress to favor by legislation anything that was inclined to do them a wrong or injustice. I know that I represent the Indians, and I know that gentlemen from other States do not understand the situation. But every man who has gone to Oklahoma and investigated the matter agrees with me, and all members of the Indian Committee who have investigated the matter agree with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the Members of the House, and I will have more to say about it later.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask to address the committee three minutes on this matter.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, we are endeavoring to get through with the bill, and there is really no question before the committee.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to add a few remarks to what my colleague [Mr. HASTINGS] has said on the matter and to indorse the position taken by him relative to oil and gas and other mineral leases on Indian lands being sent up here to be approved by the Interior Department. That is somewhat of a local matter. It is a matter in which our people alone are affected, and the requirement that these leases be sent to Washington for approval instead of being an assistance to the Indians whom you are trying to protect is a detriment. The action in striking out that amendment this afternoon is detrimental, my friends, not only to the Indians, but the business interests of all concerned. It only means more red tape. It means delay in carrying on business. For instance, if your constituent should come to my State and buy an oil lease from an Indian he would be compelled to delay the business operations until such time as that lease could be sent out from Muskogee to Washington, and all simply for going through a little bunch of red tape. Many persons who have been compelled to do this are put to large expense. The department perhaps is called upon to employ more clerks. I have heard you advocate retrenchment in expenditures this afternoon. This is an opportunity to cut out considerable red tape and expense. We are asking relief from this situation for business reasons; we are asking relief to protect the Indians. If I make a lease on his land to-morrow, while it is going through the red tape up here, my neighbor might drill within 200 feet of the Indian land and have two weeks or perhaps a month or a longer time in which to take from under the ground that which belongs to the Indian. This is by reason of the red tape. I hope that some means may be found to have the gentleman withdraw his point of order, in order that business may be facilitated and the Indian protected as well as the man who is dealing with the Indian.

The Clerk read as follows:

That where the issuance of trust patents for certain allotment selections on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, has been withheld for the reason that the lands so selected were found to be more valuable for their timber than for agricultural or grazing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to confirm such selections and to cause trust patents to be issued therefor under existing laws.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. Has this been considered by the Indian Committee? Is not this an amendment which was put on subsequent to the introduction of the bill at the last session?

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been considered by the Indian Committee. This provision in this section was introduced by myself at the request of the Secretary of the Interior in a letter of April 25, 1917, to Mr. CARTER, the former chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. The hearing was deferred for some time and finally a subcommittee of the Indian Committee reported favorably to the main committee at the last session too late to get the matter into the bill. It was inserted in the Senate. The Senate hearings of last session, at page 351, explain the matter.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. What is the purpose of this legislation?

Mr. SINNOTT. This is explained in a letter of April 25, 1917, from the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the Indian Committee, Mr. CARTER. He states that the agricultural and grazing area of the Klamath Reservation were about 220,000 acres, all practically allotted. Many of the Indians under a misapprehension of their rights selected and improved timber areas for allotments, and the department held that under the law land could only be allotted to the Indians that was suitable for agriculture and grazing purposes; that timberland could not be allotted.

Mr. GARD. Under the existing law does it permit the alienation without action of the Secretary of the Interior? Suppose an Indian is given this allotment, can he dispose of it?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; he can not.

Mr. CARTER. He is given a trust patent.

Mr. SINNOTT. It is held in trust for 20 years.

Mr. GARD. It can not be sold by him?

Mr. SINNOTT. No.

Mr. GARD. Without the consent of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

For the equipment and maintenance of the asylum for insane Indians at Canton, S. Dak., for incidental and all other expenses necessary for its proper conduct and management, including pay of employees, repairs, improvements, and for necessary expense of transporting insane Indians to and from said asylum, \$45,000.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman if this institution takes care of all the insane Indians in the United States?

Mr. SNYDER. This is the only asylum for the insane Indians that the Government operates, and at the present time it has a capacity for taking care of all that have been presented to it.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Has the committee any information as to the number of inmates?

Mr. SNYDER. There are about 200.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I note on page 42 of the bill that three insane Indians were sent from South Dakota to a State institution. Why were they sent to a State institution and not to this insane asylum?

Mr. SNYDER. I am not able to inform the gentleman. Perhaps some other member of the committee can.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I also note that the three insane cases mentioned cost only \$225 a year for each patient. If we can put the insane Indians in State institutions at \$225 a year, why do we want to appropriate \$45,000, which makes the cost about twice as much?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think it is possible to put Indians from a reservation into a State asylum.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. But they were placed there.

Mr. SNYDER. They must be individual cases.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. There were three cases.

Mr. SNYDER. It must be by special contract or something of that sort.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The instance to which the gentleman refers in the bill was merely the temporary care of those three Indians until they could be sent to this asylum.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. The section does not so state.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the fact. As a matter of fact also, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] made a point of order against the item, and it is no longer in the bill.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I understand that there are about 300,000 Indians in the country.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. And there are only 100 insane Indians out of 300,000? Is not this a very small percentage?

Mr. SNYDER. It seems there is a smaller number of insane in proportion to the whole number of Indians than of any other race. That was stated by the Assistant Commissioner of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I would state that this asylum takes care mostly of those Indians who are not citizens of the United States. A great many of the 300,000 Indians are now citizens and have access to the State institutions for the insane.

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that this seems to be a splendid activity and one that ought to be continued.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, within his discretion, the sum of \$100,000 of the principal funds to the credit of the Confederate Bands of Ute Indians and to expend same for continuing the construction of lateral distributing systems to irrigate the allotted lands of the Uncompahgre, Uintah, and White River Utes, in Utah, and to maintain existing irrigation systems authorized under the act of June 21, 1906, to be immediately available.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "to be immediately available," line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order against the language "to be immediately available." The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and civilization of Qui-nai-elsd Quil-leh-utes, including pay of employees, \$1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the chairman of the committee give his attention? Is the spelling of the first word correct?

Mr. SNYDER. The chairman is unable to state whether it is correct or not, but the spelling is the same as in the current law.

Mr. CARTER. Will the Chair tell the Clerk to correct the spelling?

The CHAIRMAN. The reading clerk calls the attention of the Chair of the name of the first tribe mentioned as being incorrect.

Mr. HAYDEN. The name is incorrectly spelled.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the spelling of the word.

Mr. WALSH. We ought to know how it should be spelled.

Mr. HAYDEN. The current law carries it as "Qui-nai-elsd."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing construction and enlargement of the Wapato irrigation and drainage system, to make possible the utilization of the water supply provided by the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stats. L. p. 604), for 40 acres of each Indian allotment under the Wapato irrigation project on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and such other water supply as may be available or obtainable for the irrigation of a total of 120,000 acres of allotted Indian lands on said reservation, \$500,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the entire cost of said irrigation and drainage system shall be reimbursed to the United States under the conditions and terms of the act of May 18, 1916.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "to be immediately available," line 16.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order just a moment to enable the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] to make a statement?

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve it for a moment.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of planning for the extension of irrigation work on this project which is necessary to be carried on very largely during the summer months, and if a little additional time could be given by making the amount immediately available it would enable the assembling of materials and the organization of work at a little earlier date and enable them to get more for their money by working at this time of the year than at a later period.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will.

Mr. WALSH. I notice this is for continuing the construction. There is evidently a project under way.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. There is.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think 10 days or 2 weeks' delay in making this available would seriously interfere with the work there?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The work is held up at this particular time, and this would enable the organization and beginning of the work. It would only be a short period, of course.

Mr. WALSH. Of course the gentleman understands that the funds would not be available until the act had been signed, and probably that will not be until the 15th or the 20th of June, from the advices we now have, and that would only be 10 or 15 days. I wondered if the gentleman thought that would seriously cripple the work there in any way.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It would simply mean the saving of possibly two weeks, which would be valuable on account of their being better able to carry on the work during the summer.

Mr. WALSH. I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the reservation of the point of order made by the gentleman. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FESS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2480, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture I report the Agricultural appropriation bill and the report thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves all points of order. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

LEAVE TO SIT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, or such subcommittees as it may designate, shall have leave to sit during the Sixty-sixth Congress and during the recesses of that Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. I move its adoption.

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if it is his intention to call up the Agricultural appropriation bill if the Indian appropriation bill is disposed of to-day?

Mr. HAUGEN. When does the gentleman from New York think the Indian bill will be disposed of?

Mr. SNYDER. I have not any idea, but I should think somewhere about 5 o'clock.

Mr. HAUGEN. My intention was to call up the Agricultural bill immediately after the passage of the Indian bill and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, with the understanding that nothing would be done but general debate, but if the Indian bill should run after 5 o'clock I take it we had better not call it up to-day.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield? Is this bill as it passed the last Congress?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is as introduced by the committee at the last session—

Mr. GARNER. By the Agricultural Committee?

Mr. HAUGEN. With a few amendments authorized in the committee.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman has a few amendments in there, I doubt whether the House would be willing to give unanimous consent for immediate consideration.

Mr. HAUGEN. We will take it up to-morrow anyway.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, pending that, may I further inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if the Indian appropriation bill is not disposed of by 5 o'clock, or if it is disposed of by 5 o'clock, does the gentleman from Iowa intend to go into debate upon the Agricultural appropriation bill? I wanted to get this information so as to accommodate gentlemen.

Mr. HAUGEN. I hardly think it is worth while to-day. We will not call it up to-day, but call it up to-morrow morning the first thing.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2480, the Indian appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title. The bill was read by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the patent issued in the name of Davie Skootah, allottee No. 35, on the Lummi Reservation, Wash., and to reallot the lands under the provisions of the general allotment law to unallotted members of the Lummi Tribe in areas of not exceeding 10 acres each.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I would like to know if this was not the subject of a private bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar at the last Congress and which was objected to?

Mr. HAYDEN. This item was included in the Indian appropriation bill as reported to the House in the last Congress, and passed the House after an explanation to the effect that but 80 acres of land was involved; that this Indian died without heirs; and it was necessary to have authority of law, so that the Secretary could reallot this land among other Indians. There was no objection to the bill at any time.

Mr. WALSH. Then this was not the bill that was reported on the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

For beginning the construction of diversion dams and canal systems for irrigating 12,000 acres of Indian land adjacent to Toppenish and Simcoe Creeks, Yakima Indian Reservation, \$75,000, to be immediately available, the total cost not to exceed \$150,000: *Provided*, That the cost of the diversion dams and distributing systems shall be reimbursed to the United States by the owners of the lands irrigable thereunder in not to exceed 20 annual payments, and the Secretary of the Interior may fix operation and maintenance charges, which shall be paid as he may direct: *Provided*, That if any allottee shall receive patent in fee to his allotment before the amounts so charged against him shall have been paid to the United States, then such amount remaining unpaid shall be and become a lien upon his allotment, and the fact of such lien shall be recited in such patent and may be enforced by the Secretary of the Interior by foreclosure as a mortgage, and should any Indian sell any part of his allotment with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the amount of any unpaid charges against the land sold shall be and become a first lien thereon, and may be enforced by the Secretary of the Interior by foreclosure as a mortgage, and delivery of water to such land may be refused, within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, until all dues are paid: *Provided further*, That no right to water or to the use of any irrigation ditch or other structure on said reservation shall rest or be allowed until the owner of the land to be irrigated as herein provided shall comply with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and he is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may determine proper for making effective the foregoing provisions, and to require of owners of lands in fee such security for the reimbursement herein required as he may determine necessary, and to refuse delivery of water to any tract of land until the owners thereof shall have complied therewith.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "to be immediately available," in line 6, page 65.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the word "prescribed," in line 7. It should be "prescribe."

Mr. SNYDER. I was about to call the attention of the Chair to that word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the correction.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior are hereby authorized and directed immediately to investigate, and to report to Congress at its next session, the advisability and necessity of acquiring, with a view to returning to the dispossessed Indians from the authorities of Pierce County, Wash., those several tracts of allotted Nisqually Indian lands, Nisqually Reservation, Wash., aggregating approximately 3,200 acres, which were acquired under a compromise agreement of April 18, 1918, between said Secretaries of War and the Interior for the sum of \$78,400 from the said Nisqually Indians by said county of Pierce for War Department purposes, and which said lands were by decree of May 6, 1918, of the local State court awarded in fee to the said county of Pierce for the purpose of transferring title thereto to the War Department as an addition to Camp Lewis.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I would like to ask some member of the committee if it is necessary. What is the idea in the minds of the authorities?

Mr. HAYDEN. A military cantonment was established in the county of Pierce, in the State of Washington, and it was necessary to purchase lands from the various parties, including these Indians, and turn the same over to the United States, giving title to the Government to the land where the cantonment was located. A large area of land was acquired under this process. The Indians now say they prefer to have their land returned to them; and, since there is a large area there

which is not needed for camp purposes, authorization was placed in the bill in the Senate, and the House conferees agreed to it, for an investigation by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior to see whether it would not be possible to return the lands to the Indians and let the Indians return the money awarded to them for the purchase price of it. In other words, the Indians would rather have their old homes than the money.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Secretary of War approve of this exchange?

Mr. HAYDEN. My recollection is that there was testimony before the Indian Committee of the Senate to the effect that the Senator from the State of Washington had inquired of the War Department and had been informed that at least not all of these lands were needed for War Department purposes. The language of this item provides for an investigation by the two Secretaries to determine whether the lands are needed by the War Department, and if not needed they are to be returned to the Indians and the moneys heretofore paid to the Indians to be returned to the county of Pierce.

Mr. WALSH. There is not anything about that last requirement in this paragraph as to the money being returned.

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, the provision describes the land and tells how much was paid for it.

Mr. WALSH. The intention is, I understand, if the lands are returned the money, or a greater portion of it, is to be returned to the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. To Pierce County, in the State of Washington. This provision does nothing more than require an investigation to be made and a report to Congress relative to the matter.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Arizona whether it is not a rather unusual proceeding to have two Secretaries make an investigation? Is there not some duplication?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not necessarily. The Secretary of War now has control of this area of land for military purposes, it being a part of the cantonment grounds at Camp Lewis. It was acquired from the Nisqually Indians. The price asked for it was so high that the Secretary of War had to condemn this land. It is now claimed by the Indians that more land was taken at that time than was necessary, and they would prefer to have their land returned to them than keep the money that has been placed to their credit in the Treasury. The two Secretaries are to determine whether it is proper to give the lands back to the Indians and return the money. The Secretary of War is to report whether or not they are needed for military purposes any longer.

Mr. FESS. The Secretary of the Interior represents the Indians?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Secretary of the Interior represents the Indians in this transaction and therefore should be a party to the investigation.

Mr. GARD. Reserving the point of order, I desire to make an inquiry about the local State court award in fee to the county of Pierce. Does that mean that an action has been taken by the State court adverse to the United States and in the interest of these Indians?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The Secretary of War, under authority granted him by law, went into the State court and condemned this land, seizing it for military purposes, saying that it was necessary that there should be a large area for maneuvering grounds in the vicinity of Camp Lewis. The Indians asked a higher price for their lands. So there was a condemnation proceeding, and the court of Pierce County acted in this case. The title of that land was in the county and the county deeded the land over to the United States.

Mr. GARD. For \$78,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. For nothing, or a mere nominal consideration.

Mr. GARD. Now, when the United States gets it it pays \$78,000 to Pierce County?

Mr. HAYDEN. Naturally the Interior Department will return the money to the county if the lands are given back to the Indians.

Mr. GARD. But the whole subject is merely a matter for investigation by those Secretaries?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; to be reported to the next Congress by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 23. For the support and education of 230 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Hayward, Wis., including pay of superintendent, \$53,350; for general repairs and improvements, \$8,000; in all, \$61,350.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I direct attention to the misspelling of the word "improvements" on line 8.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the support and civilization of those portions of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians residing in the States of Wisconsin and Michigan, and to aid said Indians in establishing homes on the lands purchased for them under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1913, \$15,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, said sum to be immediately available and to be reimbursed to the United States out of the appropriation, when made, of the principal due as the proportionate share of said Indians in annuities and moneys of the Pottawatomie Tribe in which they have not shared as set forth in House Document No. 830 (60th Cong., 1st sess.), and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make a per capita payment of \$50 to said Indians out of said funds: *Provided*, That no further expenditures be authorized or made under appropriations heretofore enacted making provisions for the purchase of land and the clearing of same for said Pottawatomie Indians.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "to be immediately available" on line 25 of page 67.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of subsistence supplies in relieving cases of actual distress and suffering among those needy St. Croix Indians of Wisconsin whose cases are referred to in report of January 30, 1915, transmitted by the Secretary of the Interior to the House of Representatives March 3, 1915, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress of August 1, 1914 (38 Stats. L., pp. 582-605), and printed as House Document No. 1663, Sixty-third Congress, third session, \$1,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. What authority of law is there for spending this money for relieving distress and suffering among these particular Indians? I do not think that was considered by the committee at all. It bears the earmarks of a Senate amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was a Senate amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. We had no hearings on that and have no information on it.

Mr. WALSH. I make a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of a road from the village of Odanah, in the Bad River Reservation, to the south line of said reservation, \$20,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, said sum to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians on the Bad River Reservation, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said Indians until paid: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the construction of said road: *Provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of Wisconsin satisfactory guarantees of the payment by the said State of at least one-half of the cost of the construction of said road.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that that paragraph is in the same situation as the previous one.

Mr. WALSH. It has not been considered by the House committee?

Mr. SNYDER. It has not been considered by the House committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York concede the point of order?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing an irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, including the Big Wind River and Dry Creek Canals, and including the maintenance and operation of completed canals, \$100,000, reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, page 70, line 5, by striking out "\$100,000" and inserting "\$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 70, line 5, strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$50,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am under the impression that in the last appropriation bill the amount carried for this work was \$50,000. While this money is reimbursable, in accordance with the act of 1905, it seems to me it would be wiser to continue the same annual sum in carrying on this irrigation system there.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me? Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will state that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] appeared before our committee in connection with this item, and stated that in his opinion it would be of material advantage to prosecute this work to prompt completion, and therefore he asked for an increase in this amount. He said that if Congress appropriated but \$50,000 and spread the expenditure over two years, the overhead expense for engineers and other high-priced help would be carried on for that longer time, while if the amount were doubled and the work carried on twice as fast, a distinct saving would be made. For that reason the committee agreed to an appropriation of \$100,000 instead of \$50,000 in this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think on another occasion, two years ago, the engineer made a statement similar to that about this item. There is no question but that this is a very feasible project, favorably considered by the committee heretofore.

Mr. WALSH. A minimum has been fixed for these projects, and it is contended that an economical expenditure can not be obtained unless \$100,000 is appropriated?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was demonstrated with respect to this particular project by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. WALSH. What is the total estimate on this project?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total estimate of the additional cost to completion was \$564,000. We are appropriating \$100,000 this year, leaving a balance of \$464,000.

Mr. WALSH. How long was it expected to take?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the full amount was made immediately available, and settlers could be found to take up the land, it might be economical to appropriate the entire amount at once, but the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] thought that at least \$100,000 should be allowed this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk calls the attention of the Chair to the misspelling of the word "River" on line 2 of page 70. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the necessary correction.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuation of investigations, construction, operation, and maintenance, and incidental operations on a project for the irrigation of a portion of the conditionally ceded lands of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., to be known as the Riverton project, \$200,000, reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905: *Provided*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said project shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and divided equitably between the Indian land and public and private land irrigated by such project, and that the charge as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905, and that the charges as fixed for private and public land irrigated under such project shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of payment of construction and maintenance charges as provided by the reclamation law and amendments thereto.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. To the entire paragraph?

Mr. GARD. To the entire paragraph, unless it is explained.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not believe that the paragraph is subject to a point of order. This is clearly in continuation of a public work now in process of construction. I shall be glad, however, to give the gentleman from Ohio all the information that I have on the subject.

Mr. GARD. I would like the gentleman to explain why in this appropriation bill we should take up matters in connection with the Wind River Reservation and apportion the charges on Indian lands and on private lands.

Mr. HAYDEN. This is the situation: Certain areas of the lands belonging to the Shoshones in Wyoming were ceded to the Federal Government; that is, areas that were not previously allotted to the Indians, with the result that, under this reclamation project there is a checkerboard of allotted Indian lands and lands sold to white settlers. Now, the economical and efficient operation of this irrigation project requires that the Indian lands and the private lands must be served with water together. It is also necessary that provision be made for the return of the money advanced for the construction of these works. That is the true explanation of the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. GARD. Is there existing authority for the expenditure of any of this money for privately owned lands?

Mr. HAYDEN. No more than that the project has heretofore been adopted. It is a work in progress, and under the rules of the House we are entitled to appropriate money to continue construction. Water for irrigation could not be economically used

if the Indian lands should alone be appropriated for. The Indian would have to bear the entire cost, while the white man's land would lie waste. Combining the white man's and the Indian's land is the only way to carry on a feasible project.

Mr. GARD. I wanted to know whether this was a project to irrigate speculators' real estate under the guise of the Indian lands.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will take the trouble to read the hearings, beginning on page 347, he will find an extended statement by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and a full explanation by Mr. Reed, chief engineer of the Indian irrigation service, both of whom were questioned in great detail by the committee. Their statements show that a number of white people bought Indian allotments with the idea of making homes upon the land. The only difference between their situation and that of homesteaders on the public domain is that they are compelled to buy Indian lands and pay the Indians for them. It is not a matter of speculation on the part of these settlers but an honest effort to make homes in what otherwise would be a desert region.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If gentlemen will permit, there are alternate portions of land owned by men who have purchased allotments of the Indians. It is quite impossible to irrigate the Indian lands without also irrigating the white man's land. The purpose of this provision is to require the white settler to pay his pro rata share of this irrigation. The item is not subject to a point of order, because it is authorized by the general irrigation act of 1905, which authorizes the irrigation of Indian lands.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARD. There is no existing authority for an appropriation for such privately owned land as might lie near or contiguous to public land.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The condition of the land made it necessary to put in a provision so that the Indian's land could be irrigated and the settlers who are his neighbors be required to pay their share of the project.

Mr. GARD. I know nothing about the condition of the lands out there; but does the gentleman say that the project is one which is meritorious for the development of lands in this territory?

Mr. HASTINGS. There is no question about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No doubt about it.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the proportionate share of the cost of constructing a diversion dam and for the construction of canals and laterals for the irrigation of Indian land on the ceded portion of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., \$50,000, to be immediately available, reimbursable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the words in lines 2 and 3, page 71, "to be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing roads and bridges within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, \$25,000, said sum to be reimbursed from any funds which are now or may hereafter be placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said Indians until paid.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Much has been said since the reading of the bill relative to the great advantage that has come to the Indians since they have been civilized under the care of our Government. They are now presidents of banks, of railroads, own large estates, and prominent in professional life. Nothing, however, has been mentioned about the Indian woman. It seems to me that in this great State of Wyoming, where woman suffrage has been so prominent for 25 years, and where the men have been influenced for the better, now living higher and nobler lives than previous to the date of suffrage, as was so eloquently expressed only a few days ago by the able Representative from that State—I would like to know if the chairman has any information as to whether the Indian squaws continue to work and till the land, as they did previously and thus enable their Indian husbands to hold the high positions which they have now conquered. Have the Indian women obtained the spirit of suffrage? Are they now studying literature, art, and social science. It seems to me if they are developing at all, they should be advanced in this great State of Wyoming. May I ask the chairman if his committee has any information relative to the mental standard of the Indian squaws?

Mr. SNYDER. The chairman is willing to advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, in his judgment, the most intelligent Indian that addressed the committee was an Indian woman. [Applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to know if the Indian squaws of Wyoming are still working in the fields as they did previous to the enactment of woman suffrage. Are there now greater chances for the Indian women?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think I can answer the question concerning the activity of the squaw in the field. My information is that if there is any advancement at all among the so-called ordinary Indians it is with the squaw and not with the buck. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I recall 30 years ago I crossed the State of Wyoming and camped for several days in the Shoshone Reservation. Indians came into the camp and offered beautifully bound Bibles for tobacco. Have the Indians under the influence of woman suffrage become so civilized that they give tobacco to the white man in exchange for Bibles?

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman ask the question of me?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Yes. Have the Indians advanced so that they appreciate the Bible more than they did 25 years ago?

Mr. SNYDER. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question intelligently, but I hope that they have.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON]. He asked the question whether the Indian woman has been improved. I visited one of our Indian schools about two years ago. I accepted an invitation to have dinner with the pupils in the school. I sat at a table where a number of girls were seated, the girls ranging in ages from 17 to 19. This was at my request. I have not listened to a more intelligent discussion of current events at any table at which I have sat in 15 years than I listened to at that table. They did not know that they were to discuss current events at that time, because it was not arranged until five minutes before that anybody should have dinner with them at their table. They discussed men in this House and men in the other body. They discussed an official of the Government of the United States now residing in Paris with incisive intelligence. There was nothing that had escaped them. It was about the time we entered the war, and they knew of many reasons that had not been called to the attention of many Members of the House why we were in the war and why we should have been in it long before. Their brothers and their sweethearts were ready for service. They were as keenly alive to everything that was going on as any people with whom I have talked at any time since the war began. They were girls who will become the Indian women, the squaws, if you please, of the future.

I am asked in a stage whisper where this was. This was at the Haskell School, in Lawrence, Kans., about two years ago.

Some years ago I examined a number of Indians before a committee of this House. There sat behind me a woman who prompted me when I was cross-examining an obstreperous witness. I did not know who was prompting me. I had not seen the woman, but she was suggesting searching questions to me to put to the witness. As soon as we had adjourned for the recess I turned around and looked at her. She then introduced herself as the squaw of a man whom she introduced as her husband. She was an Indian woman residing in Oklahoma. I think that squaw man of hers obeyed orders strictly. I do not think she carried the burdens for him or tilled the fields or carried the game. I think he did his part.

The Indian women are developing. They play the piano and they paint pictures and they cook a meal as well as it can be cooked by anyone. They are studying modern methods of doing everything in our schools and, I think, are developing as rapidly as their brothers, if not more so. The Indian woman is advancing.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the statement of the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 27. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered, under general regulations to be fixed by him and under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act, to lease to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, any part of the unallotted lands within any Indian reservation within the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, or Wyoming heretofore withdrawn from entry under the mining laws for the purpose of mining for deposits of gold, silver, copper, and other valuable metalliferous minerals, which leases shall be irrevocable, except as herein provided, but which may be declared null and void upon breach of any of their terms.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. This entire section is all new legislation, and confers new powers upon the Secretary of the Interior. I believe it is very similar to a measure that was introduced in the last Congress by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN],

which he succeeded in having passed. In view of its importance I think we should be assured that the Government is properly safeguarded, and before I withdraw the reservation of the point of order I should like to hear from some member of the committee or from the gentleman from Arizona himself. I wish the gentleman would state how this compares with the legislation heretofore passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very familiar with this legislation which authorizes mining for metalliferous minerals on Indian reservations, having twice passed similar bills through the House, and this being the fourth time it has been under consideration by this body. This section was first passed as a Senate amendment, and then adopted by the House as a part of the conference report in the last session. The section shows all of the amendments made in conference. Those changes being to change the word "act" to "section" wherever it appeared; to reduce the leasing period from 30 years to 20 years, which conforms with the term in the general leasing bill; to make the payment of royalties and rentals in each case a minimum amount—that is to say, not less than 25 cents an acre for the first year, 50 cents an acre for the second year, and \$1 an acre for all years thereafter; and to provide for royalties of not less than 5 per cent. The committee will note that this legislation provides for minimum rates only, it being within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to charge the maximum—to go as high as he sees fit.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Was this measure considered or discussed at all by the Committee on Indian Affairs prior to the bill being reported to the House at this session?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; because it is practically the same bill that was reported favorably by this committee in the last Congress and placed on the calendar. We have considered nothing but the Indian appropriation bill, of which this section is a part.

Mr. WALSH. This measure is somewhat different than the bill reported out by the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Only in the respect that I have just mentioned.

Mr. WALSH. It is somewhat shorter than the bill which was reported out.

Mr. HAYDEN. This section contains the same number of paragraphs as the bill which was reported in the last Congress and practically the same language.

Mr. WALSH. The same number of paragraphs, but there are two or three paragraphs that are much shorter in the measure passed in the last Congress. Does the gentleman think that the Government is properly safeguarded by the phrasology—

That leases under this act shall be for a period of 20 years, with the preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years, upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that leaves the whole matter entirely in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, and it is his duty to safeguard the interests of the Indians and the Government.

Mr. WALSH. The terms and conditions of the renewal will be a part of the lease, will they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the lessee will have a preferential right to apply for a new lease at the end of each 10-year period, if the deposits are not worked out by that time.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but of course the terms and conditions of the renewal will be stated at the time he takes his lease for 20 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not my understanding that such would be the case either in this bill or any of the other leasing bills which have passed this House so many times, this being an identical copy of the language used in those bills, without any change whatsoever.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman expect a man with capital to invest will go and take a lease for 20 years under this bill and enter on the nineteenth year of his lease, and then the Secretary of the Interior might come in and make a lot of regulations and rules which would make it inadvisable for him to renew his lease?

Mr. HAYDEN. The only preference the lessee would have, all other things being equal, is that if he desired a renewal he would obtain a new lease, rather than some one else, under the conditions prescribed by the Secretary.

Mr. WALSH. Well, it is confined to eight or nine States. Has the gentleman any information as to how much mineral lands, how many acres, there are comprised within those nine States?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are about 30,000,000 acres of unallotted Indian land in the States to which the law would be applicable. I gave the exact figures in my report upon the bill in the last Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Is it fair to assume some survey or investigation has been made, the result of which has been to include only those States and none of the others?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the bill as originally introduced applied to the State of Arizona alone. At the request of a number of gentlemen in the House who have large areas of unallotted Indian lands within their States the bill was made general, to cover the entire United States.

Mr. WALSH. But it does not cover all the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Objection was made to including the entire United States by certain Senators in another body, who were opposed to any kind of a lease law whatsoever, and their States were eliminated from the bill. So instead of making it general, the bill applies to the States named herein, which is satisfactory to the delegations in the House and Senate from those States.

Mr. WALSH. Well, what is the purpose, for instance, of including the State of Montana?

Mr. HAYDEN. The State of Montana contains very large areas of Indian lands, parts of which contain mineral but which can not now be mined, because there is no authority of law to do so.

Mr. WALSH. What kind of minerals?

Mr. HAYDEN. Gold, silver, and other metalliferous minerals. Montana is a great mining State, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. WALSH. But what kind of minerals are upon Indian reservations in Montana?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no specific information at hand, but it was represented to me by the Representatives from Montana that they desired to have whatever minerals there were in their Indian reservations opened to mining under the terms of this law.

Mr. WALSH. But originally this legislation was proposed simply for the State of Arizona, because in that State there are the largest tracts of metalliferous land within Indian reservations.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman is correct, but upon making his report upon the bill the Secretary of the Interior recommended it be made general, and the same request was made by Representatives from these States in the House of Representatives, and so your committee acted accordingly.

Mr. WALSH. Now, these leases, I notice in the first paragraph, are to be irrevocable, except as herein provided.

Mr. HAYDEN. Which was copied from the language used in the general leasing bill. A lease may only be revoked under the terms of the paragraph, beginning in line 19, page 76—

That any lease granted under this section may be forfeited and canceled by appropriate proceedings in the United States district court for the district in which said property or some parts thereof be situated—

And so forth.

Mr. WALSH. That is, of course, for a breach of the lease?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Whenever the lessee, after reasonable notice in writing, as prescribed in the lease, shall fail to comply with the terms of this section or with such conditions not inconsistent herewith as may be specifically recited in the lease.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat doubtful of the propriety of adding this measure to the general appropriation bill for the Indian Bureau, but I am willing to take the judgment of the gentleman from Arizona, who has been insisting upon this for several years, and I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve a point of order, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from Arizona. I notice that this bill provides that the royalty shall not be less than 5 per cent of the net output. Is that the usual royalty?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the minimum royalty.

Mr. BLANTON. Is that the usual royalty in the gentleman's State with respect to private concerns?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is with respect to low-grade copper ores.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the usual royalty higher than that, and does not that apply to the gross output instead of the net output?

Mr. HAYDEN. The usual royalty paid on a metalliferous mining lease is based upon the net and not the gross value of the ore. There is no reason why the Secretary of the Interior may not provide in advance for a sliding scale of royalty based on the metallic content of the ores, in the same manner as

freight charges are now collected by the railroads on the ore shipped to the smelters. The miner loads his ore on the cars and ships it to the smelter, and the bill of lading shows nothing much except that it is a carload of ore. The smelter returns show the value of the ore, and the freight rate is based upon that, the richer the ore the higher the freight rate. If the railroad companies can collect their freight on such a sliding scale there is no reason why the royalty to be paid to the Indians can not be provided for in the same way.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not the judgment and opinion of the gentleman that with this minimum royalty fixed in this bill the Secretary of the Interior will accept it as the judgment of Congress in fixing royalty?

Mr. HAYDEN. On the contrary, if the gentleman has had any experience at all with the administration of Indian affairs he will find that the representatives of the Indian Office are very zealous indeed that the Indian shall receive even more than he is entitled to, in order to make a record for themselves. I have no fear of that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That leases under this act shall be for a period of 30 years, with the preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods: *Provided*, That the lessee may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be permitted at any time to make written relinquishment of all rights under such a lease and, upon acceptance thereof, be thereby relieved of all future obligations under said lease.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask just a question. I notice that the Clerk read "section," and the bill I have reads "act."

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman has the star print of the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, what I desire to know is whether there is any change in this particular paragraph, and as I assume this is all a part of one enactment and should be subject at any time to a point of order, it provides for a comprehensive piece of legislation. What I particularly wanted to know was about the leases under this act, and whether that is the same language as contained in the mining law the House passed in the last Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly so. It was copied from that bill.

Mr. GARD. Thirty years?

Mr. HAYDEN. Twenty years. The gentleman has not the bill that was agreed to in the committee.

Mr. GARD. The committee print is for 30 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill as reported provides for 20 years. The term was so reduced in conference. That is the reason for the change.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman explain whether there is any change made in the bill I have, the completed and proper bill, in regard to the matter of timber on this land?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no change in that regard. The principal differences between the bill you have and the corrected print is that wherever the word "section" appears it has been changed to "act," and that in line 10, page 76, the leasing period was reduced to 20 years, that being the period agreed to in conference between the House and the Senate when the bill was acted upon in the last session.

Mr. GARD. Advancing a little, on page 77, for the purpose of information at this time, I notice there is no reservation for cutting of timber by the Secretary of the Interior, but merely by the superintendent of the reservation. Is that a proper regulation?

Mr. HAYDEN. It surely should not be necessary for the purpose of securing a little mine timber to refer the application to Washington, 3,000 miles away from the reservation.

Mr. GARD. It is not mine timber. It provides that no timber shall be cut on the reservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. That change was made in the Senate. Under the general mining law a miner has the right to go on the public domain and cut timber necessary for mining purposes. The Senator who offered this amendment wanted to be sure that no such right would be granted by this bill except by permission of the superintendent of the reservation, and upon payment of the fair value thereof.

Mr. GARD. I think no such authority should be given in this bill for cutting timber.

Mr. HAYDEN. The timber referred to is to be used only for mining purposes.

Mr. GARD. It does not state that.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will offer an amendment to that effect I shall accept it.

Mr. GARD. I will offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the reservation is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That in addition to areas of mineral land to be included in leases under this act the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may grant to the lessee the right to use, during the life of the lease, subject to the payment of an annual rental of not less than \$1 per acre, a tract of unoccupied land, not exceeding 80 acres in area, for camp sites, milling, smelting, and refining works, and for other purposes connected with and necessary to the proper development and use of the deposits covered by the lease.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to line 21, to change the word "act" to the word "section," in order to perfect the text.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman will recall that I was opposed to permitting 80 acres of land to be taken adjacent to these mineral lands for camp sites for smelters.

Mr. HAYDEN. I find upon an examination of the potash law passed last year that that area was limited to 40 acres. If the gentleman wants to offer an amendment reducing that to 40 acres, I will accept it.

Mr. WALSH. I will offer an amendment after the gentleman corrects the word he referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN offers an amendment: Page 75, line 21, strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "eighty," in line 25, and inserting the word "forty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Amend, line 25, page 75, by striking out the word "eighty" and inserting the word "forty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to correct the spelling of the first word in line 25, page 75.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the correction.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, in making any lease under this section, may reserve to the United States the right to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of the surface of the lands embraced within such lease under existing law or laws hereafter enacted, in so far as said surface is not necessary for use of the lessee in extracting and removing the deposits therein: *Provided*, That the said Secretary, during the life of the lease, is hereby authorized to issue such permits for easements herein provided to be reserved.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. What is the idea of permitting the Secretary of the Interior to sell the surface of these lands when the deposits are under lease?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a very common practice in a mining country, and it might be of immense value to the Indians.

Mr. WALSH. It is not a common practice, however, on reservation land.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a common usage on coal lands in Oklahoma. Where minerals are under the ground a town might be located on the surface where the miners would live who mine the deposits, and such land could be sold to the great benefit of the Indians. If the surface is segregated from the minerals under the ground and the Secretary has the right to lease or sell the surface, he may obtain very high values for the land, which otherwise would accrue to the advantage of the lessees.

Mr. CARTER. In Oklahoma the surface of our coal land has brought about 60 or 70 per cent, that part that has been sold, of the amount brought by the mineral itself. That is, in known and developed coal fields.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but it seems to me that if you permit that to be done with Indian reservation land, you might get a lease to operate for the minerals beneath the surface for 20 years,

and immediately after the lease is signed and operations have begun the Secretary of the Interior would sell the surface of the land and they might exhaust the minerals beneath the surface of the land inside of 10 or 15 years and cease operations, and then move out; and then you would find that the Indian reservations embraced within that area had been sold and no longer exist. Now, I doubt the propriety of conferring that authority upon the Secretary of the Interior. I think if they are going to be permitted to operate beneath the surface, they might be permitted to lease, but not to sell, because they might expect to be operating there for a number of years, and then the Secretary of the Interior would have sold the surface and by that much would have decreased the area of that Indian reservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman seeks to amend by striking out, in line 5, the words "sell or otherwise dispose of"?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I think that would be a protective amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will offer his amendment, I shall accept it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and move to amend, in line 5, page 76, by striking out the words "sell or otherwise dispose of."

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman propose by his amendment to limit it to the time of the lease?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALSH offers the following amendment: Page 76, line 5, strike out the words "sell, or otherwise dispose of."

Mr. GARD. The question I asked was whether there was to be any time in the lease. The gentleman uses the word "lease," but does not state any period of time for which it may run, whereas the other lease provides a 20-year limit.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I suppose that situation might be corrected by a further amendment, after these words are stricken out, by inserting there the words "for a period not exceeding the lease of the mineral land."

Mr. GARD. Does not the gentleman think that should be done? I simply suggest that.

Mr. WALSH. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to further amend by inserting after the word "lease," in line 5, page 76, the words "for a term not exceeding that of the mineral lease."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 76, line 5, after the word "lease," insert the words "for a term not exceeding that of the mineral lease."

Mr. GARD. The mineral lease hereinafter authorized.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not necessary. It refers to that in the particular paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, on page 77, line 26, after the word "except," insert the words "for mining purposes, and then only," so that the section as amended will read:

That no timber shall be cut upon the reservation by the lessee except for mining purposes, and then only after first obtaining a permit from the superintendent of the reservation and upon payment of the fair value thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 77, line 26, after the word "except," insert the words "for mining purposes, and then only."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that on page 77 there is language providing for the payment of 25 cents per acre, 50 cents per acre, and \$1 per acre, depending on the years in which it is to be paid; and it provides also that all moneys paid for rentals by the acre shall be credited on the royalties charged at 5 per cent. Now, if the rent paid per acre is to be deducted from the royalty charge,

and the lessee is permitted to cut the timber from the surface of the land, even though it may be only for mining purposes, it may well be that he will cut more timber each year from the land than the rent per acre will amount to; and I rather think that if he is permitted to cut the timber he ought not to be given any credit for the amount paid for the rent for the surface of the land, for it will undoubtedly be the case in any event, without respect to what timber he may cut, that he will do some damage to the surface of the land, and perhaps a good deal more damage than the rent will amount to.

Mr. HAYDEN. He can not cut any timber except upon permission of the superintendent and upon payment of the fair value thereof. He must pay for the timber in any instance.

Mr. MADDEN. Where does it say that?

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 78, at the top of the page—And upon payment of the fair value thereof.

Mr. MADDEN. All right then. Let us assume that he pays a fair value for the timber, and then let us assume that the cutting of the timber will be a damage to the surface of the land as well; and then if we assume that the amount paid for rent is to be taken from the royalty, the royalty is reduced by that amount; and it may be that regardless of the question of timber the surface of the land will be more or less injured where these mining claims are operated, and I do not believe that the lessee ought to be permitted to take credit on his royalty.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I copied this language directly and exactly from the general leasing bill which passed this House in the last three Congresses, and the theory of that bill is that the operator should pay the royalty whenever he is operating his mine, but that when he does not operate it there should be a rental for the use of the land which is in the nature of a penalty for not doing any work on the property. That is the whole idea, and that is why we followed that plan in this bill and the other leasing bills.

Mr. MADDEN. I assumed that that was the reason why the rental charge was made, but it does not say so in this bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. It certainly does.

Mr. MADDEN. Where does it say so? Read it. It does not say that the rent shall be paid only when he is not operating the mine.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MADDEN. But it does not say so.

Mr. HAYDEN. This bill says that there shall be a rental of not less than 25 cents, 50 cents, or \$1 an acre, according to the year, except that the rental shall be credited against the royalty accrued for that year.

Mr. MADDEN. Sure.

Mr. HAYDEN. If there is no royalty, there is the rental to be paid.

Mr. MADDEN. He pays the rental anyhow.

Mr. HAYDEN. The practical effect is what we are getting at. Mr. MADDEN. It reduces the royalty by the amount of the rent.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the usual custom.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it is a good proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. That question was debated fully in the last three Congresses, and this policy was adopted in the coal, oil, and gas leasing bill, and this provision is copied from that general bill.

Mr. MADDEN. But the mere fact that it was adopted previously does not necessarily make it good practice. If you foreclose a question because it has been settled once, and if no new idea can be injected into it, why, then, the world stops and you make no progress at all.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield to me for a moment—

Mr. MADDEN. I am always delighted to yield to the gentleman, who is always very clever.

Mr. CARTER. I will say that the same policy has been followed with reference to the leasing of the coal lands of the Choctaws and Chickasaws in Oklahoma. They lease their lands in tracts of 960 acres. They require a royalty per ton, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and require an advance royalty of \$100 for the first year, \$300 for the second year, and \$500 for the third and each year thereafter so long as any mining is done upon the property. Then if the coal is mined thereafter during the period of the lease the advance royalty is applied at the ton basis on the coal mined.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that to be the case; and I understand that a man who enters upon the mining of coal may want a lot of property adjacent to the mine that he is operating, and he is not ready to enter upon it; but in the case of mines such as are provided for in this bill the presumption is that the lease is made by a man who undertakes to enter upon the active work of mining at once. He has charge of the surface of the property, and in the other case the owner of the property still has charge of the surface. They are not alike, and it seems to me if we charge a rental fee per acre that that is to be definite and decisive and it ought not under any circumstances to be deducted from the royalties.

Mr. CARTER. That would be true if the lessee received any revenue from the property outside of the coal mine.

Mr. MADDEN. Whether he does or not, he has control of the property and can prevent the owner of the property from using it for any other purpose. He may destroy the surface of the property after he begins to mine, and the value of the property when the mining operation is completed may not be worth much of anything. In the meantime the owner of the property has been reimbursed to the extent of the rental paid, and this ought not to be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 20 to make a correction which I promised the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] I would do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent to return to page 20 for the purpose of making a correction. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. It refers to the Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 70, and it should be page 77.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the change.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a new section:

"That during the present session of Congress those members of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, not less than five in number, who are Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, are authorized to conduct hearings and investigate the conduct of the Indian Service, at Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, is hereby appropriated for expenses incident thereto. The said committee is hereby authorized and empowered to examine into the conduct and management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all its branches and agencies, their organization and administration, to examine all books, documents, and papers in the said Bureau of Indian Affairs, its branches or agencies, relating to the administration of the business of said bureau, and shall have and is hereby granted authority to subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, administer oaths, and to demand any and all books, documents, and papers of whatever nature relating to the affairs of Indians as conducted by said bureau, its branches and agencies. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance, including stenographers, as said committee may deem necessary in the proper prosecution of its work: *Provided*, That stenographers so employed shall not receive for their services exceeding \$1 per printed page."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that an amendment should be made. The amendment reads "during this session," and it seems to me it ought to be "during this Congress."

Mr. SNYDER. I will accept that modification.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Might I not suggest that there should be another change, and refer to the present Members of Congress instead of to the Sixty-sixth Congress?

Mr. SNYDER. The whole amendment was drawn to cover the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, there is some doubt as to whether my reservation of a point of order is in order, and I will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as modified.

The question was considered, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2480) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SNYDER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HUTCHINSON, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness in his family.

COMMITTEE ON WATER POWER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the appointment of the following members of the Committee on Water Power.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ESCH, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. WINSLOW, Mr. SINNOTT, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, Mr. ELSTON, Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. MC LAUGHLIN of Michigan, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SIMS, Mr. DOREMUS, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. FERRIS, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. RAKER, Mr. LEVER, Mr. LEE of Georgia, and Mr. CANDLER.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 27, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting revised estimates of appropriations required by the Office of Farm Management for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the general deficiency bill for operating public buildings, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Acting Secretary of State submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Finland from June 16, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3075) to prohibit the employment of any person who is not a citizen of the United States as radio operator or telegrapher on any vessel of the United States engaged in interstate or foreign commerce and to establish the age of radio operators; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) to amend section 8 of the act approved June 26, 1906, entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) to provide for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) to provide for the establishment of a division of civic training in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3080) to commission acting assistant or contract surgeons of the United States Army who have served in the Army for a period of at least three months to be first lieutenants in the United States Medical Reserve Corps, and to add to the Medical Corps of the Army in case of necessity; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3081) for the erection of new buildings for the Golden Gate Life-Saving Station, at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) to make further provision for the organization of native troops in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3083) to provide for the admission into soldiers and sailors' homes of persons who have served in the Army or the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 3084) providing for the discharge of sailors and marines who enlisted since April 7, 1917, and before November 11, 1918; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 3085) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the trustees of the Carnegie Free Library, of Beaver Falls, Beaver County, Pa., one small cannon or machine gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3086) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Charleroi, county of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3087) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Beaver Falls, county of Beaver, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3088) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of New Brighton, county of Beaver, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3089) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Castle, county of Lawrence, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Volant, county of Lawrence, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3091) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of McDonald, county of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of West Middleton, county of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHIER: A bill (H. R. 3093) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Broadalbin, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 3094) to increase the limit of cost of the public building at Paris, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3095) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the village of Loudonville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 3096) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Buffalo, N. Y., three German cannons or fieldpieces, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3097) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the village of Marilla, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to Elmo, State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and projectiles, to the village of Clarence, State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3100) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lancaster, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Depew, N. Y., one Ger-

man cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Williamsville, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Akron, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Alden, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3105) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Greenville, Muhlenburg County, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3106) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bowling Green, county of Warren, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) to correct the military record and provide for the granting of pensions to survivors of certain battalions of Kentucky Militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) to regulate the sale of unstemmed leaf tobacco in the hand; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3109) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3110) establishing a Mammoth Cave National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) for the erection of a public building at Russellville, Logan County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 3112) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Easton, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3113) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Snow Hill, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3114) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salisbury, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3115) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Princess Anne, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3116) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elkton, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Easton, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Denton, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chestertown, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Centerville, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cambridge, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3122) to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) to provide for the erection of a public building at Corapolis, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) to provide for the erection of a public building at Duquesne, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3125) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal Building at McKees Rocks, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3126) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elsberry, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3127) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mexico, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3128) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bowling Green, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3129) providing for the raising of the Government dike opposite Clarksville, Mo.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 3130) for the erection of a public building at Medford, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3131) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wakefield, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 3132) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Great Barrington, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3133) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Adams, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 3134) for the erection of a public post-office building at De Funiak Springs, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBSTER: A bill (H. R. 3136) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce passed February 4, 1887, and subsequent amendments thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3137) to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Stevens and Ferry Counties, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3138) to create an additional judge in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3139) providing for the marking and protection of the battle field known as Dades massacre, in Sumter County, Fla., and for the erection of a monument thereon; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 3140) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sheffield, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3141) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3142) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Athens, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 3143) to provide for further educational facilities by requiring the War Department to loan certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade and technical schools and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 3144) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Wilkesville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 3145) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Spencer, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3146) to establish a workers' home board for the purpose of making loans to workers with which to build or buy their homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 3147) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Spruce Pine, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and suitable complement of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3148) to provide for a site and public building at Clearwater, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 3149) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 3150) extending the benefits of the \$60 bonus provided under Title XIV, section 1406, of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919, to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 3151) to construct and equip a lighthouse depot for the eighth lighthouse district at New

Orleans, La., or vicinity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3152) for the erection of a post-office building at Monte Vista, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3153) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cisco, in the county of Eastland, in the State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 3154) regulating the salaries of Army field clerks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 3155) further extending the time for the repayment of certain Spanish War revenue taxes erroneously collected; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 3156) to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands, to be known as the national soldier settlement act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 3158) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon at Bishop, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Holtville, Calif., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 3160) to amend an act providing for the erection of a public building at Syracuse, N. Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3161) for the erection of a public building in the city of Everett, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) for the erection of a public building in the city of Malden, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3163) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Malden, in the State of Massachusetts, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 3164) to regulate pawnbrokers and their business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 3165) to provide for appointment to places under the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) for equipment and maintenance allowance for carriers on rural free delivery routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3167) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Blytheville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3168) authorizing the establishment of rural routes in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3169) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) to authorize the payment of 50 per cent of the proceeds arising from the sale of timber from the national forest reserves in the State of Arkansas to the promotion of agriculture, domestic economy, animal husbandry, and dairying within the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3171) to amend the practice and procedure in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) to make eligible for appointment ex-soldiers of the Union and Confederate armies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wynne, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3174) to increase the salary of the clerk of the district attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Arkansas, counties of Mississippi and Poinsett; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3176) to provide for a site and public building at Fort Myers, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) to provide for a site and public building at Plant City, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 3178) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Throop College of Technology, Pasadena, Calif., one captured German aeroplane for scientific purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3179) to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting interstate transportation of the products of convict labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 3180) providing for a refund to certain officers of the Naval Reserve Corps by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3181) to authorize the purchase for site and the erection, completion, and equipping of a Federal building at Fort Wayne, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 3182) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Water Power.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 3183) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of the lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Water Power.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of the lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Water Power.

By Mr. ALMON: Resolution (H. Res. 54) providing for printing additional copies of soil survey of Lauderdale County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 55) expressing the opinion of the House of Representatives that the treaty of peace should be ratified at once; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: Resolution (H. Res. 56) to pay B. F. Estopinal, clerk to the late Hon. Albert Estopinal, one month's salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PARK: Resolution (H. Res. 57) providing for the appointment of minority employees; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution (H. Res. 58) authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to sit during sessions and recesses of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

By Mr. CARAWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 59) to investigate cotton exchanges; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) tendering the thanks of Congress to those who served or gave others to the service of the country in the Great War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan necessary tents and equipment for use at the celebration in honor of the returning soldiers and sailors of Wisconsin, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., during September, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) providing for an investigation of the various press or publicity bureaus of the various departments, bureaus, boards, or commissions of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 3185) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Linn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3186) granting a pension to Arthur Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 3188) granting a pension to Ruth Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3189) granting a pension to Margaret Mabery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3190) granting a pension to Thomas W. Breckenridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) granting an increase of pension to James W. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) granting an increase of pension to William R. Boren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) granting an increase of pension to Jacob McKnight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) granting an increase of pension to John M. Thorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) granting an increase of pension to Horace B. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) granting an increase of pension to John Small; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 3199) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of George W. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3200) to appoint Lieut. Commander Richard Drace White a commander on the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3201) for the relief of E. F. Mathews; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3202) granting an increase of pension to Annie Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3203) granting an increase of pension to Augustus W. Connor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3204) granting a pension to Florence G. Tuttle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) granting an increase of pension to Wilhelmine Gaehler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 3206) granting a pension to Margaret A. Gilmore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) for the relief of William Sennhenn and Borris M. Spector; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 3208) granting a pension to Robert J. Phinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 3209) for the relief of W. H. Overocker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 3210) for the relief of Joseph A. Prat; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) for the relief of Emma J. Spear; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3212) for the relief of legal representative of George E. Payne, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3213) for the relief of George M. Leahy, receiver of the New Orleans Mechanics' Society of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3214) for the relief of the legal representative of Lapene & Ferré; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) for the relief of I. C. Johnson, Jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) for the relief of the heirs of Isabelle Ann Fluker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) for the relief of Celeste Doussan Bisset; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) granting a pension to Henry Rudolph; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) granting a pension to James A. Coyne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3220) granting a pension to Widow Emma Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 3221) granting a pension to Elmer Wagar; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 3222) granting a pension to Maurice Leahy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) granting a pension to William A. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3224) granting a pension to Martin Tahaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to James R. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3226) granting a pension to Harry Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3227) granting relief to Columbus Shannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) for the relief of Jacob Ehla, alias Jacob Eby, alias John Ihle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3229) to correct the military record of Algernon N. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 3230) to correct the military record of Charles Trougott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) for the relief of Belle Rush; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 3232) granting an increase of pension to John W. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3233) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 3234) for the relief of the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 3235) authorizing the President to appoint D. G. Barr a second lieutenant in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 3236) granting a pension to Henrietta I. Machenheimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3237) granting a pension to Emma Lee Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 3238) authorizing the President of the United States to restore to the active list Daniel Moriarty, chief boatswain, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3239) granting a pension to Katie Noblitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) granting a pension to Maxwell Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) granting a pension to John H. Simmons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) granting a pension to Robert F. Tietz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) granting a pension to Charles A. Lyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) granting a pension to John Haight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3245) granting an increase of pension to John McMahon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) granting an increase of pension to Mary Leahy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3247) granting an increase of pension to Jerome McWethy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3248) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) for the relief of the minor nephews of Owen F. Solomon, first lieutenant, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) for the relief of James Ross; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) for the relief of George F. Stedman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) for the relief of Patrick McNamee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) for the relief of David Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3254) for the relief of Horatio S. Turrell, alias Horatio Seaward; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3255) for the relief of Jasper J. Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3256) for the relief of Thomas Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3257) for the relief of Mary Curtin, widow of Michael Curtin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 3258) for the relief of Julius Jonas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 3259) for the relief of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 3260) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Waldorph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 3261) granting a pension to Eva L. Woolacott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3262) granting a pension to Margaret Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 3263) granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. Dicus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) granting an increase of pension to Francis Cortois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 3265) to relieve the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of said Thomas H. Hall of the payment of money alleged to have been misappropriated by a clerk in said office; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3266) granting a pension to Ulysses G. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3267) granting a pension to Henry T. Kinrade; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3268) granting a pension to Filen Whalin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 3269) granting an increase of pension to George C. Hazeltine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3270) granting an increase of pension to Carolina M. Anthony; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 3271) granting a pension to George Milams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 3272) granting a pension to Thomas C. Nation; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3273) granting an increase of pension to William Burgess; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) to pay to Silas McElroy, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of \$10,000 for injuries received while in the service of the Government; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Letter from the International Defense Association of Mexico, relating to Mexican Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of sympathy adopted by the State Council of Maryland, Daughters of America, upon the death, May 13, 1919, of the Hon. John Lawson Burnett, of Gadsden, Ala.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Sara J. Darr, president, and Anna Marden Deyo, secretary, Woman's Christian Temperance Union of California, protesting against lifting the ban from wine and beer and for enforcement of war-time prohibition and constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California Conference Free Methodist Church, opposing repeal of prohibition war measure or change in present law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of W. M. Hartley, J. D. Simpson, and 400 other citizens of Platte and Andrew Counties, Mo., asking for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOPLEY: Petition of residents of Joliet, Ill., asking for repeal of section 904, revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition with 35 signers of Bates County, Mo., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, asking for enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, relating to protection of lives and property of aliens, a new oriental policy bringing our laws into harmony with treaties with China, and a policy in the restriction of immigration with regard for the interest of all the nations concerned; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, asking that a Federal law be enacted for the suppression of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry farmers, voters, and taxpayers of Loyal, Wis., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Edwin E. Shaeffer and Fred Steinmetz, both of route 4, Lititz, Pa., asking repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of citizens of Virginia, asking congressional consideration of conditions in Korea under Japanese rule; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Aroostook, Penobscot, and Piscataquis Counties, in Maine, asking for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of California Almond Growers' Exchange, praying for passage of legislation making appropriation to investigate the culture of the almond, walnut, and other nuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions adopted by the California Bean Growers' Association, praying for passage of legislation placing a high protective tariff on foreign grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of Highgrove Methodist Episcopal Church, California, and San Antonio Heights Church, Upland, Calif., protesting against lifting the ban on beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Protestant churches of Santa Ana; Central Christian Church, San Diego; and First Methodist Episcopal Church, Hemet, all in the State of California, against lifting ban on beer and wine, and urging support of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Meyer Fur Co., Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against luxury tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of members of the Pacific Coast Section, National Electric Light Association, disapproving of the proposed establishment of a standard of ethics by the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of board of trustees of city of Glendale, for speedy return of telephone lines and systems to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Retail Shoe Dealers' Association of San Diego, Calif., protesting against the luxury tax on shoes and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of enginemen working on the Arizona division of the Santa Fe coast lines, strongly in favor of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of citizens assembled in Harrison, N. J., for absolute equality, political liberty, and religious freedom to all men, Jews and Christians alike, in all countries signatories of the treaty of peace, particularly in the countries which will be created as a result of the World War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, asking for immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: Petition of International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Helpers, Local No. 170, Richmond, Va., for Government ownership of railways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Produce Exchange, protesting against certain activities of the Bureau of Markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Pittsburgh Council of the Churches of Christ, W. I. Wishart, president, protesting against the recommendation made by President Wilson for the repeal of the prohibitory act of November 21, 1918, in so far as it applies to wines and beers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Grange of Bernards Bay, N. Y., protesting against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of S. Wechselblatt, furrier, New York, asking for repeal of luxury tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of B. Harris, importer of furs and skins, New York, asking for repeal of luxury tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Grass, Friedman & Co. (Inc.), manufacturing furriers and fur novelties, New York, asking for repeal of subdivision 19, section 900, title 9, of the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation which will provide an adequate and effective budget system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of Charles H. Trowbridge, of Oakham, and other residents of third district of Massachusetts, for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of M. M. Waldron and sundry citizens of Pittston, Me., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of E. C. Mathews and sundry other citizens of Waterville, Me., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Arthur N. Ward and sundry other citizens of Winslow, Me., asking for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINES: Resolutions of Pearl Lodge, Odd Fellows, favoring league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America, urging the passage of legislation for the suppression of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, asking for immediate return of our soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. C. Capewell Co., Oakland, Calif., urging the repeal of the so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, telegram from president of Womans Christian Temperance Union, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the lifting of the ban on beer and wines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, urging the incorporation of certain clauses relative to religious freedom, etc., in the covenant of the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Resolution of the trustees of the city of Glendale, Calif., favoring prompt return of the telephone lines to their owners; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of seven missionary societies of Long Beach, Calif., favoring enforcement of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, protests of Friends' Church of Huntington Park, and First Universalist Church, and Lake Avenue Methodist Church, of Pasadena, all in the State of California, against repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Master House Painters and Decorators' Association of St. Louis, Mo., demanding an increase on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of S. Wechselblatt, of New York City, urging repeal of the 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Constitutional League and Southern States Woman Suffrage Conference on Woman Suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Postal Telegraph-Cable Co., urging the immediate return of telegraph and telephone systems to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lang & Klein, Freundlich & Matler Co., and B. Harris, all of New York, urging the repeal of 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jewelers' Vigilance Committee (Inc.), urging the repeal of Title IX, sections 900-907, inclusive, revenue-tax law, 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, urging the return to the United States of all soldiers serving as part of the American Expeditionary Forces in Siberia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, for the suppression of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, for adequate protection of the lives and property of aliens and policy in the restriction of immigration based on a just and equitable regard of all of the nations concerned; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, requesting the incorporation of a clause into the covenant of the league of nations guaranteeing freedom of religious belief; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Self-Determination League of Liberty, with headquarters in New York City, relative to war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of H. E. Huntley, of Corfu, N. Y., and 25 other residents of that vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Merton Phelps, of Caledonia, N. Y., and 18 other residents of that vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mrs. A. B. Johnson, of Caledonia, N. Y., and 12 other residents of that vicinity, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of H. S. Neill and others, of Eden Prairie, Minn., for repeal of daylight-saving plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Joseph Frumkin and others, of Minneapolis, Minn., to provide for the national ownership and Government operation of all railroads in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Resolution passed by the members of the Italian Chamber of Commerce of New York, approving the repealing of act restricting the manufacture, import, and sale of wines and beer on and after July 1, 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of Board of Foreign Missions of Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, asking repeal of war-time act affecting the manufacture and sale of beer and wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 27, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, our Heavenly Father, in whom is all wisdom, power, and goodness, we humbly pray that Thy holy influence may be exerted on the mind and heart of man, that all evil may give way to the good in him and Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done in earth as in heaven; that life at its best, in thought and deed, may live and evil die to the good of the world and to Thy glory in Christ, who gave His life that man might live and enjoy every blessing. In His name. Amen.

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

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have rereferred from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service the bill (H. R. 261) for the retirement of civil-service employees. This rereference has the consent of the introducer of the bill and the chairman and, as far as I know, every member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to rerefer the bill referred to from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for reference of the bill H. R. 1235, the minimum-wage bill, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill just specified, the minimum-wage bill, be rereferred from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to the Committee on Labor. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up privileged House resolution 40, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 40.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives from date of their appointment, not earlier than May 1, 1919, until otherwise provided by law for the services of a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger, compensation at the rate of \$2,500, \$1,500, and \$1,000 per annum, respectively, the said clerks and messenger to be appointed by and to be under the direction and control of the majority floor leader.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this corresponds with the help now controlled by the minority leader?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Exactly?

Mr. IRELAND. No.

Mr. GARNER. Why the difference?

Mr. IRELAND. There is a difference in the salary of the assistant clerk to the minority leader, which was provided for

in the legislative appropriation bill. It is my opinion that this discrepancy will be corrected within a few days, but as to that I am giving only my individual opinion.

Mr. GARNER. Why is this dated back to May 1?

Mr. IRELAND. Because one of the appointments was made on May 2, I think—though I will not be positive as to that—prior to the opening of Congress, and one about the middle of the month.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman means that these employees were arranged for? Of course, the House had not authorized anything of that kind.

Mr. IRELAND. No; certainly not.

Mr. GARNER. I presume the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] needed them at that time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I found that there were some matters that needed attention and the assistance of a clerk. I took the responsibility of hiring a clerk at the first of the month and then another one about the middle of the month.

Mr. GARNER. And it is the gentleman's understanding that the Committee on Accounts does intend to equalize the salaries of the minority and majority employees?

Mr. IRELAND. I am not at liberty to speak for the committee. I can only give the gentleman my individual opinion, and my opinion is that it does.

Mr. GARNER. It seems to me that the gentleman introducing the resolution ought to be prepared to speak for the committee if he expects the House to support the resolution. Each one of these gentlemen, the minority and majority leaders, ought to have the same amount of help, and they ought to be paid the same amount of money.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. As I understand it, the clerk receives \$2,500, the assistant clerk \$1,200, and the messenger \$1,000.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And the gentleman is now proposing to raise the pay of the assistant clerk for the majority leader from \$1,200 to \$1,500. If it is necessary to have a clerk at \$1,500, it occurs to me that it is necessary for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to have one at that price. I call attention to it because the gentleman's committee being in power it ought to do the fair thing.

Mr. IRELAND. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. The reason for that might be found in the fact that possibly a year or two ago you might secure an assistant clerk for less money than you can to-day. I have every confidence that this discrepancy will be taken care of, but I am only giving the gentleman my individual opinion and not speaking officially for the committee. I am not privileged to speak for them in that sense.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Accounts has prepared and on yesterday introduced a resolution providing that the pay of the clerks to the minority leader shall conform to that of the majority, and further providing for pay for the month of June. The legislative bill provides only for compensation to begin the 1st of July, but in order that he may have the benefit of these clerks during the month of June provision will be made in conformity with the other. That will be brought up before the Committee on Accounts at its next meeting.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE TRANSATLANTIC FLIGHT.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for five minutes on a subject which I know will meet the approval of every Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in the advance of science and the achievements of industry, the genius of America in the triumphs of peace shines forth with a brilliancy as resplendent as the victories of war, where the spirit of America, transmuted into the blood of heroes, has brought to the Nation glory everlasting. [Applause.]

America has given to the world its greatest inventions and mankind pays us tribute for the most potential benefits rendered humanity. A few years ago two Americans, following in the footsteps of one who died before the successful demonstration of the convictions of a lifetime, brought forth the airplane, and the hope of centuries became the reality of the present. The